

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SIXTH YEAR

**2285<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 16 JUNE 1981

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2285) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
Complaint by Iraq: Letter dated 8 June 1981 from the Chargé d'affaires of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14509) .....	1

## NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

## 2285th MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 16 June 1981, at 3.15 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Porfirio MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: China, France, German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2285)

#### 1. Adoption of the agenda

#### 2. Complaint by Iraq:

Letter dated 8 June 1981 from the Chargé d'affaires of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14509)

*The meeting was called to order at 4.20 p.m.*

#### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

#### Complaint by Iraq:

Letter dated 8 June 1981 from the Chargé d'affaires of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14509)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings [2280th to 2284th meetings], I invite the representatives of Iraq and Israel to take places at the Council table, and I invite the representatives of Algeria, Bangladesh, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia and of the Palestine Liberation Organization to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Hammadi (Iraq) and Mr. Blum (Israel) took places at the Council table and Mr. Bedjaoui (Algeria), Mr. Kaiser (Bangladesh), Mr. Corrêa da Costa (Brazil), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Malmierca (Cuba), Mr. Hulinský (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt),*

*Mr. Sinclair (Guyana), Mr. Rácz (Hungary), Mr. Krishnan (India), Mr. Suwondo (Indonesia), Mr. La Rocca (Italy), Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan), Mr. Al-Sabah (Kuwait), Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon), Mr. Erdenechuluun (Mongolia), Mr. Mrani Zentar (Morocco), Mr. Chamorro Mora (Nicaragua), Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan), Mr. Freyberg (Poland), Mr. Marinescu (Romania), Mr. Koroma (Sierra Leone), Mr. Adan (Somalia), Mr. Fonseka (Sri Lanka), Mr. Abdalla (the Sudan), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Kirca (Turkey), Mrs. Nguyen Ngoc Dung (Viet Nam), Mr. Alalni (Yemen), Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia), Mr. Mutukwa (Zambia) and Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Malaysia in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Halim (Malaysia) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.*

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): the first speaker is the representative of Morocco. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

4. Mr. MRANI ZENTAR (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like to thank you and the other members of the Council for allowing me to take part in this debate on the Israeli aggression against the Republic of Iraq.

5. At the same time I should like to express my great pleasure at seeing you, Sir, conducting our business in such difficult circumstances, because your presence in the post of President is not only a tribute to Mexico, with which most of our countries maintain steadfast relations of trust, it also assures us that, thanks to your competence and the authority unanimously recognized in you, our work will lead to the constructive results that the entire international community expects of us.

6. I should also like to congratulate the representative of Japan, who presided over the Council last month in masterly fashion at a very difficult time in international relations.

7. The Republic of Iraq, which has so often manifestly proved its fidelity, dedication and attachment to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, has been the target of premeditated, unjustifiable and pointless aggression by Israel, to which the international community has reacted.

8. Yesterday [2282nd meeting] we listened with great interest and gratitude to the statement of the representative of France, Mr. Jacques Leprette, and we thus had an opportunity to receive first-hand information as to the nature of the Osirak Tamuz nuclear facilities, their equipment, their capacities and their purposes.

9. Every precaution was taken and every technical and political provision was made to prevent and, should the need arise, to cut short any modification or misuse of the facilities being built so that they could be used to produce nuclear bombs—and, incidentally, any such modification would have been complicated, costly and absurd.

10. Further, the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) categorically refuted the Israeli claims that Osirak could prove to be a nuclear threat to anybody, since Iraq was not only a signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] but that country had also properly complied with the statutory inspections which had, what is more, never brought to light any activity contrary to the provisions of the Treaty.'

11. This act of international vandalism has not thus far been justified by any argument acceptable in the slightest degree and no authority, no national or international agency, even among those most indulgent about Israeli aberrations, has lent the least credence to the illogical reasons offered by Israel for destroying facilities with sophisticated technology built for the first time in an Arab country.

12. If we compare the zeal of Israel since the end of the British Mandate in acquiring the most advanced technological means for producing civil and military goods, the most sophisticated weapons to preserve a permanent, comfortable, general technological lead over their neighbours, if we consider that for 30 years Israel has been developing an "iceberg" style of atomic programme—and we saw the tip of it and some of the waves it has made when we heard what might be styled the slip-ups of the Ministry of War and of the Mossad and saw a few flashes from the explosions of nuclear tests which South African complicity was not able to cover up—if we place all this alongside such an abundance of murderous gadgets and the state of technological impoverishment in which Israel wishes

at all costs to keep the Arab and Islamic world around it, we will understand why Mr. Begin has struck a blow against the Iraqi plant, why he threatens to carry out aggressive action again as often as necessary and why he claims to dictate to the Arabs what technology they can be allowed to have and what use they can make of it.

13. Israel, meanwhile, will not sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty and, consequently, will allow no inspection, does not comply with any rules and will stop at nothing.

14. We already knew that Mr. Begin had decided for the Arabs what arms they could have and on what hills they could be deployed. On the same day he refused to allow some to have unarmed AWACS planes flying over their own airspace, and yet sent Israeli observation aircraft daily into Arab airspace.

15. My delegation wishes vigorously to denounce this strange concept of international relations and strongly to condemn this abusive claim to technological supremacy that is to be militarily imposed to the scientific, technological and industrial impoverishment of the Arab world on the basis of so-called imperatives of security unilaterally established and arbitrarily given effect by the reckless use of force and violence, all in violation of the decisions of the United Nations and the provisions of the Charter.

16. His Majesty Hassan II said in his message of solidarity with President Saddam Hussein:

"This unjustifiable action appears as a blatant challenge to all international rules, all values of civilization and moral principles of humanity and is an attempt to thwart sincere efforts made to establish peace and security in the Middle East."

17. Indeed, the very praiseworthy efforts now being made to ensure security for the brother country of Lebanon, to guarantee its sovereignty, its unity and its fundamental territorial integrity, together with the international effort to win recognition for the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to establish a sovereign State on its own national territory, an essential prerequisite for the return of peace and harmony in the Middle East, all these efforts could, because of the Israeli aggression against Iraq, be jeopardized to a very great extent.

18. In article 3 (b) of the Definition of Aggression [*General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), annex*], the General Assembly defined aggression as follows:

"Bombardment by the armed forces of a State against the territory of another State . . ."

Article 5, paragraph 1 adds:

"No consideration of whatever nature, whether political, economic, military or otherwise, may serve as a justification for aggression."

19. It therefore follows that Article 39 of the Charter, which provides that measures shall be taken in such an instance, and Article 41, which mentions the measures which the Council must consider as a minimum, have full force.

20. Furthermore, Israel has committed this crime and openly acknowledges its responsibility in the matter and there are, therefore, grounds for calling for just and equitable reparation for all loss of life and damage to property involved.

21. Besides this reparation, it is especially necessary that Israel should not be given the chance to maintain or strengthen a so-called balance of power which favours it so flagrantly that it has constantly abused it.

22. The freedom of peoples and nations, their dignity, and their right to life, cannot be haggled over and are not divisible. Our community has the duty to protect them in order to ensure, as far as possible, the maintenance of international morality which would allow future generations to build an ever better world.

23. This responsibility, this very human mission, is today incumbent on the Council.

24. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the Minister for External Relations of Cuba, Mr. Isidoro Malmierca, who has requested to be allowed to speak as the representative of the Chairman of the non-aligned movement. On behalf of the Council, I most cordially welcome him, and I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

25. Mr. MALMIERCA (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is not our custom to repeat the ritual formulas of diplomacy. We are living at a time of serious danger to international peace and security and we welcome the fact that, at this difficult moment, the Council is being led by Mr. Muñoz Ledo, an exemplary representative of independent, courageous and esteemed Mexico.

26. Once again the Council is obliged to hold emergency meetings to consider another act of aggression by the State of Israel, although this time it is an act of aggression which is unprecedented in the history of international relations.

27. The response will depend on the capacity shown by the Council at this time to check the aggressive actions of the Tel Aviv Government and to oblige it to abide by the most elementary principles of international law.

28. Already there is a long, too long, list of resolutions of the United Nations, the non-aligned movement and other international bodies which vigorously condemn the expansionist and aggressive nature of the State of Israel. In the same context, we have con-

demned the economic, political, diplomatic and military support of North American imperialism for Israel and the policy of disregarding the legitimate representatives of the people of Palestine, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), and ignoring the major obstacles to the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the region.

29. Developments in the conflict in the Middle East in the last few months bear out this view of the situation. Perhaps we could regard as an isolated incident this criminal and unjustifiable attack by Israel against a civilian Iraqi target, the peaceful purposes of which have been acknowledged and certified by IAEA.

30. We do not feel it necessary to begin to theorize in order to show that this action by the Government of Israel, which is typically terrorist in nature, forms part of the Zionist policy pursued from positions of strength, the most recent manifestations of which have given grounds for alarm to international public opinion. We are referring to the stepping-up in the last few weeks of indiscriminate air, sea and land attacks against Lebanon and the people of Palestine living in the south of that country, against the Arab forces of deterrence as well as against Syria and other Arab nations.

31. Those responsible for these serious events and for the dangerous deterioration of the situation in the Middle East are none other than those who in the past few years have made it impossible for the Council to take effective measures against Israel while, on the other hand, supporting the Israeli authorities in their intransigent and aggressive attitude by increasing their economic assistance, supplying sophisticated weaponry, persistently resorting to partial and separate agreements, openly denying the most fundamental rights of the long-suffering Palestinian people and repeatedly exerting pressure on various Arab countries and threatening them.

32. All of those actions have their place in the global strategy of the United States Government, characterized by the use of cold-war language, the strengthening of its military presence in the region and the Pentagon's efforts to set up new military bases in countries of the Middle East, the Arabian peninsula and eastern Africa.

33. Those elements that support the aggressive Zionist régime may once again attempt to prevent the Council's taking action in these particularly alarming circumstances.

34. That is why, in accordance with the request of the Government of Iraq, the countries of the non-aligned movement held an extraordinary plenary meeting today at United Nations Headquarters in which, after lengthy consideration had been given to the dangerous consequences that the criminal Israeli action could have for the peace and security of the

region and throughout the world, it was agreed, *inter alia*, that the Security Council would be asked to implement the most comprehensive, binding sanctions against the State of Israel for which provision is contained in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations [S/14544, annex].

35. May I recall that the same request had already been formulated by the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Havana in September 1979<sup>1</sup> and was ratified by the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries held at New Delhi in February 1981.<sup>2</sup>

36. We do not consider it untimely to bring this to the attention of members of the Council, because if this craven act of aggression carried out by the Zionist authorities were to be allowed to go unpunished, then all the peoples of the Middle East would be vulnerable to like acts of aggression and an extremely dangerous precedent would have been created in international relations.

37. On behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, we wish from this podium to appeal to members of the Council to apply the necessary binding sanctions against the State of Israel, pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, and we reiterate our strongest support for and solidarity with the Government and the people of Iraq in the face of the criminal Zionist action. We should therefore like to read out the communiqué adopted at the extraordinary meeting of the countries of the non-aligned movement held today at Headquarters. It reads as follows:

"An extraordinary plenary meeting of non-aligned countries was held in New York on 16 June 1981 in response to a request by Iraq to consider the grave act of aggression committed by Israel against the Republic of Iraq.

"The plenary was chaired by His Excellency Isidoro Malmierca, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cuba, and was addressed by His Excellency Saadoun Hammadi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, and representatives of other member countries.

"Having considered the grave situation arising from the premeditated attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations, devoted exclusively to peaceful purposes, the plenary strongly condemned the naked Israeli aggression as an act of State terrorism and a blatant violation of the sovereignty of a non-aligned country.

"The plenary considered the latest act of aggression by Israel, coming as it did in the wake of recent attacks on its Arab neighbours, particularly the Palestinian people, as a new manifestation of its

expansionist policies which have constantly endangered international peace and security.

"The non-aligned countries recalled the principled and consistent support they had extended to the just struggle of the Arab peoples against expansionist policies and aggressive actions of Israel, and expressed their full solidarity with and support to Iraq in the defence of its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

"The plenary strongly demanded that Israel should refrain from any such aggressive acts.

"It reaffirmed the inalienable right of non-aligned countries to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes in conformity with their priorities, interests and needs.

"The plenary expressed its conviction that Israel, as the aggressor who inflicted severe material damages and loss of human lives, has the responsibility to pay prompt and adequate compensation to Iraq.

"The plenary reaffirmed the General Assembly resolutions concerning Israeli nuclear armaments and demanded that Israel comply with the said resolutions.

"In view of the act of aggression committed by Israel and the constant threat its aggressive policies pose to international peace and security, the non-aligned countries called upon the Security Council to take effective measures against Israel in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

"The non-aligned countries called upon all States, and especially the United States of America, to refrain from giving Israel any assistance, whether military, political or economic, that might encourage it to pursue its aggressive policies against the Arab countries and the Palestinian people.

"The plenary pledged to work at the forthcoming session of the General Assembly to enable it to adopt decisions which would prevent Israel from committing such acts of aggression and force it to comply with the norms of international law, the principles of the Charter and the provisions of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations." [S/14544, annex.]

38. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

39. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure and satisfaction to greet in you,

Mr. Muñoz Ledo, a worthy representative of a very friendly country, Mexico. In the light of our experience, and familiar as we are with the great qualities and well-known abilities which you have shown, we are certain that you will lead the work of the Council most prudently and diligently to success.

40. In past times, Mexico opened its doors to immigrants, including those from Palestine, offering them hope for a better life, for themselves and their children. Those children are today true Mexicans and they do not feel like strangers. It is true that they have neither forgotten nor abandoned their roots, but they are Mexicans.

41. The Government of Mexico and the PLO have the best possible relations of mutual respect.

*[The speaker continued in English.]*

42. At long last the Council has convened to consider yet another act of terrorism committed by a State Member of the United Nations. This series of meetings is long overdue. The monstrous crime committed by the organized terrorist gang of Tel Aviv is but the latest in the chain of crimes perpetrated during the recent phase of the renewed and escalated acts of aggression by the Member commonly known as the State of Israel. This latest phase started a few months ago: to be precise, it was initiated almost concurrently with the accession to power of the new Administration in Washington. The green light was given by the leader of the new United States Administration when he publicly said "there is the terrorism that is being practised by the PLO." That statement was reported in *The New York Times* of 3 February 1981. How diametrically opposite can people be? President Reagan's predecessor's first reference to my people was that we should have our homeland; at least he tried to sound more concerned with the basic human right of a people to have its own homeland. But since January 1981, the Washington Administration has shown signs that it is not really concerned with human rights.

43. The head of the new Administration apparently did not get his message across to Tel Aviv. Maybe in Tel Aviv they could not believe what they had heard, or maybe they were not sure of what President Reagan meant. His assistant, the National Security Advisor, Mr. Allen, sent a sort of explanatory message in which he justified Israeli aggression under the pretext of hot pursuit. He disingenuously declared that "there is no question that the United States must identify the Palestine Liberation Organization as a terrorist organization" and that there is "ample justification for taking action against acts of terrorism". What is said cannot be unsaid.

44. Such statements did not only encourage the terrorist gang in Tel Aviv to escalate its aggression; in fact, they instructed Tel Aviv to exacerbate further the tense and explosive situation in the area. There is no

way to prove it now, but eventually we may be able to do so. One of the aims, in our opinion, was to prove a point, namely that Washington, D.C., is omnipotent and that its arm—its striking arm—is Tel Aviv. The new strategy started in the form of daily bombing and shelling of the Palestinian refugee camps in southern Lebanon, bombing and shelling of an unprecedented magnitude. Begin could not refrain from admitting that Israel would continue its raids and strikes, if not hourly then at least daily. He called that strategy preemptive. So, children must be killed now to prevent them from growing up and to prevent the increasing probability of their joining the ranks of the fighting Palestinians.

45. On this matter of renewed and escalated Israeli attacks, a number of letters have been addressed to the Council and to the Secretary-General. It is no accident that a situation of near confrontation was created when the Israeli war machine directed its guns against Syria and Syrian planes and helicopters.

46. Israel insists that Syria has no right to defend even its own territory because, Israel maintains, the defence of Syrian territory by the Syrian people constitutes a threat to the security of Israel. Such a twisted and sick argument can at best be attributed to the teachings of Adolf Hitler and his gang.

47. Israel has arrogated to itself the power to decide and determine what methods any sovereign State, especially the neighbouring States, can adopt to ensure its defences and guarantee its independence and territorial integrity. Israel—in its own opinion—will decide. And this reminds us of a historic fact: On 3 April 1939, Adolf Hitler issued top-secret directives to the armed forces of the Reich—top-secret directives known as "Case White Unknown". The aim of the plan was "to destroy Polish military strength and create in the East a situation which satisfies the requirements of national defence"—the national defence of Nazi Germany. The analogy might not be perfect, but the concept of deciding for, and taking actions against, other States on the basis of one's own requirements is only one aspect of aggressive militarism. And this, in our view, continues.

48. The state of tension had to be escalated still further, and in this the role of Washington should be underscored. The campaign of lies and intimidation and terrorization of the Arabs was continued. A myth, a scarecrow, was created in Washington for exportation to the Middle East—not much different from the myths of the early 1950s. I refer to the myth of communist expansion threatening the independence of the Arab States—particularly the oil-producing countries—and the anticipated potential effectiveness of protection that could be provided by the United States, be it by AWACS or the rapid deployment force, was overstressed. But the Arabs of the 1980s are not that clumsy. We do not willingly believe what the others—namely, Washington and others—wish us

to believe. We have developed, we have learned through the years, and we too can make our own assessment as to who really threatens us.

49. But then came the climax: the arm of Israel to strike the blows as directed by Washington must reach out. And it did. The Foreign Minister of Iraq gave the Council [2280th meeting] the details of the barbarous terrorist attack on his country. But did this terrorist attack achieve the aim of terrorizing the Arabs and bringing us to our knees? No. Our determination to defend our survival, to defend our territorial integrity, to defend our natural resources and, most importantly, to defend our people is more deeply rooted and further strengthened. And how did the Pentagon react? "By George, what a beautiful job: you beat us to it." That statement, attributed to Henry E. Catto, Jr., clarifies what I have been saying. He said: "The United States Government saw no reason to be concerned that the intelligence services had not discovered that the raid was planned or in progress." Naturally, Washington was not at all concerned that the crime was being perpetrated or was in progress, despite the violation of the airspace of two friendly States and the act of aggression on the territorial integrity of a third State, Iraq.

50. As a matter of fact, Washington was delighted. Did not Mr. Catto express grudging admiration for what he called the "surgical precision" of the bombing? Did he not say, "You cannot but admire their technical proficiency, which is what they displayed"? How cynical and nauseating. Are murder and genocide—is destruction, carried out smoothly and with the most sophisticated weaponry—a glorious act when committed with a smile? I tell you, this is the limit of inhumanity and immorality. This is not only collusion and co-operation and complicity between Washington and Tel Aviv: this is inviting, indeed commanding, more operations to be carried out with similar "surgical precision". Are we nearing the precipice—the brink of disaster?

51. When asked whether Israel would attack a Libyan reactor, Menachem Begin said, on 9 June: "Let us deal first with that *meshugunah*, Saddam Hussein." There are two elements in that statement: the first, "let us first deal with this" one—implying that he will deal with the other one at a later stage—and the second, describing the head of State of Iraq as a *meshugunah*, as crazy, as mad.

52. Again, a reflection on what the Nazis said: on 10 August 1939, the daily paper *Der Fuehrer* carried the following: "Warsaw threatens bombardment of Danzig . . . unbelievable agitation of the Polish Archmadness"—madness again. But Begin is no Fuehrer—although he is acting like one.

53. And now let us return to consider why the United States Government saw no reason to be concerned that the intelligence services had not discovered that

the raid was planned or in progress. The intelligence services simply could not have failed to discover that the raid was planned and in progress; otherwise, there might be questions about the efficacy and efficiency of the spy and defence system which is costing the American taxpayer billions of dollars. Or, perhaps, the intelligence services immediately recalled the fate of the spy ship *Liberty*, and so the souls of their colleagues victims of Israeli crime hover over them. The sense of security that the man in the street—the ordinary Joe Smith—enjoys or wants to believe in might be shattered, and a counter-productive effect might develop.

54. Sometimes I go into flights of imagination, and I can imagine the following appeal being made to the American citizenry: "No, citizens, please believe the Government: the intelligence services did function perfectly, but the United States Government wanted the oil producers to know and have trust in the United States"—albeit at the expense of violating the airspace and committing aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the oil-producing countries.

55. It is the freedom of flow of Arab oil that must be safeguarded and guaranteed, and not the sovereignty and independence of the oil-producing countries. What they desire is the marked stagnation and frustration—nay, the undermining—of the sincere endeavours of the Arab people to make peaceful use of their natural resources while those resources last. It is the development of those countries, it is the social services rendered to their peoples, it is the education of their children, it is their aspirations to a healthier and more developed society that the Israelis wish to prevent and arrest. It is through such terrorist acts that the United States and Israel imagine they can convince the Arabs and win their confidence.

56. Impeding the development of other countries in the region and arresting the advancement and well-being of the Arabs is yet another power that Israel wishes to arrogate to itself. If Israel considers that education of the Arabs in the neighbouring countries constitutes a threat to its security, then Israel will intervene and exercise that arrogated power. Israel is not satisfied to invoke national security; in the military field and on questions relating to borders; it also invokes its economic national security and says that the latter might demand stagnation and no advancement. Israel believes it is omniscient and omnipotent. As a matter of fact, it is under the guise of national security that schools and colleges in the occupied Palestinian territories are closed and classes interrupted. It is under the guise of national security that young Palestinians are compelled to leave their home or are evicted. But Israel is not the military occupation power in the rest of the Arab world. The Arabs, as well as the Palestinians, have the inalienable right to advancement and improvement of their economic situation, and we will defend that right by all means.



57. The Arabs, according to that Israeli concept—as supported by the Government of the United States—must remain in the dark ages to “enjoy” the benefits and feats of modern science and technology meted out to them by their so-called friends.

58. To add insult to injury, the United States Secretary of State, Alexander M. Haig, Jr., bothered by his conscience, goes theological and reports to the Speaker of the House and the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, “In these circumstances, I must report on behalf of the President that a substantial violation of the 1952 Agreement may have occurred.” Two elements in that report call for theological scrutiny. Secretary of State Haig must have a clear conscience and refrain from passing judgement *a priori*. The questions that must be answered at this juncture, Secretary of State Haig, are: Did Israel in fact violate the 1952 Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement? If so, was that violation substantial? And who is going to decide? Where can we draw a line? Where can we draw the line between self-defence and aggression?

59. Is flying 1,200 miles, violating the airspace of two States, dropping bombs on a third State, destroying an installation for advancement and development by peaceful means, under the supervision and investigation of the international community—is that “journey” undertaken to ensure the self-preservation of the attacking team? Is it a legitimate act of self-defence? It needs only the wisdom of the wise to answer. Moreover, who sets the yardstick with which we measure the degree of substantiality of a violation? What is the criterion?

60. And, finally, what is the result? A “suspension for the time being of the immediate shipment of four F-16 aircraft which had been scheduled for” 12 June 1981. A suspension of four aircraft for the time being—so let it be. A slap on the wrist, a pat on the shoulder. Again, here I go into a flight of wild imagination. This is what I imagine: “Listen, child, you really have done something not nice. Please, try not to do it again. I understand. This week you get no pocket money, but next weekend we shall see. Who knows? If you act like a good boy-scout we might make it up for you. Anyway, you have enough saved up from the last few weeks or years. We have given you billions of dollars of taxpayers’ money. Now we shall take care of the other side. We will explain. They will understand.”

61. And on this trip of my wild imagination, I can visualize the President of the United States summoning the Arab representatives and telling them: “Listen, my friends, you must realize that Israel is a small Zionist State and lives in constant fear of Arab attacks. You just have to look around: Syria is deploying missiles to defend its borders and the PLO still practises terrorism. As friends, please go and tell Syria and the PLO to behave. But tell me”—this is the

President addressing the Arabs in my imagination—“what do you want the nuclear reactor for? God bestowed on you camels and oil, so you must be grateful. Israel has no camels and no oil. It has only a dozen atomic bombs, more or less, but it has promised that it will not be the first to use those atomic bombs. Unless your camels go berserk Israel will not use the atomic bombs.” Then, in my imagination, the President says to his Arab guests: “Finally, my friends, remember you are only friends but Israel is our ally—and our commitment to our ally has first priority.”

62. It sounds dramatic but it is actually tragic. The Washington Administration had already assured Tel Aviv: “Go ahead, do not worry, we are committed by treaty to veto any concrete action by the Security Council against you. All that the Security Council can do is call you ‘naughty.’”

63. That is how we understand the concept of the Washington Administration and its role in the Security Council in defence of Tel Aviv. It is not the principles, it is not the international consensus, it is not the Charter, it is not the national interests that determine this particular policy—and the facts do not really count.

64. Will the Council act in the spirit and substance of the principles of the Charter? Will it prove beyond a doubt that the Charter is the guide and the beacon and not permit itself to become a class-room in which to debate interpretations of international law to no avail?

65. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait has set forth before the Council the unanimous will of the Arab States and expressed their hope to see the Council apply the provisions of the Charter. I shall quote the following from his statement:

“If we really respect our great international Organization and care for its credibility we must provide it with the necessary means that will enable it to discharge its responsibilities. In the case under discussion it is in the interest of morality and international peace that this Council adopt a resolution calling for the imposition of sanctions against the aggressor. Without such a resolution Israel will continue to violate international rules and principles and thus will rest assured that it will be neither deterred nor penalized.

“The exercise of the right of veto against a draft resolution imposing sanctions on Israel will have a negative impact upon world public opinion, which has condemned in an unprecedented way the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installation. The leaders of various countries of the world have strongly condemned that aggression, and so has the press in different parts of the world. International public opinion will therefore be dismayed to see the aggressor free to pursue its aggressive policies against other nations, in this case the Arab States.

"Should any State cast its veto to prevent the adoption of such a resolution the Arab peoples will undoubtedly be greatly shocked because they still believe that the United Nations represents the conscience of the international community and is a refuge to which peace-loving nations turn. Will, then, the hopes of the Arab people be frustrated, and will the aggressor be given the green light to proceed with its acts of terrorism and piracy?"

"Any objection to the imposition of sanctions will in this case be explained by the Arab people and the peoples of the third world as an act of bias in favour of the aggressor for reasons which can neither be understood nor justified, especially since the Arab right is crystal clear in this case. Should any State exercise its veto power, which God forbid, this Council will thus reinforce in the minds of weak peoples the conviction that the principles and rules embodied in international charters are different from those of the real world. There is no doubt that that would jeopardize the chances for mutual respect and confidence among different peoples as well as the settlement of conflicts in various parts of the world." [2281st meeting, paras. 21 to 24.]

66. Sheikh Sabah Al-Ahmad Al-Jaber Al-Sabah, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait, spoke on behalf of the Council of the League of Arab States, of which he is the current Chairman.

67. Remedies, if not cures, have been prescribed to "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". Those measures should apply equally to our generation.

68. Earlier in my statement, I said that Washington might have instructed Tel Aviv to exacerbate the situation further and that there was no way to prove that now, but that eventually it might be possible to prove it.

69. I recall that in 1956 Israel attacked Egypt. What was the role of the United States then? Moshe Sharett—and we all know who he was—noted that "Teddy Kollek brought in a classified cable from Washington in which Kermit Roosevelt of the CIA described the terrible confusion prevailing in the State Department under the shock of the Nasser-Czech—that is, Russian—"deal". Kermit Roosevelt added: "We are surprised at your silence. . . . If, when the Soviet arms arrive, you will hit Egypt, no one will protest." Sharett noted a couple of days later that Ben-Gurion had declared in the Cabinet Meeting, "If they really get MiGs . . . I will support bombing them. We can do it!". Sharett added, "I understand that he"—that is, Ben-Gurion—"read the cable from Washington. The wild seed has fallen on fertile ground". The "fertile ground" was Ben-Gurion, who got the message.

70. All this was revealed at a much later date. Who knows in what or in whose memoirs we shall read, a

few years hence, about another wild seed falling on fertile ground? And why wait? Only last Sunday Prime Minister Begin announced on television that he had been tipped off by a very well-informed source about the A-bomb in Baghdad. I hasten to add that he did not say that he had been informed by his allies; he said he had been tipped off by a very well-informed source. Since his own military have today denied that they supplied him with the information, I wonder who that very well-informed source was.

71. Yes indeed, there is fertile ground.

72. The same Mr. Sharett noted that he was "meditating on the long chain of false incidents and hostilities we"—that is, the Israelis—"have invented, and on the many clashes we have provoked which cost us so much blood, and on the violations of the law by our men—all of which brought grave disasters and determined the whole course of events and contributed to the security crisis".

73. And there were the others—the overwhelming majority of the Zionist leaders in Israel, persons like Moshe Dayan, who vehemently rejected any border security arrangements offered by the neighbouring Arab States. Dayan insisted on pursuing the policy of terror, attacks and incursions. Such acts, according to Dayan, "are our vital lymph. They help us maintain a high tension among our population and in the army".

74. Terror was, is and will remain the *modus operandi* of the Zionists. This is neither the time nor the place to recall that it was the Zionists who introduced terrorism into Palestine, the savage and cold-blooded massacring of innocent Palestinian Arabs. This was carried out by planting explosive charges in the bazaars and souks of Haifa, Jaffa, Jerusalem and other cities and villages. Terror was the method finally adopted by the Zionists to "spirit the indigenous population across the frontiers". That was the final solution, the decision to make the dream of Theodor Herzl come true. Terror proved effective to displace the Palestinians—temporarily. We are determined to pursue by all means our struggle to return; it is our inalienable right, unanimously supported by the international community; it is the prerequisite for peace.

75. The Zionists do not like peace. As Foreign Minister, the same Sharett, as far back as 28 May 1955, instructed Israel's ambassadors as follows: "There may be an attempt to reach peace by pressuring [Israel] to make concessions on the question of territory and the refugees. I warned against any thought of the possibility of returning a few tens of thousands of refugees, even at the price of peace". I leave it entirely up to the Council to determine the significance of such an attitude towards peace, which remains the declared policy of Israel. The so-called framework for peace—the Camp David accords—explicitly attempts to deny the Palestinian

people its inalienable rights as defined and affirmed repeatedly by the General Assembly. The denial of the attainment and exercise of our inalienable rights is the reason why we Palestinians pursue and escalate our struggle, under the leadership of the PLO. The PLO is the representative of the Palestinian people. This is the will of the Palestinian people and the consensus of the international community. The representative of Ireland had no doubts about this when he made his statement on a procedural matter in this chamber on 12 June [2280th meeting].

76. To return to the issue of peace in the Middle East, the PLO has on several occasions declared before the Council and the General Assembly that the Palestinian people want peace. We thirst for peace. But what peace can we savour and enjoy when we are prevented from exercising the basic human right: the right to live in peace in our own homes?

77. The policy of the Zionist movement is opposed to peace. The peace they talk about calls for a prohibitive price—namely, the denial of the rights of the Palestinian people, the annulment of those rights. We have just quoted Sharett's condition. I shall quote it again: "no return, not even at the price of peace". It is the apocalyptic peace—as the representative of Lebanon put it so well—that they are after. The Zionists are opposed to peace because, as Dayan said, "it ties our hands".

78. What do the Zionists want? Let them state it here in clear terms. But if they want to pursue their persistent policy of aggression, of expansion, of confiscation and of the denial of the human rights of others, there will be no peace.

79. The Council is committed to the maintenance of international peace and security, and in our opinion it is incumbent upon its members to determine that the terrorist attacks by Israel do constitute a threat to peace, and to recommend that measures be taken in accordance with the provisions of the Charter—Article 41—to restore and maintain international peace and security.

80. The credibility of the Organization depends upon the application of the provisions of the Charter. The world has its eyes fixed on the current proceedings. Humanity aspires to seeing the Council save this generation and the succeeding generations from the scourge of war, and reaffirm the faith of all peoples in fundamental human rights. Will the Council's sublime mission be undermined?

81. I appeal to each and every member around this table to preserve our faith and trust in the United Nations. Failure to take action will only encourage the terrorist gang in Tel Aviv to continue and to escalate its criminal attacks not only on the Palestinian refugee camps in southern Lebanon, but on the Palestinians everywhere and on the Arab countries. They will

pursue their policy of provocation and aggression against all. As long as the Council does not seriously address itself to the heart of the conflict, the question of Palestine, the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, the fate of 4 million Palestinians, the Council will not succeed in finding a solution and a peaceful end to the conflict in the Middle East. It will continue to busy itself with derivatives, derivatives which are charged with explosives that lead the world to the brink of a major armed confrontation, but which remain derivatives.

82. The PLO notes with great satisfaction and gratitude that speakers in this debate have addressed the heart of the conflict, the question of Palestine, affirming that the question of Palestine remains the key to peace.

83. We believe it could prove useful to recall that the Palestinian National Council in 1977 considered the different aspects of the question, in particular in the light of the position of the international community. A consensus was emerging. The Palestinian National Council authorized the elected executive committee to participate on an equal footing in all endeavours and conferences held under the auspices of the United Nations in order to resolve the question of Palestine, the core of the Arab-Israeli conflict, on the basis of the attainment and full exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. That, in our opinion, was the road to peace. On 1 October 1977, the world heard the joint statement of the Soviet Union and the United States of America, and the PLO saw in that statement a beam of hope, a process conducive to peace.

84. Our dreams and hopes were shattered when, instead of a comprehensive approach, our inalienable rights were trampled on, the General Assembly resolutions calling for a conference to achieve a comprehensive peace in the Middle East were disregarded, and a bilateral approach and partial treaties replaced the comprehensive peace process. Those treaties, it now transpires, were designed to pre-empt peace.

85. In our hope we still cling to the United Nations. On several occasions the Council has dealt with the question of peace in the Middle East. Several draft resolutions were submitted, but unfortunately the United States used its veto, and our sincere hopes and endeavours were frustrated. But we do not despair. We shall continue to play our part in the search for peace and a solution to the Middle East conflict, preferably through the Council.

86. A few weeks ago President Brezhnev proposed the convening of a conference to attain peace and a solution to the Middle East conflict. The PLO highly appreciated the proposal and welcomed it.

87. The PLO still believes that a conference should be held under the auspices of the United Nations and

with the participation on an equal footing of all the parties to the conflict—I repeat, all the parties to the conflict including the PLO and, perhaps, the members of the Council. The aim of such a conference should be to resolve the question of Palestine through a comprehensive settlement that would guarantee our inalienable rights as defined and affirmed by the General Assembly, particularly at its seventh emergency special session [resolution ES/7/2]. That is the way to peace and to the end of the Middle East conflict.

88. We Palestinians have had enough. Give us peace. Let us all have peace. Let us all enjoy peace. But let us take action that will ensure the right of us all to enjoy peace.

89. At this point, Mr. President, I wish through you to extend our thanks to the members of the Council who joined in inviting the PLO to participate in the consideration of the question before the Council. To the member that voted in the negative I can only say that we are not distressed. We note the concern of the United States regarding the provisional rules of procedure—I repeat, the provisional rules of procedure—but we should like it to know that the legal foundation of a decision is the basic rule that the Council is master of its own procedure. We look forward to the day when the United States Administration shows equal concern for and adherence to the substance and the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

90. Zionist leaders in Israel are suffering not only from megalomania but also from the phenomenon of insensitivity to acts of wrongdoing and to moral occupation. The late Zionist leader and Israeli Foreign Minister Sharett pointed out that:

“We do not have a moral approach to moral problems, but a pragmatic approach to moral problems . . . this does not mean that public opinion, the army, the police have drawn no conclusions from the acts committed. Their conclusion was that Arab blood can be freely shed. . . . All this must bring about revulsion in the sense of justice and honesty in public opinion; it must make the State appear in the eyes of the world as a savage State that does not recognize the principles of justice as they have been established and accepted by contemporary society.”

Sharett continues—and this is back in 1955:

“What we [the Israelis] succeeded in achieving in 1948 cannot be repeated whenever we desire it. Today we must accept our existing frontiers and try to relax the tensions with our neighbours to prepare the ground for peace. I proved that the occupation of the Gaza Strip will not resolve any security problem, as the refugees . . . will continue to constitute the same trouble, and even more so, as their hate will be rekindled by the atrocities that we

[Israel] shall cause them to suffer during the occupation . . .”

91. The question now is this: will the Zionist Israeli leaders in 1981 take heed? Or can they not take heed because of their ideological commitments “not to have their hands tied and to keep the vital lymph”?

92. In the light of the revelation of this morning that the Israeli military sources had no information about the alleged secret underground installation where atomic bombs were being manufactured, and in the light of the rejection by France of the Israeli allegations, we have the right to ask why did Begin order that terrorist attack, and precisely why now? Is this another of his malicious efforts to pre-empt peace? Was he aware of any serious and fruitful endeavours to achieve peace in the Middle East? Was he trying to provoke a situation to embarrass his benefactors in Washington and drive a wedge between the Government of the United States and its friends among the Arabs? Or, finally, did Washington really give the green light to Begin to strike in order to humiliate and anger the Arabs? I really cannot find a proper answer, but, as responsible people, members of the Council might feel that they should ask and seek an answer.

93. Finally, a word to those who use the Bible as their source of wisdom and action. I must say: remember how nicely Abraham was received in the land of Canaan. Read not only Joshua, and do not follow in his footsteps.

94. I quote from Joshua: “to smite with the edge of a sword and utterly destroy the enemy, neither leaving any to breathe”. That was the first holocaust perpetrated and recorded. To those people I would counsel a reading of the same Joshua:

“Therefore it shall come to pass, that as all good things are come upon you, which the Lord your God promised you; so shall the Lord bring upon you all evil things, until he have destroyed you from off this good land which the Lord your God hath given you.” [Joshua 23:15.]

95. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of Czechoslovakia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

96. Mr. HULINSKÝ (*Czechoslovakia*) (*interpretation from Russian*): Permit me, Sir, to begin by congratulating you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the current month. The Czechoslovak delegation warmly and sincerely greets you, an eminent diplomat in your own country, a country with which mine is linked by age-old ties of friendship and fruitful co-operation.

97. The Israeli air raid on the research centre of Osirak on 7 June this year is a flagrant act of

aggression. The present Government of Israel gave the order for it to be carried out in a burst of irresponsible adventurism, showing total disregard for its consequences for peace and security throughout the world. Can we even for a moment imagine what would happen if all States were to explain their conduct with the same sort of senseless excuses? Mr. Bedjaoui of Algeria quite properly noted before the Council that:

"The Israeli action has the monstrous characteristic of introducing into international relations new frightening forms of action based on aggression, baptized 'preventive' in order to make the unacceptable acceptable." [2280th meeting, para. 157.]

98. However, it is obvious that an overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations regard the raid against Iraq as a violation of the principles of the Charter and the fundamental norms of international law.

99. The Czechoslovak delegation, which has spoken on several occasions in the Council when it discussed various aspects of Israel's aggressive policies, warned from the very outset that the conclusion of the separate Camp David deals virtually gave a free hand to Israel against the Middle Eastern States which categorically opposed this anti-Arab plot. Are not the continued occupation of Arab lands, the gross flouting of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, the attack on Lebanon, is not this most recent barbaric raid on Osirak, which caused civilian casualties and also material damage, clear proof of this?

100. By force of arms and by acts of terror, Israel is maintaining the Middle East in a state of conflict. However, this is only half of the truth. In view of the uninterrupted and comprehensive economic, military and political support which the United States continues to extend to Israel, the Government of that great Power has thereby affixed its signature to the policies pursued by Israel and is directly responsible for the fact that in the Middle East the rights of peoples are flouted and aggression goes on unpunished and tension remains.

101. The irresponsible nature of the raid on Osirak is made even clearer by the fact that this attack was perpetrated against a State which was from the very outset a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and which had therefore made all its nuclear activities subject to the relevant international safeguards within the IAEA framework. Furthermore, this raid was carried out by the air force of a State which refused to become a party to this extremely important international legal instrument. If now the representatives of Israel take the liberty of asserting that the destruction of this peaceful nuclear installation belonging to Iraq has made peace more durable, then it may legitimately be asked whether Israel's nuclear activities are a source of imminent

alarm to the international community. Has not the General Assembly of the United Nations in its resolutions condemned—and severely condemned—the constant desire of Israel to gain access to nuclear weapons? The raid on Osirak should once again remind everyone whom this concerns that it is time to cease any co-operation with Israel in the military field and particularly in the nuclear field. It is time for the Council to give effective thought to the danger represented by nuclear weapons in the hands of an aggressive régime which has promoted terrorism to the rank of a State policy.

102. Czechoslovakia welcomes and supports the timely decision in this connection of the Board of Governors of IAEA on 12 June of this year; that decision has been transmitted to the Council [S/14532].

103. Czechoslovakia naturally supports the idea of creating a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East region. However, this idea should not be utilized in order to camouflage the aggressive policies of Israel towards the neighbouring Arab countries. Is it not abundantly clear that this was the purpose of document A/36/315, which was so hastily distributed by the Israeli delegation? This simply conceals an attempt to distract attention from solving the most fundamental problems of the Middle East to involve the Arab countries in an unequal discussion and to preserve the advantages and benefits which have been illegally usurped by Israel.

104. The position of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic on the matter which is now being considered by the Council is reflected in the statement made by the Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 11 June, which emphasizes, *inter alia*:

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic demands that the United Nations Security Council condemn Israel most resolutely and take a decision regarding the imposition of sanctions against the aggressor under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations." [S/14533, annex.]

105. The PRESIDENT (*Interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of Bangladesh. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

106. Mr. KAISER (Bangladesh): Mr. President, it is an honour to speak before the Council when you are presiding over its deliberations for the month. I have had the privilege of working with you in the Council and have always benefited from your wisdom, knowledge and skill and your rich experience as a diplomat and politician, finely meshed with your pragmatic understanding of intricate problems, which lends unique relevance to your decisions. You represent a country, Sir, which has established itself as a relentless champion of a better economic order, in an effort to render justice to the teeming, deprived millions of

the world. For that and the concern for peace, the rule of international law and the progress of mankind shown by our brothers in Mexico under the presidency of Mr. López Portillo, we pay tribute to your countrymen and your leadership and we assure you that our people and leaders salute your great country and its leaders.

107. I also take this opportunity to express our gratitude and warm regards to your predecessor, Mr. Masahiro Nisibori of Japan, for the excellent and efficient way in which he conducted the business of the Council during the month of his presidency.

108. Mr. President, I take this opportunity of extending the most profound and sincere thanks of my people, my Government and myself to you and to the other members of the Council for the warm and rich tributes rendered in the Council on 4 June last [2279th meeting] on the occasion of the martyrdom of the late lamented President Ziaur Rahman. The moving expression of profound admiration for President Ziaur Rahman, as a unique leading personality of the world, particularly of the third world, as a servant of Bangladesh and humanity and your words of sympathy and encouragement in our mourning have been a source of solace for the people of Bangladesh.

109. Through you, Mr. President, I would convey to the Council that, although we are in the midst of deep mourning for a great leader, who belonged not only to us but to the entire world, we, the people of Bangladesh, wish to assure the Council that the high ideals of peace, freedom, fairness and justice that inspire the people of Bangladesh, of which the late President Ziaur Rahman was a unique embodiment, will continue to guide us and also that we are at the service of the world and shall do our humble best to bring about a peaceful order based on law and justice for mankind in all aspects of life.

110. On a stunned and surprised world the news broke last week of the sneak attack of Israel on completely unsuspecting Iraq, which threw into chaos and anarchy the valiant attempts to establish the rule of international law and the efforts to control the demon of the brutal and naked use of military might in the Middle East. That area is already an unfortunately troubled spot and the Council has repeatedly been engaged, as have other United Nations organs, in striving to bring about stability and peace in a region which has not known these precious values for a long time.

111. Bangladesh has, in the Council, in other organs of the United Nations and elsewhere, along with numerous other representatives of nations, pointed its finger correctly at the root cause of this situation: namely, Israel's greed for dominance, its arrogance based on the military muscle acquired from others and its utter and contemptuous disregard for all the legal and human rights of the people of the region.

112. Our views on the subject are well known and well recorded and today we do not draw any sense of smug consolation from the fact that "we had told you so", but we view the situation with the gravest concern. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bangladesh, on this subject of the unprovoked act of aggression of Israel against Iraq, has expressed the views of the Government in no unmistakable terms [S/14530]:

"The Government of Bangladesh condemns the bombing of the nuclear plant in Iraq by Israel as a most outrageous violation of the Charter of the United Nations and all international laws and norms. This is a despicable act of international piracy. This act of naked Israeli aggression without any provocation is the most arrogant example of the reckless use of its armed might. It is an act of barbarity without parallel and is an affront to the entire civilized world and a challenge to the rule of law and international relations.

"The growing armed might of Israel clearly poses a threat not only to the Middle East but also to international peace and security and to the principles and values which the international community is committed to uphold and defend."

113. The Parliament of Bangladesh has also strongly condemned the wholly unprovoked Israeli attack on the nuclear plant in Iraq as the most outrageous violation of the Charter and international laws and norms and has characterized this action as a flagrant example of international terrorism.

114. I shall not now go into details, but we have repeatedly pointed out the danger of the denial of human and legal rights to the people of Palestine by Israel. Israel's denial of that people's inalienable right to a homeland, its usurpation of the Arab and Palestinian territories acquired by feats of arms and its repeated aggressive activities in Lebanon are known to all and have caused not only numerous setbacks to the chances of establishing peace and stability in the region but also embarrassment to Israel's friends and supporters, whose trust and confidence, as we always believed, was mistakenly placed in Israel.

115. I should like here to go into the profound implications of the latest Israeli act of aggression against Iraq, with its immediate effect on the countries of the region, as well as the definite setback to the efforts to spare mankind the horrors of war by the establishment of the rule of international law.

116. Israel's sterile excuse is based on nothing more than supposed evidence of Iraqi nuclear preparations, evidence which not only has gone unsupported but has also been rejected by the world community and some of the friendliest supporters of Israel.

117. Iraq was one of the first nations to sign the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and became one of

its very early adherents. Iraq signed the Treaty on 1 July 1968 and ratified it on 29 October 1969. The agreement on the application of safeguards to all nuclear activities in terms of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was concluded with IAEA in 1972. Iraq has faithfully observed the provisions of the Treaty. The last safeguards inspection took place in January this year. The Director General of IAEA reported to the Board of Governors that all nuclear materials were satisfactorily accounted for.

118. Time and again the Iraqi Government has stressed the peaceful nature of the nuclear facilities they have acquired and facilities still under construction. The acquisition of technical know-how and knowledge for peaceful uses of nuclear energy is fully in accord with and is supported and encouraged by various provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and various other decisions of the United Nations.

119. That is Iraq's clean record. On the other hand, what do we see on the part of Israel? We see a persistent refusal to let others inspect its nuclear facilities to satisfy the world regarding its intentions; and, of course, it has never been a signatory of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It is widely believed—not only by us, but in many quarters friendly to Israel—that Israel is in possession of nuclear weapons. In this context, the evidence gathered by other neutral non-interested parties should not be overlooked.

120. My delegation has ample reason to believe the assertion made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq that

“The motives behind the Zionist campaign and aggression against Iraq are, first, the desire to cover up Israel's possession of nuclear weapons and secondly, and more importantly, the determination not to allow the Arab nation to acquire the scientific or technical knowledge necessary for its development and progress.” [2280th meeting, para. 43.]

121. My country adheres to the Non-Proliferation Treaty along with more than 100 other nations. Members of the Council can imagine what a Pandora's box the Israeli aggression against Iraqi nuclear facilities has opened. Is it not legitimate to ask the obvious question: what are the safeguards for a signatory of the Non-Proliferation Treaty after this unprovoked aggressive act, which led to destruction and loss of life, by another country, which does not adhere to the Treaty and which has consistently refused international or any other impartial inspection of its nuclear installations?

122. The Foreign Minister of Iraq quoted the Director General of IAEA, and made the following quotation from that authoritative head of the Agency which is the zealous guardian of the observance of the provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty:

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

123. In this context, it is relevant to point out that the Israeli action has thrown the whole question of adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty into a debate. It may not come out in the open in this chamber today, but perhaps every adherent of the Non-Proliferation Treaty is debating this matter within himself. Who authorized Israel to decide that Iraq does not need to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes because it is an oil-rich country? The absurdity of that logic does not need any explanation or elaboration. Oil is a non-renewable source of energy. Every nation, oil-rich or oil-starved, has the right to seek alternative sources of energy, nuclear or non-nuclear. If the reason given by Israel is taken to its logical conclusion, it could even provide a pretext for Israel to destroy a university in a neighbouring country which may be teaching nuclear physics, as was pointed out by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Saudi Arabia. Incidentally, the sovereign integrity of his country, along with that of Jordan, was also violated without compunction in the course of the Israeli raid.

124. Israel quotes Article 51 of the Charter. What a travesty. Who has given Israel the right to distort the concept of self-defence as defined in the Charter by the use of spurious excuses? Can it arrogate to itself the right to commit acts of aggression against another sovereign nation and in the process throw to the winds all approved international law, including the inviolability of the rights of sovereign States over their airspace?

125. In this context, we should like to repeat what we have long felt: that to inject arms, and in massive quantities, into any troubled area is asking for grave consequences. It is simple logic, and a lesson of history, that when it comes to problems between nations or within a region, it is the capacity of the nations that matters, not their intentions, for intentions can always change while capacities remain. That is exactly what has happened. Israel has the arms, and has the capacity and technical know-how to use them; it sees no rule of conduct or provision of international

law preventing it from forcing its political will on its neighbours whenever it feels like using those arms.

126. In this context, I should like to quote some extracts from an editorial which appeared in *The New York Times* of 9 June under the heading "Israel's Illusion":

"Israel's sneak attack on a French-built nuclear reactor near Baghdad was an act of inexcusable and short-sighted aggression.

". . .

"But Israel has become the first nation to act on that impulse [to take pre-emptive action] and thus to tear yet another of the international system's fragile barriers against anarchy. What good is Israel's heroic and painful quest for secure and recognized boundaries if it, too, pays them no heed?

"When Prime Minister Begin cries out that he is 'not afraid of any reaction by the world', he embraces the code of his weakest enemies, the code of terror. He justifies aggression by his profound sense of victimhood. And he assumes that even commitments to allies—like those governing the use of American weapons—can be twisted to suit any purpose."

Where now is the cry for secure borders for Israel which we have been hearing for such a long time? Should not the Council now consider seriously the question of providing security for Arab neighbours that find their sovereignty threatened by Israel, which has been disproportionately and indiscriminately armed?

127. This latest aggressive action of Israel takes place against the unsettled and worsening situation in the Middle East. There is a serious crisis in unfortunate sovereign Lebanon, raising the spectre of a new conflict; the Palestinian people continue to be denied the right to a homeland of their own. We believe that it is not yet too late to turn this dangerous course away from the precipice of major conflagration, which could be disastrous not only for the Middle East but for mankind as a whole. The Israeli aggressive act has once again underlined the imperative necessity of making serious efforts to achieve a durable peace through a just and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem.

128. Peace built upon manifest inequity is ephemeral. One nation's security cannot be bolstered at the expense of that of other nations. In order to achieve peace in the Middle East and beyond, the rule of law and justice must prevail. Israel must withdraw from the occupied Arab lands and recognize the inalienable national rights of the people of Palestine.

129. Similarly, southern Africa is another region where what is happening in the Middle East is being

repeated. The scenario is the same. The pre-eminence of the military capability of South Africa is even greater than what one suspects. There are reports of clandestine acquisition and development of nuclear arsenals. The vast majority of the people of South Africa and Namibia have been held hostage under the repressive laws of colonial domination and racial discrimination.

130. The Israeli attack on Iraq is unprecedented in its scope and nature. It is therefore no wonder that even Israel's friends have found it difficult to justify that act. The international community must condemn in one voice this irresponsible act on the part of Israel and ensure that it is not repeated—not in Iraq or any other country. The Council, as the principal organ of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security, must act now—and decisively. There should be no doubt in anybody's mind that Israel cannot act with impunity in the way it has been doing. This is an extremely serious matter where peace is hostage, and the Council should ponder very carefully the consequences of the act which took place on 7 June. All those who are in the Council or outside have a clear responsibility to judge the question without any prejudice, on its own merit, and initiate action commensurate with the grave issues which are at stake. The Charter has ample provisions for such action. And, above all, the people of the world, wherever they are, should be made aware that, when an attempt of so grave a nature to disrupt peace and subvert international law has taken place, the world must act in its own interest to save human beings by taking appropriate deterrent action to ensure that there is no repetition and that the country at fault does not get away with its enormous guilt. This would be the very first step to restoring the confidence of a shocked world in the fact that international law and the rules governing conduct of relations between nations cannot be broken with impunity.

131. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of Poland, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

132. Mr. FREYBERG (Poland): Sir, allow me at the very outset to extend to you our heartfelt congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council, the body which is entrusted with the most important task of and primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. You represent a country with which Poland maintains friendly relations of close and constructive co-operation that is being constantly developed in the interest of both our nations and in the interest of the entire international community. May I express our recognition of and esteem for your record of distinguished and tireless work, for your diplomatic skill and abilities in discharging the duties of your high office. We wish you every success in your difficult work.



133. I should like also to extend our congratulations to your predecessor, Mr. Nisibori of Japan, for the excellent way in which he presided over the Council last month. May I also convey, through you, our gratitude to the members of the Council for giving me the opportunity to address this body.

134. Poland has asked to be allowed to speak at this meeting of the Council to express its strongest condemnation of the flagrant act of aggression committed by Israel against Iraq. The bombing by the Israeli Air Force of the Iraqi nuclear centre near Baghdad constitutes an unprecedented act of international terrorism and piracy which casts a long ominous shadow over the situation in the Middle East, already so dangerously aggravated by the aggressive policy of Israel.

135. Nothing can justify this, yet another successive act of aggression. It once again forcefully proves that the Israeli authorities have not, even for a single moment, departed from their policy of *diktat* towards the Arab countries, which has been pursued for years with brutality and arrogance. For years this policy of adventurism of the Israeli authorities has been making it impossible to find a just and lasting solution to the Middle East crisis—a solution that would also respond to the vital interests of the Israeli nation itself.

136. Throughout the years-long discussions devoted to the dangerous trends in the development of the situation in the Middle East, Poland has been consistently pointing to its grave implications for world peace and security. We have been steadfastly emphasizing that a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in that region cannot be established without the withdrawal of Israel from all the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem, and without the achievement of a just solution of the problem of Palestine, on the basis of the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the establishment of its own independent State.

137. The ensuring of independent statehood for the Arab people of Palestine, in accordance with the postulates of the PLO, its sole, legitimate representative, is a prerequisite for such a solution. The position of the socialist countries, Poland included, on the problem of the Middle East is well known as are their proposals for a just and lasting settlement.

138. The recent act of Israeli aggression against Iraq adds directly to the further aggravation of the already exceptionally tense and explosive situation in the Middle East, threatening as it does a conflagration at any moment.

139. It goes without saying that such dangerous steps cannot but make prospects for a settlement more distant. In their results, they can only diminish security in the region.

140. The arguments of the Israeli authorities concerning the alleged threat to Israel's security are groundless and cannot deceive anybody. The nuclear centre under construction in Iraq is not, as the authorities of that country have repeatedly stated, intended to serve military purposes. This is also confirmed by the declarations of experts of IAEA, under whose control Iraq, a State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, has placed its nuclear development programme. As is known, Israel, which has for years been in possession of nuclear reactors, has not acceded to the aforementioned Treaty.

141. It would be pertinent also to recall here General Assembly resolutions 34/89 and 35/157.

142. The international community—the United Nations—whose opinion is reflected in the numerous statements made here in this chamber, confirms the profound concern of nations over this serious development in the situation and its grave consequences for peace and security in the region.

143. Polish public opinion, Polish society and the Polish Government deplore with indignation this act of open aggression that constitutes a flagrant violation of all norms of international law, and they lay the burden of responsibility for all its consequences on the Israeli authorities and those forces which aid and abet them in their aggressive policy.

144. The continued Israeli acts of aggression, in defiance of numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Council, require action of a rigorous and decisive kind. My country supports the requests in this respect put forth by the latest victim of this policy of aggression. We support the just cause of Iraq. The adoption of these measures would serve the cause of peace and security well.

145. **The PRESIDENT:** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, who has asked to be allowed to speak at this stage.

146. **Mr. HAMMADI (Iraq):** I should like to inform the Council that, on the request of the Government of Iraq, the representatives of the Islamic Group met this afternoon and debated the subject-matter of this series of Council meetings—namely, the aggression of Israel against Iraq's nuclear installations—and that at the end of the debate the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

*"The Islamic Group,*

*"Having met at United Nations Headquarters on 16 June 1981 at the request of the Republic of Iraq to consider the act of aggression committed by Israel against the Republic of Iraq,*

*"Having heard* the statement of Sheikh Sabah Al-Ahmad Al-Jaber Al-Sabah, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait, on behalf of the Council of the League of Arab States,

*"Recalling* the position of the member countries of the Organization of the Islamic Conference on strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons (resolution No. 33/12-P), as well as the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in Africa, the Middle East and South Asia (resolution No. 32/12-P),

*"Considering* the grave situation arising from the premeditated attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations, devoted exclusively to peaceful purposes,

*"Recalling* the various resolutions adopted by the Islamic Conference in connection with Israel's acts of aggression against the Palestinian people and the Arab countries,

*"Affirming* that aggression entails international responsibility, with the payment of prompt and adequate compensation for the damages suffered,

*"1. Strongly condemns* the premeditated and unprovoked aggression by Israel as an act of State terrorism and a blatant violation of the sovereignty of a non-aligned country and a member of the Organization of the Islamic Conference;

*"2. Requests* that the international community take the measures envisaged in the Charter to prevent Israel from pursuing such acts in future;

*"3. Demands* that Israel pay prompt and adequate compensation for the damages suffered by Iraq;

*"4. Reaffirms* the inalienable right of all States to apply and develop their programmes for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy for economic and social development in conformity with their priorities, interests and needs;

*"5. Affirms* its solidarity with and support of Iraq in its endeavours to exercise that inalienable right and to resist Israeli aggression;

*"6. Reaffirms* the resolutions of the General Assembly relating to Israeli nuclear armament and demands that the international community make Israel comply with the said resolutions;

*"7. Pledges* to work together during the forthcoming session of the General Assembly to achieve the application by the United Nations of the measures envisaged in the Charter to prevent Israel from committing such acts of aggression and to comply with the norms of international law, the principles of the Charter and the provisions of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations."

*The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.*

---

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> This statement was made at the 563rd meeting of the Board of Governors of IAEA, the official records of which are issued in summary form.

<sup>2</sup> A/34/542, Political Declaration, para. 116.

<sup>3</sup> A/36/116, Political Declaration, para. 70.

<sup>4</sup> *United States Treaties and Other International Agreements*, vol. 3, Part 4, 1952 (United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1955), p. 4985.

---

### كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

#### 如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在世界各地的书店和经销处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

#### HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

#### COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

#### КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Изложите справки об изданиях в нашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

#### COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

---