



CONTENTS

Agenda item 130:

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

Page

939

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

AGENDA ITEM 130

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

1. Ms. KHAPARDE (India): The General Assembly has already on numerous occasions in the past considered the explosive situation in West Asia caused by the aggressive actions and expansionist policies of Israel. In total disregard of the repeated calls of the international community, Israel has continued stubbornly to hold on to the illegally occupied Arab lands and to deny the people of Palestine their fundamental right to their own homeland.

2. Nowhere have Israel's aggressive policies been more evident than in the flagrant and premeditated attack launched by Israeli F-16 jet aircraft against the Iraqi nuclear reactor near Baghdad early in June of this year. The fact that this attack came at a time when the Arab countries were making a serious effort to avoid a widening of the conflict in Lebanon made the action all the more provocative. Israel's aggressive action is a flagrant violation of all the canons of international law and of the principles governing the conduct of relations between States. Whatever the arguments used by Israel to cover its actions with a cloak of justification that fact cannot be repudiated and deserves universal condemnation. To call its action self-defence and to ascribe aggressive motives to the victim of its aggression is a gross perversion of facts and a blatant effort to confuse the issue; indeed, it is an attempt to turn the Charter of the United Nations upside-down. If the argument of pre-emptive attack were accepted, then the sovereignty of any State could be violated on any pretext and this would make a mockery of all the rules governing the conduct of relations between States.

3. The action of Israel in attacking Iraq must be seen not as an isolated act of adventurism but as part of its overall policy aimed at denying the rights of the people of Palestine, continuing its illegal occupation of Arab lands and creating a situation of instability, tension and conflict in the region in order to further its own political interests.

4. The argument that Israel has advanced to justify its action has been that Iraq was on the verge of producing nuclear weapons. This allegation is baseless, because Iraq has repeatedly declared that its programme in the nuclear field has all along been devoted to the utilization of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. It is therefore manifestly absurd to imagine that the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes by Iraq can constitute a threat to Israel. On the other hand, the whole world knows that it has been Israel that has been making systematic efforts towards acquiring a nuclear weapons arsenal. The sovereign right of a developing country to acquire and develop nuclear technology for peaceful purposes cannot be denied or thwarted through discriminatory practices or policies, and certainly not by such a blatant act of aggression as the one committed by Israel.

5. The Government of India has already condemned in the strongest terms the unprovoked and unjustified act of aggression committed by Israel against Iraq. We have in various international forums expressed our solidarity with the Government and people of Iraq and have supported the strongest possible punitive action against the aggressor, including effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. Such action is merited purely on the grounds of its unprovoked aggressive action and its repeated disregard and grave violation of the principles of the Charter.

6. While stating this, however, my delegation would like to emphasize that the linking of issues such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] or full-scope or other safeguards to the present question is not relevant and detracts from the central issue to be addressed, which is that of aggression. I should like to reaffirm that the position of my delegation on issues such as the Non-Proliferation Treaty and full-scope safeguards remains unchanged, and we view the references to these issues as they appear in draft resolution A/36/L.14 on this item in the context of our well-known position.

7. Once again Israel alone must bear the responsibility for threatening peace and security in West Asia. As long as Israel feels it can continue its behaviour with impunity the situation in the region will remain tense and uncertain. The Government of India has consistently maintained solidarity with the Arab nations in facing the threat of Israeli aggression and expansionist policies. We have repeatedly called for the withdrawal of Israel from the Arab territories occupied since 1967, to facilitate the establishment of a Palestinian State and to guarantee the right of all States in the region to live in peace and harmony.

8. Our hopes for a durable peace in the region have been shattered by this action by Israel. We earnestly hope that Israel and its friends will give heed to the demands of the overwhelming majority of States. Israel must refrain from further aggressive action, take the necessary steps to compensate for the material damage and loss of life suffered, and make genuine efforts to resolve the

problems of the region in accordance with the principles and recommendations endorsed by this body over the past several years. Only in such a manner can peace and security in the region be ensured.

9. Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic welcomes the inclusion in the agenda of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly of the item on the armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations. Consideration of this item is not only necessary in order to condemn the serious consequences of Israel's act of armed aggression against Iraq and to condemn the aggressor, but is of particular significance and relevance today in view of the proclamation of further new and aggressive military doctrines by the imperialists and hegemonists, for example, the doctrine of the propriety of "preventive strikes", "punitive action", "teaching lessons" to other States and even of a first nuclear strike.

10. What is at stake here is the struggle to preserve peace and ensure the security of all peoples. Israel's criminal act of aggression against the Iraqi nuclear research centre is but another link in the long chain of Israeli attacks against its Arab neighbours. Since then, the bombings launched against the capital of the Iraqi Republic have been followed by other acts of aggression by Israel, in particular against cities, villages and refugee camps in Lebanon. The Israeli leaders continue to threaten to use military force against sovereign States.

11. The German Democratic Republic, like the majority of other States, very firmly condemned this new act of piracy by Israel. That aggression is a very gross violation of the sovereignty and territorial inviolability of the Iraqi Republic. It shows cynical disregard of the norms and principles of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations. It is common knowledge that Israel can only pursue its policy of aggression and occupation in the Middle East thanks to the broad political and military support being provided to it, in particular by the United States of America. The German Democratic Republic, like many other States, wishes therefore to draw attention to the responsibility of these imperialists for the act of aggression committed by Israel.

12. There are full grounds for emphasizing the direct link between the escalation of Israel's aggressive policy and the military actions of the United States in the region, for example the large-scale manoeuvres by the so-called rapid deployment force of the United States. There is therefore a firm basis for the fear that the principal effect of the recently announced so-called new strategic alliance between Israel and Washington will be to encourage those in the ruling circles of Israel to continue to expand their policy of aggression, creating a new threat to the independence and sovereignty of Arab States and, indeed, to the stability of the region.

13. Moreover, in the light of recent statements from Washington concerning first nuclear strikes and nuclear demonstrations, the question must arise as to whether Israel did not act, in respect to the Republic of Iraq, in the spirit of the imperialist doctrine that the Pentagon and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] would propose to apply in Europe and other regions of the world using nuclear weapons. History has already shown us the catastrophic consequences of the theory and practice of so-called preventive strikes and preventive wars. Today, with the possible use of nuclear weapons, the application of

that theory would lead to the annihilation of entire peoples and continents. All this clearly exposes the hypocrisy of those imperialist forces which on the one hand talk about peace, freedom and human rights and on the other do not hesitate to hatch plans that threaten overall peace and the fate of peoples with catastrophe.

14. One of the most noble objectives of the United Nations is to promote the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, to ensure the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and to free mankind from the ever-present threat of thermonuclear catastrophe. The régime of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons serves that end, and its basis is the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Israel's attack on peaceful nuclear installations is a direct attack on that régime. Whereas more than 100 States, including Iraq and Israel's direct Arab neighbours, have acceded to that Treaty, Israel has to date refused to become a party to it. Although all nuclear installations in the territories of the Arab States in the Middle East are monitored by IAEA, most of the corresponding installations in Israel are not subject to that monitoring. Accordingly, States and peoples are watching Israel's activities in the nuclear field with justified suspicion. It is well known that from the 1950s to the present, Israel has been making considerable efforts in various sensitive areas of nuclear technology. The Group of Experts to Prepare a Study on Israeli Nuclear Armament also arrived at the conclusion that "Israel, if it has not already crossed that threshold, has the capability to manufacture nuclear weapons within a very short time". [See A/36/431, annex, para. 82.]

15. It is characteristic of Israel's position that on the one hand it refuses to provide any data about its nuclear programme while at the same time its Government deliberately gives ambiguous answers to any questions relating to Israel's nuclear activities in the military sphere, and on the other hand that Government, using military means, tries to arrogate to itself the decision as to which State can use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and in what circumstances. The German Democratic Republic condemns that policy and would recall that States have a right to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. My delegation therefore strongly advocates strict compliance with the non-proliferation régime. Because Israel's aggressive policy is a serious threat to the vital interests of all peace-loving States it is essential that the United Nations give a strong response to Israel. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic reaffirms its position as set forth in the Security Council in June of this year¹ to the effect that Israel's military attack on Iraq's nuclear installations must be strongly condemned as an act of aggression in clear violation of the norms of international conduct. It is essential to recognize clearly Iraq's right to compensation for the damage done.

16. Israel's aggressive policy and the deterioration in the overall situation in the Middle East, and the resumption of debates on this matter in the United Nations, once again emphasize the need to reach a comprehensive political settlement of the Middle East conflict. Recent events confirm once again that such a settlement is possible only on the basis of Israeli withdrawal from all the Arab territories which it occupied in 1967, and on the basis of the implementation of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to return home, to exercise self-determination and to establish their own independent State. Accordingly, the proposal to convene to that end an international peace conference on the Middle East with the participation of all the parties concerned, including

the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO], is extremely relevant today.

17. The German Democratic Republic will in the future continue to advocate the assurance of peace and stability in the Middle East.

18. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): As the General Assembly is aware, this subject was debated at length last June in the Security Council, where matters alleged to be a threat to peace and security are properly brought. The Security Council at that time was able to arrive at the satisfactory conclusion of a unanimous vote which took into account all the relevant aspects of the attack on Tamuz.

19. My Government believes that no useful purpose is served by continuing the debate here today. The matter has already been dealt with in a constructive fashion in the Security Council. All members of the Security Council supported that procedure for dealing with this subject. In our view, action by the General Assembly on this topic—coming as it does on the heels of Israel's condemnation yesterday—does not contribute to the cause of peace in the Middle East. On the contrary, the contentious, unbalanced draft resolution before this body can only complicate the search for peace in the Middle East.

20. The present draft resolution departs in important ways from resolution 487 (1981) adopted unanimously by the Security Council. The draft resolution before the Assembly speaks unwarrantedly of Israel's "aggression", a legal term scrupulously avoided by the Security Council. Such a characterization raises troublesome legal questions and prejudices thoughtful deliberation and a judicious outcome. The United States Government objects strenuously to the use of that term and insists that such actions must be viewed in their total context, which includes Iraq's refusal to accept the international consensus formulated in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and its refusal to make peace with Israel.

21. This debate, which has been engendered by the introduction of this provocatively worded item, diverts our attention from what should be the focus of United Nations efforts—namely, the pursuit of peace and security in the Middle East. Two States in the region, with encouragement and appropriate participation of my country, have worked for the last several years in a practical way towards a comprehensive settlement of disputes which have plagued the area for decades. Critics feel that the Camp David process is painfully slow and doomed ultimately to failure. They seek instead an instant solution in one huge leap, wilfully disregarding the obstacles and pitfalls which have undermined previous peace efforts. To them I would point out that the enormous progress that has been made to date between Israel and Egypt—progress that has met the legitimate security needs of each country—has opened the way towards normal commercial and diplomatic relations and constitutes the only realistic prospect of achieving a lasting peace and a just resolution of the Palestinian problem.

22. We are now being asked to consider questions that are both irrelevant to this debate and a hindrance to the stated goal of regional peace. The United States, for instance, is asked to cease its arms and other relationships with Israel. The United States friendship with Israel is a constant and an enduring fact of our foreign policy. It springs from traditions and values shared by the citizens of both countries. It will not be altered by occasional differences over actions taken by one nation or another.

23. Various countries in this body provide nuclear technology and large quantities of arms to States in the region. Yet this draft resolution asks no one to cease supplying arms and other military assistance to Israel's neighbours. The United States therefore strenuously objects to the entirely unwarranted and inappropriate language concerning this country's relationship with Israel. We consider this language unbalanced and unfair.

24. A similar attempt at distraction from the goal of regional peace is the call for the Security Council to investigate Israel's nuclear activities. We oppose any such effort to engage the Security Council in an unbalanced, politically motivated activity. In this connection, however, I should like to point out that my delegation has supported resolutions adopted by the General Assembly proposing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. We support this goal as a way of addressing the issue of nuclear arms in that region.

25. Finally, I must also object strenuously, and as a matter of principle, to the call for enforcement action in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution. This would only aggravate tensions at a time when the United Nations should be doing its utmost to reduce tensions and defuse potential causes of conflict.

26. It is for the foregoing reasons, therefore, that my delegation will vote against the draft resolution before the Assembly.

27. Mr. KLESTIL (Austria): Before making my comments on the agenda item under consideration, I should like to extend a warm welcome to the delegation of Antigua and Barbuda. Its membership in the Organization is yet further proof of the validity and success of the United Nations concept of peaceful decolonization. Austria looks forward to close and satisfactory co-operation with the new Member State.

28. The military attack which Israel carried out against the nuclear installations in Tamuz in June this year, which resulted in the complete destruction of the nuclear reactor, has been discussed extensively in the Security Council as well as in IAEA. Security Council resolution 487 (1981), which was adopted unanimously, in our opinion presents a correct and firm position on that unprecedented act, taking into account all its facets, and Austria fully subscribes to that decision. In view of the consequences and far-reaching implications of that armed attack, Austria regards it as justified that at this session the General Assembly also should pronounce itself on that incident and reiterate the strong condemnation of it by the Security Council.

29. The event itself has to be regarded from different angles. First, it added another serious dimension to the already complex situation in the Middle East. The long preoccupation of the United Nations with the Middle East conflict has resulted in the definition of the approximate terms of a viable comprehensive settlement. Foremost among those terms, we are convinced, is that it will have to be a peaceful solution and that the renunciation of violence and the use of force is the essential prerequisite for any progress in the search for a solution. The attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor has once again reinforced this conviction and put additional emphasis on the urgent need for such a solution to be achieved.

30. Secondly, in defending in the Security Council as well as in other forums its decision to destroy the Iraqi nuclear installations in Tamuz by military means, Israel

made use of the argument of self-defence and tried to legitimize its action by reference to Article 51 of the Charter. Austria cannot accept this line of argumentation, which is as short-sighted as it is dangerous. Acceptance of the argument of self-defence—or, as it has been called, the right to pre-emptive retaliation—as a justification for this military attack would imply that a basic principle of the Charter is void of meaning. It would replace the legitimacy of defence against armed aggression pending international action to restore peace and security by an unlimited and uncontrolled concept of armed retaliation against all possible future dangers on the basis of a very subjective and unilateral assessment of those dangers. If accepted and applied it would amount to the nullification of all our combined efforts within the United Nations to restrain exactly such arbitrary and subjective actions of States and to create a frame of principles and obligations for the conduct of relations between States. It would imply reverting to a state of lawlessness and anarchy in international affairs. In our view, there is nothing contained in the Charter which could serve as justification for the action taken by Israel. On the contrary, several basic principles of the Charter have been breached, such as respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, the renunciation of the use or threat of use of force and the obligation of all States to seek solutions to disputes by peaceful means.

31. As the third aspect I wish to address the grave implications of this event for the international system of nuclear safeguards, and thus for the very basis of IAEA. The Director General of the Agency clearly identified that point when he addressed the Board of Governors of IAEA. He said:

“The Agency has inspected the Iraqi reactor and has not found evidence of any activity not in accordance with the Non-Proliferation Treaty. A Non-Proliferation Treaty country has evidently not felt assured by our findings and about our ability to continue to discharge our safeguarding responsibilities effectively. . . . One can only conclude that it is the Agency's safeguards régime which has also been attacked. Where will this lead in the future? This is a matter of grave concern which should be pondered well.”

32. This is indeed a very valid point and we share the view of the Director General that the Agency's safeguards system is a basic element of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and that the Israeli attack amounts to an attack on the IAEA's safeguards régime. We also maintain that, if a State has well-founded arguments against the efficacy of the safeguards system, this can be pursued through existing legitimate ways and means within IAEA. We cannot accept that a Member State that is not party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and has not opened its own nuclear installations to inspection can assume the role of a judge over a system on which the international community relies in as sensitive an area as nuclear energy, and as a consequence resort to the use of force against nuclear installations of another State.

33. We are considering an issue on which the international community has pronounced itself unequivocally and indeed with one voice. In view of the gravity and the serious implications of the problem I deem it essential that the General Assembly retain this spirit of unanimity. Security Council resolution 487 (1981) deals with all the various aspects of the Israeli attack and contains decisions to which we can all subscribe. I trust that the General Assembly will bear this in mind when it takes its own decision on this matter.

34. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): On 7 June last the world learned with surprise, shock and indignation that once again Israel had perpetrated aggression against a State Member of the United Nations, Iraq. The target of the armed attack that time was the peaceful nuclear research centre at Tamuz, in the suburbs of the Iraqi capital. That indescribable action immediately elicited condemnation and criticism throughout the world. Iraq, knowing that it was right and being anxious to respect international legality, chose to react to that aggression by coming to the Organization and its main organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council.

35. Following a lengthy debate in which many Foreign Ministers participated, including the Foreign Minister of my country speaking on behalf of the Arab countries² and calling on the Security Council to speak for justice and right, the Council adopted unanimously, on 19 June, resolution 487 (1981), which clearly condemned the action against the independent sovereign State of Iraq.

36. During the debate in the Security Council Tunisia's position was dictated by its international responsibilities and conformed to the provisions of the Charter and the principles of law, and today, even though it means repeating myself, I reiterate very strong condemnation of such irresponsible actions, which are clearly part of an overall plan, with extremely dangerous implications, which shows that there are serious designs on the entire Middle East region, either in the near future or over the longer term.

37. The very serious consequences, and far-reaching dimensions of this matter, Israel's consistent refusal to obey the injunctions of the Security Council and its arrogant defiance of world public opinion mean that the General Assembly is justified in dealing with this matter and taking the necessary decisions. What is at stake is the credibility of the Organization, its capacity to defend its Member States when they are subjected to armed aggression and its ability to act effectively against the aggressor and to ensure that international legality is respected.

38. I shall not dwell on the fallacious arguments and false pretexts invoked by Israel to try to justify the unjustifiable. Just how futile they are has been demonstrated most clearly by IAEA. But we must consider the implications of this most evil deed carried out by the leaders in Tel Aviv and its negative consequences for the validity and value of the international juridical instruments that should govern inter-State relations.

39. Would it not mean opening up the path to complete anarchy, would it not tend to legalize aggression if we were even partially to accept the unacceptable assertion based on the principle of preventive attack, an idea so dear to Israel and so often applied by it in Lebanon and elsewhere? What country could feel safe if force and hegemonism were to become the law, a law that any powerful country could invoke for its own purposes on the basis of a unilateral evaluation that there existed some supposed danger to its own security? What kind of security is it if a country constantly practises a policy of domination, terrorizes the region on a daily basis, elevates international terrorism to a State practice and tramples underfoot the most fundamental norms of justice and law?

40. Can we in any way accept as justification the idea of legitimate self-defence in the context of Article 51 of

the Charter as set forth and developed by the representative of Israel? That Article gives Member States the right to legitimate self-defence if they are subjected to an armed attack. In no way does it recognize a preventive attack which is contrary to the purposes and principles of the Organization, the spirit and letter of the Charter and many declarations of the General Assembly and the principle of the non-use of force in international relations.

41. That "preventive action" was directed against whom and against what? The target was the completely peaceful Iraqi nuclear installations. Their peaceful nature has been attested to by the Director General of IAEA, and it was also recognized in the resolution adopted by the Board of Governors of that Agency on 12 June last. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons has been signed and ratified by more than 100 States. It has been universally recognized as an extremely effective instrument for encouragement of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy for the purposes of scientific progress and economic development. The effectiveness of the safeguards system in ensuring that States parties comply with the Treaty and its objectives has never been challenged. Iraq has ratified that Treaty; it has fully subscribed to the safeguards system of the Agency and has always opened its installations for international inspection. Those inspections and what the Director General of the Agency has said refute Israel's arguments in an extremely effective and cutting manner, for it is clear that Iraq has fully discharged its obligations under the terms of the Treaty and the safeguards system. But what about Israel? Why does it refuse to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty? Why does it refuse any inspection of international supervision?

42. Is there any need for me to repeat here what everybody already knows—that for some time now Israel has possessed nuclear weapons? Have not many statements by Israeli generals confirmed that? Is there any need now to remind the Assembly of the clandestine and illegal means used to obtain the raw materials necessary for the development of such weapons? Is there any need to recall the frequent attempts made—some of them even within the territories of other States—to prevent Iraq from developing nuclear technology?

43. Israel's bellicose initiative was not an isolated action. It was designed purely and simply to slow down the struggle against underdevelopment, to undermine the patient work being done by Iraq, and indeed by the Arab and Moslem world, to master the new scientific and technical methods and to move towards progress, which remains the most profoundly felt and legitimate aspiration of the developing countries. Apparently the economic and scientific development of the Arab world does not accord with the Israeli Government's strategy, which is based exclusively on the criteria of superiority, domination and expansion. Otherwise, why has it adopted the role of policeman of the region?

44. It had two possible courses of action: to accept the Arab world as it is, independent and responsible and concerned with its well-being and development, or to try to keep the Arab world in a state of cultural and scientific underdevelopment despite its geo-strategic importance. Apparently Israel had to choose the second course of action. Moreover, the question that is now before us is but the culmination of the escalation of breaches of international law, which have frequently been described in the General Assembly and the Security Council. They include the annexation of territory by force, continuing illegal occupation of that territory, the denial of the inalienable na-

tional rights of the Palestinian people and frequent and flagrant acts of aggression against and harassment of neighbouring States.

45. Furthermore, Israel seems, rather curiously, to use these violations as a means of exerting diplomatic pressure. Indeed, whenever any kind of diplomatic action has been taken within the Organization or elsewhere relating to the Middle East, has it not become customary for Israel to proceed to engage in hostilities or to revive tensions? As proof, need I refer to the movements of the Israeli air force in the last few days? The press has given them wide coverage.

46. We did not request the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the General Assembly for the purpose of sterile diatribes, although the representative of Israel has accused us of this. It is clear that this despicable action by Israel goes beyond Iraq itself or the countries of the region. It is something that has to be contained and reduced by the collective efforts of the international community. This is the true significance of having recourse to the United Nations and why the General Assembly must play a decisive role. It must draw from the Charter the lessons and the actions that are necessary in order that law and justice may prevail and to ensure the security of all.

47. The draft resolution now before us, of which Tunisia is a sponsor, is in keeping with the requirements of the situation created by the Israeli attack on the peaceful nuclear installations of Iraq.

48. To vote for it is to vote for law and international legality; it is to vote for the credibility of the Organization and for the international system set up to safeguard the uses of nuclear energy.

49. Mr. ALLAGANY (Saudi Arabia) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Before beginning my statement I should like to congratulate the delegation of Antigua and Barbuda on its admission to the United Nations.

50. The decision to include the item now before us in the agenda of the Assembly was made at the request of a number of countries of the third world. It is of fundamental importance that this item should be on the agenda of the General Assembly, not just because of the seriousness of the act of armed aggression committed by Israel on 7 June 1981, but also because resolution 487 (1981), adopted unanimously by the Security Council, asked Israel, which had committed the act of aggression against the peaceful Iraqi nuclear installations, to submit its own nuclear installations to the safeguards system of IAEA, as Iraq had done with its installations which had fallen victim to the Israeli act of aggression.

51. The Security Council also declared that Iraq was entitled to compensation for the damage caused by the Israeli act of aggression against the peaceful Iraqi installations. It seems that the fate of that resolution, which was adopted unanimously, has been the same as that of numerous other resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly regarding the problem of Palestine, the situation in the Middle East, and so on, in the course of the past 33 years. No Israeli initiative indicates that Israel has complied with the resolution.

52. We all know here in this international community, and this includes the major Powers and the countries that support or submit to Israel, that the Zionist entity recognizes neither legitimacy nor law and that it acts only to

serve its own aggressive interests. This is the case as regards Palestine and the Palestinian people. But on this occasion Israeli criminality was extended to a place hundreds of miles away, affecting not only the neighbouring Arab countries, but countries far from the region and we can only ask, quite naturally, whether Israel commits such criminal acts of criminal instinct or because it is encouraged by certain Powers, the Powers that arm Israel and support it and commit themselves to defend its cause. In any event, this criminal act violates the provisions of the Charter and all international law and practice and could undermine the United Nations and expose the entire world to the danger of war.

53. The Israeli act of aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installation was an act of piracy, not unlike other acts by Israel against the Palestinian people—acts committed since 1948, in what remains of Palestine since 1948, and in Arab and Palestinian territories occupied by Israel since 1967. The fallacious arguments of Israel have revealed the nature of the Zionist entity and the danger posed by that entity in the Middle East in the near and distant future. Perhaps some countries felt that the Israeli strike force could improve their interests in the region. Were they perhaps forgetting that the only danger to their interests, if there were any danger, would be that caused by Israeli acts of aggression, the injustice suffered by the Palestinian people, the unlimited support given to Israel by certain Powers and the grave consequences of all this on Arab peoples throughout the Arab world?

54. Israel knows full well, as the entire world knows, that the Iraqi nuclear reactor did not constitute any danger, but was simply a laboratory, a nuclear research centre for peaceful purposes. It is the right of any country to possess such facilities. That nuclear reactor was installed in a very open way and all the information on it was clear. Iraq was one of the first countries to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which entered into force in 1970. Iraq also signed an agreement with IAEA in 1972 to apply the safeguards system under that Treaty.

55. In other words, there was no evidence whatsoever of Iraq's having violated any safeguards mentioned in the Treaty. On the contrary, there was conclusive and irrefutable evidence that the Iraqi nuclear reactor had been installed for peaceful purposes, for development purposes exclusively. Mr. Eklund, the Director General of IAEA, affirmed that the Agency had inspected the reactor and had found no sign of any activity in violation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

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

56. Who committed that flagrant act of aggression against the Iraqi installations, thus violating the provisions of Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations, endangering the peace and security of a Member of the United Nations and thus threatening peace and security throughout the world? Who committed such an act of aggression? It is a State which is unique in its criminal acts and its violations of international law, the Charter and resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. It is the State that many years ago established a great number of nuclear reactors, that did not ratify the Non-Proliferation Treaty, that has concluded no agreement with IAEA and that has always refused to permit inspection of its nuclear installations—even refused its United States friends and allies. It is the very entity that set up the Jewish State in Palestine and conspired with the Western world; especially the United States, to steal hundreds of

tons of uranium and transfer them to the Israeli Dimona nuclear reactor, where Israel has proceeded to produce nuclear weapons since the 1960s. It was the Jewish State that used terrorism for its creation. It is the State that continues to use terrorism, to conceal its actions to eliminate the Palestinian people, to break down its resistance, to prevent it from exercising its right to self-determination and to live in dignity, peace and security. It is that State that found another ally in the racist régime of South Africa and that collaborated with that régime for the provision of weapons, both conventional and nuclear. There is a great similarity between the two régimes, based on racial discrimination, violence and oppression. Yet Israel, which heads the international Zionist clique, armed with all sorts of sophisticated weapons, behaves as though it has a right to decide on the policies of all States and to dictate what those countries should or should not do at the national and international levels.

57. The time has come for the international community to put an end to these actions of the Zionist entity. The United Nations and in particular the Security Council have the authority to implement their resolutions. The Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 487 (1981), concerning the act of aggression against the Iraqi reactor. Therefore the Council is in duty bound to adopt another resolution to ensure the implementation of paragraphs 5 and 6 of resolution 487 (1981).

58. Israel has made the claim of self-defence. However, Iraq and the other Arab peoples are the peoples that need to have their self-defence guaranteed. Israel has proved that it is the only country that does not take account of the Charter, that does not comply with international law, that acts irresponsibly, not only towards its enemies but also towards its friends that have been giving it support for some 33 years and continue to do so.

59. The fact that Israel continues to act in this arrogant way can only intensify the already explosive situation in the Middle East. Does this worry Israel? No, it welcomes the situation, because this gives it an opportunity for new conquests. However, we still have faith in the United Nations. We have faith in the will of the international community to protect the Organization and to avoid any deterioration of the situation. We appeal to the General Assembly to adopt a resolution requesting the Security Council to take every necessary measure to ensure strict implementation of resolution 487 (1981) and to see to it that United Nations resolutions are taken seriously. The implementation of these resolutions is necessary if an end is to be put to the constant defiance and actions of Israel and if peace and security are to be established in the Middle East and throughout the world in keeping with the Charter and international law.

60. The fact that Israel is concealing its own nuclear research, its acquisition of uranium and its production of nuclear weapons sows fear throughout the Middle East and other parts of the world. Israel's confidence that other countries too cannot carry out nuclear research certainly does not allay the fears of those countries. We are certain that the international community is aware that the force of arms cannot suffice to destroy the legitimate rights of peoples and that the will of peoples to recover their rights, regardless of how long it may take, will enable those peoples to triumph.

61. Israel's act of aggression against the Iraqi nuclear reactor constitutes a military act under international law. If that act had been committed against a major Power, it

would have led to a world war. The great danger of the precedent that such an act can set in international relations must be taken into account. Military aggression does not differ from one country to another, except in the logic of racists as reflected in an article by William Safire in *The New York Times* on 11 June 1981: "No nation has cause to fear an atomic attack from Israel any more than one from the United States. Weaponry whose purpose is to deter is not weaponry whose purpose is to terrorize; there is a huge moral difference." That is the logic of William Safire, the Zionist racist who continues to believe that Israel is a dove of peace while the Arabs are the hawks of war. That is the logic of Israel, which has been committing bloody acts of aggression for the past 33 years.

62. Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly is now considering the situation resulting from the attack carried out on 7 June by Israeli aircraft on the Iraqi nuclear installations near Baghdad. This caused material damage and took the lives of civilians. As will be recalled, the leaders of Israel officially claimed responsibility for that attack.

63. The people of Bulgaria and the world public at large immediately reacted to that criminal act of terrorism with deep indignation. My Government's position on the Israeli attack was expressed clearly during the consideration of the situation in the Security Council. In our view, it constitutes a flagrant violation of the Charter and international law and it further exacerbates the already tense situation in the Middle East. It constitutes open and premeditated aggression capable of shaking the very foundations of the system of international relations and it makes the aggressor internationally liable under the Charter. It is an example of state terrorism which once again confirms Israel's aggressive intentions. It is an act that seriously jeopardizes peaceful nuclear co-operation among States within the context of an international system for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

64. The Israeli attack can be understood only within the context of the policy pursued by Israel and its protectors in the Middle East. It is a logical result of the strategy which, through separate negotiations, seeks to divide the united front of the Arab States and peoples. That is precisely the purpose of the Camp David agreements, which give those in the most extremist circles of Tel Aviv a free hand selectively to attack Arab States. Israel's actions against the Palestinian people in the occupied territories, against Lebanon and now against Iraq are irrefutable proof of that strategy.

65. Israel, seeking to justify its aggression here in this Hall and in the Security Council, has advanced ridiculous arguments drawn from an imaginary nuclear threat. The overwhelming majority of States and the world public have categorically rejected those arguments, primarily because they have been contradicted by the facts. Moreover, to accept Israel's arguments would be tantamount to giving a green light to preventive war and would mean that international law would be replaced by the law of the jungle.

66. The consideration of item 14 on the annual report of IAEA, at the 50th to 52nd meetings clearly demonstrated the importance that Member States attach to peaceful nuclear co-operation. In the promotion of that co-operation the most important role belongs to the non-proliferation régime and the safeguards system of the Agency. As Mr. Eklund, Director General of the Agency, has confirmed, the Agency inspected the Iraqi reactors and found no evi-

dence of activities not in accordance with the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Despite many appeals, Israel has refused to sign that Treaty. There is sufficient information and documentation available to show that Israel possesses nuclear weapons and is able to manufacture them. The close co-operation between Israel and the racist régime of Pretoria in the nuclear field is no secret. In the light of those facts, the raid against the Tamuz nuclear installations is particularly dangerous for international peace and security.

67. In these conditions it is difficult to pass over in silence the role and responsibility of those who support Israel. The fact that Israel has been condemned in words and that its main protector, the United States, delayed for some time the delivery of new offensive weapons changes nothing. It was because of United States protection that the Security Council did not adopt effective measures to prevent the repetition of such acts of aggression in future.

68. Many conclusions could be drawn from this debate. In the view of my delegation there is one conclusion that is particularly convincing: the policy designed to divide the Arab world by separate agreements cannot lead to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East but is simply playing into the hands of Israel and its expansionist designs. The only path to peace is by way of an overall settlement of the problems, with the participation of all the interested parties, including the PLO. This settlement could be arrived at within the context of an international conference specially convened for the purpose. We sincerely hope that all interested parties will take that path.

69. Mr. CHOUEIRI (Lebanon) (*interpretation from French*): On 7 June last, by a premeditated and unjustifiable act, Israel attacked Iraq's nuclear research installations. The peace and security of the world were thus endangered and the principles of the Charter and the norms of international conduct were violated. The seriousness of that act of aggression has escaped no one. The entire international community has strongly criticized it. The Security Council and the Board of Governors of IAEA have expressed the firmest condemnations and set forth measures to be taken.

70. There can be no doubt that this was a dangerous act fraught with grave consequences, in a region where the situation is already explosive, and that it was a flagrant violation of international law.

71. Exactly what was at issue? Allow me to recall the objective of IAEA, which is to enhance the contribution of atomic energy to peace and prosperity throughout the world. To that end the Agency has, *inter alia*, established a safeguards system, which is a fundamental element of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. That safeguards system is the result of close international co-operation and it is constantly re-examined and improved by competent experts. It involves inspections the modalities of which are adapted to each research installation subject to the system. Methods of diversion to non-peaceful purposes are known and detection methods have been developed and are applied at each inspection.

72. Iraq's nuclear research installations were no secret. Their activities had been regularly inspected by IAEA under the safeguards agreement signed between the Agency and Iraq when that country became a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, on the date it entered into force in 1970. The most recent inspections at Tamuz took place in January of this year and were completely satisfactory.

73. The Israeli attack called into question the principle of non-proliferation. Adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty would become pointless if the parties to it were unable to exercise the resulting rights. Israel, none the less, has thus far refused to submit its nuclear installations to the IAEA safeguards system, although it is a member of IAEA, and it has not adhered to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Therefore, apart from the danger involved for the entire world, a member of the Agency has challenged and shaken the very principles of that organization, of which it is a member.

74. It seems to those of us who want to place the question of the Middle East in its historical context that Israel has at present two options: either to accept the Arab world as it is and as it will become—more prosperous and fully developed—or to try to keep that Arab world in a state of colonial dependence and cultural underdevelopment, despite its wealth and geo-strategic importance.

75. The odious attack against Baghdad on Sunday, 7 June, revealed Israel's choice. In order to preserve the myth of its security, Israel must ensure its unquestionable superiority and its unassailable right to police 20 countries at the crossroads of history and the world. The problem is inseparable from that of the security of the region at a time when efforts are under way to eliminate the dangers of nuclear proliferation. The attack, in our view, represents an obstacle to those efforts and may frustrate hopes for peace.

76. We are all gathered here to demonstrate our confidence in the United Nations. We of the Arab world believe that peace can be achieved only through dialogue within this international framework and by the use of force to defend the Charter and the rights of nations. In this connection, there can be no security without responsibility and without applying the coercive measures of international law. Therefore, above and beyond the measures provided by the Charter, we should seek, in a practical fashion, ways and means of submitting Israel's nuclear superiority to the requirements of international bodies.

77. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation supported the initiative of a large group of Arab and other non-aligned countries on the inclusion in the agenda of this session of the General Assembly of an item on armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and its grave consequences in a number of areas. There was, indeed, every reason to include this item.

78. First, the matter of Israel's aggressive acts against the Arab peoples in general has constantly been brought before the Security Council, where one fifth of the total number of meetings have been devoted to that problem, and on the agendas of other organs of the United Nations as well. Israel's continuing occupation of Arab lands and its other hostile acts against Arabs have frequently been condemned. Israel's criminal act against Iraq was another flagrant violation of international norms and a serious disturbance of the peace in the Middle East. These actions by Israel, as is well known, have been unanimously condemned by the Security Council and by IAEA.

79. The particular danger of this Israeli raid—and, indeed, of the one undertaken by Israel following it, the barbaric bombing of Beirut—consists in the following. It represents a new and insolent phase in Israel's policy of international terrorism against Arab States; it is an attempt to strengthen the criminal practice of so-called preventive

strikes against Arab cities and villages; it is an attempt to replace international law by the law of the jungle and to play politics from a position of strength. Israel's attempts to justify its acts of piracy are obviously futile. In fact, they would hardly be worth bothering about if not for the fact that, clearly, these attempts by Israel are aimed not so much at justifying its evil actions as at intimidating neighbouring countries by the possibility of similar future actions.

80. Secondly, the consequences of Israel's act of piracy go beyond the scope of relations between States of the Middle East. This bombing was an attempt to damage the whole system of the peaceful use of nuclear energy, IAEA and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as well as the safeguards system relating to it. It is important to note that during the IAEA's consideration of the item on Israel's armed attack against the Iraqi nuclear installations not a single delegation questioned the Agency's safeguards system.

81. The Soviet delegation wishes once again to express its support for the IAEA safeguards system as an important instrument in the international régime for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. This system makes possible the peaceful use of nuclear energy in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect. The Soviet Union is a consistent advocate and supporter of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and considers it an effective instrument for ensuring the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons on this planet. The Soviet Union advocates adherence to the Treaty by all countries in the Middle East region and by other countries that have not yet signed it.

82. Thirdly, it is well known that Israel, despite frequent appeals from the international community, has refused to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The question of Israel's nuclear ambitions and of its co-operation with the Pretoria racist régime in the production of nuclear weapons has, for some years now, been discussed in the United Nations. The General Assembly has strongly condemned Israel's attempts to create, acquire and stockpile nuclear weapons and has called on Israel to submit all its nuclear installations to IAEA inspection and safeguards. It has also called on the Security Council to take the necessary steps to ensure implementation of the relevant resolutions on the question of Israel's nuclear weapons. Israel's refusal to comply with United Nations decisions is eloquent proof of the fact that its real objective is to establish its own nuclear domination in the Middle East. One can well imagine the consequences if such adventurist plans are not stopped.

83. Fourthly, in talking about Israeli aggression we cannot pass over in silence the role of those who stand behind Israel. Begin's Government would not be bold enough to challenge the entire international community were it not convinced of Washington's actual encouragement of its adventurist and expansionist policies. Facts are facts. The bombing of the nuclear research centre near Baghdad was carried out using the newest American military technology. The United States Government states that the weapons it provided to Israel could be used solely for defensive purposes, but the bombing nevertheless took place. The basis of comprehensive and close American-Israeli co-operation is clearly the aspiration of the United States to use Israel as an instrument for its imperialistic policy in the Middle East. This was confirmed by the proclamation of strategic co-operation between Washington and Tel Aviv.

84. Fifthly, the Soviet delegation considers that in the face of this uninterrupted escalation of Israeli aggression, it is the duty of the United Nations to take strong steps against the aggressor. It must be a question not only of condemning Israel, but also of halting any similar actions that might take place in future. It is also essential to ensure that Israel pays compensation for the material damage done to Iraq. The Soviet Union also supports the proposal that appropriate sanctions should be applied against Israel by the Security Council.

85. Mr. M'RANI ZENTAR (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): I should like first of all to perform the very agreeable duty of greeting here among us for the first time the delegation of Antigua and Barbuda, now a full-fledged Member of the United Nations. I take this opportunity to wish it every success in its efforts, which will certainly be very positive and will strengthen the activities of the United Nations.

86. During the debates in the Security Council in June, the inadmissible circumstances of the Israeli attack against Iraq's peaceful nuclear installation at Tamuz were made known to a shocked international community, and we also received clear-cut evidence of the excessive and unjustifiable nature of that act of aggression and its violation of international institutions that threatens to upset the entire system painstakingly established for the control and peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

87. Israel had unilaterally claimed the right to pass final judgement on the technical characteristics of the Osirak installations, although they had been constructed with the collaboration of foreign Powers whose devotion to international peace and security was totally reliable, and although they were being periodically checked by international agencies with competence in the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

88. Iraq is a signatory of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, a country committed to the principles and objectives of the Charter of the United Nations, a country that regularly and strictly submits to the inspections provided for under the international agreement.

89. We heard and were pleased to note the factual evidence submitted by the French authorities with regard to the characteristics, capabilities and objectives of the Osirak reactor installations, as we were to learn that it would be a near impossibility technically to transform that reactor, which was in the process of construction, into a producer of atomic bombs—an act which would, moreover, have been a costly absurdity for a developing country confronted, as are many of us, with urgent needs in the economic and social spheres.

90. We also noted with real concern that that aggression against a signatory country of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons constituted a threat to the entire international system established for the control of nuclear weapons based on voluntary adherence to controls and rules that have proved their usefulness and effectiveness.

91. In attempting to justify its act of aggression against the economic installation of a sovereign State, Israel produced nothing but accusations that were immediately disproved by responsible international agencies along with its familiar litany of shady plots being fomented in the darkness to bring about Israel's total destruction.

92. Such Israeli acts, aimed at periodically destroying any development effort by its neighbours and at attempting, *manu militari*, to maintain an Israeli supremacy alongside an industrial and technological impoverishment of the Arab world, are the surest way of creating inevitable rejection phenomena.

93. It is impossible to separate such constant aggressive Israeli conduct against its Arab neighbours from its continuous refusal to acknowledge the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to create a State on its national territory. These are major obstacles to the final restoration of peace in the Middle East, obstacles for which Israel bears the responsibility.

94. Israel's attack on the Iraqi atomic installations is an unjustifiable act concerning which His Majesty Hassan II, in his message to President Saddam Hussein, stated "This act evidences open defiance of all international rules, of all the values of civilization and of the moral principles of mankind and constitutes an attempt to scuttle the sincere efforts being made to establish peace and security in the Middle East".

95. The first consequence of that criminal act, that act of constant defiance should be the immediate and unreserved suspension of all assistance, particularly military assistance, to Israel in order to remove the means underlying its arrogance, the means through which it perpetuates its aggressive system. The Israeli nuclear programme, which is developing outside international control and which benefits from such support as that of South Africa, constitutes the true mortal danger to the entire region and should therefore be the subject of a very thorough international investigation. Not only should that Israeli aggression be condemned on principle and for its consequences, but there should be equitable compensation to Iraq, whose legitimate interests, protected by international law, were unjustly attacked.

96. On this occasion the General Assembly must also reaffirm the right of all countries freely to develop all the nuclear technology they need with a view to peaceful programmes and economic development and with respect for international law concerning the protection of our entire community from the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

97. As an unexpected consequence of the Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations at Tamuz, the majority of peace-loving Members of the United Nations were made aware of their fundamental rights to free access to modern technology, with respect for international law and free of diktats and other external threats based on exclusivist interests and on a desire for domination. Together with the condemnation of Israeli aggression, all small countries that cherish freedom would like to obtain here clear confirmation of their inalienable rights of access to technology, the only guarantee of their development and their progress.

98. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Since yesterday morning the Assembly has been discussing a new item on the agenda of its thirty-sixth session entitled "Armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security".

99. At first glance it seems that a new element has now been added to the old, chronic elements that have contrib-

uted separately and collectively to making the situation in the Middle East and in the world in general more complex and to causing increasing deterioration—as though the Middle East needed new problems when so far it has not been able to break the vicious circle of crises, wars and disturbances from which it has suffered for decades. A first reading of this new item shows clearly how many issues it covers and how many grave consequences it points to. It is as though the item was simply summarizing all the old, chronic problems of the Middle East, giving them a new and frightful image.

100. While Security Council resolution 487 (1981), adopted unanimously in June 1981, strongly condemned this armed action, describing it as a “clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international conduct”, the discussions in the Security Council in June, in which many countries, including Egypt, participated, reflected to a large extent the widespread reaction among the international community, which condemned that violation. I shall not speak of this widespread reaction here, whether among the world public or in the international community as a whole. I shall simply quote one paragraph from an editorial that appeared in *The New York Times* of 9 June—that is, two days after the aggression was committed. It points out the consequences of the Israeli action not only for peace and security in the region and in the world but also for Israel itself.

“Israel’s ever-widening definition of self-defence is illusory. It is bound to unify a challenged Arab world. It keeps eroding the support of Israel’s fastest friends. Such conduct argues that Israeli behaviour is irrelevant to Middle East events. It argues for unrelenting attack in pursuit of an unsustainable superiority. It argues for a policy that will make it impossible to augment Israel’s formidable defences with diplomacy. Israel risks becoming its own worst enemy.”*

101. The Egyptian delegation, in the discussions in the Security Council on 15 June 1981,³ made the same assessment as many other delegations; our delegation gave the position of the Egyptian Government and people in the statement by the Egyptian Government.⁴ It condemned this irresponsible act of aggression, which is contrary to the requirements of peace and the responsibilities incumbent upon every State in contributing to the establishment of the proper atmosphere for the creation of confidence and goodwill.

102. This aggression caused reactions throughout the civilized world and by all peace-loving peoples. There were some that interpreted the aggression as self-defence and this premeditated attack as preventive or pre-emptive action, and others that questioned the effectiveness of the safeguards system of IAEA. There is no doubt that it was an attack not only on peaceful nuclear installations but also on the right of all countries to independent development and progress, by attempting to establish a nuclear monopoly and preventing other States in the region making progress in the field of science and technology in the service of peace and the well-being of peoples.

103. I shall confine my remarks here to another question from an American source, one that can hardly be suspected of being against Israel or prejudiced against it. Mr. Philip Klutznik, the former Secretary of Labor and former Chairman of the World Jewish Congress, said the

following in the *Christian Science Monitor* of 19 June 1981:

“... the devil of pre-emptive attack has been loose—all the worse for Israel having acted without clearly exhausting all opportunities for reaching a general peace in the region, which is surely the only way in the long term to safeguard Israel’s security.”*

104. The use of pre-emptive strikes, claiming self-defence, has resulted only in retrogression. Moreover, Israel’s security will not be achieved by one pre-emptive strike or even dozens of them; and Iraq and other Arab countries will not be destroyed even if their reactors and nuclear facilities are destroyed. Chaos, instability and the desire for revenge will remain the order of the day in the Middle East area.

105. After the lengthy discussions last June, there is no need for me to repeat our rejection and condemnation of this aggressive action; indeed, they are shared by the international community without exception. Neither is there any need for me to repeat what I had the honour to state on behalf of the Egyptian delegation in the Security Council on 15 June 1981; it affirmed our standing position of principle in regard to a matter of principle transcending any dispute or passing crisis between Egypt and its Arab brothers. Such disputes and crises will certainly pass. I should like to quote one paragraph from the statement made by the Egyptian delegation last June:

“... Egypt has been affected by this act of aggression as much as all Arab countries and peoples have been. Egypt has been and will continue to be an organic part and parcel of the Arab nation. Our history is one, our present aspirations and ordeals are one, and our common destiny is and always will be one. Not one person, Government or country should be under the illusion that Egypt’s national interests differ from those of the Arab peoples—and I say that loud and clear. They are one and the same. Egypt, as it has done in war, will fulfil in peace all its historical tasks in safeguarding and enhancing the legitimate interests and aspirations of the Arab people.”³

106. I would not be exaggerating if I were to say that the armed Israeli attack against the Iraqi nuclear installation has consequences not only for the existing international system for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy or the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security; they go far beyond that. Perhaps the most important casualty of the Israeli attack was not Iraq’s nuclear reactor—which Iraq will restore in reaffirmation of its right to development—but trust, the foundations of which Israel should have striven to strengthen instead of undermining them. What Israel did was not, by whatever standards, an act of self-defence, but rather an act of self-destruction—even if only in the long run. It was just one more step back on the path towards a building up of peace and mutual trust. Israel destroyed the peaceful nuclear reactor in Iraq but it did not destroy the will of the Iraqi people nor that of the Arab peoples. It did not shake their determination to catch up with the advancement of civilization and science in order to ensure progress, prosperity and peace for their peoples.

107. Peace and security in the Middle East can be achieved not by aggression or premeditated or pre-emptive attacks but, rather, by the elimination of the barrier of

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

fear, suspicion and centuries-old hatred among the peoples of the region and through serious and responsible efforts to ensure a just and peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem. The heart of that problem is the cause of the Palestinian people and their legitimate national rights, the foremost of which is the right of self-determination, to return to their homeland and to establish their own free and independent State. Egypt, in all sincerity and determination, is working towards that peace and the attainment of that lofty objective.

108. Mr. EL-SHEIKH (Sudan): At the outset I should like to extend to the delegation of Antigua and Barbuda the warm congratulations of my country on its admission to membership in the United Nations. We hope that its participation in the work of the Organization will contribute to the attainment of the objectives to which we all aspire.

109. Once more the international community is considering a lawless act of far-reaching consequences for international peace and security. Once more the General Assembly finds itself obliged to consider an act in clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of orderly international conduct. As if the repeated attacks from the air and on land on the peaceful hamlets and innocent women and children of Lebanon and Palestine were not enough, Israel stunned the whole world on 7 June 1981 by its reckless, unprecedented and premeditated air attack on Iraqi nuclear installations for peaceful purposes. By so doing, Israel, which has flouted every resolution relating to it adopted by the competent organs of the Organization, including the Security Council, chose that day to undermine the Charter, the principle of the non-use of force and thus the very *raison d'être* of the Organization.

110. We were told yesterday by Mr. Blum of Israel, with his usual twisted logic, that such an unwarranted act of aggression was justified by the following:

"In view of the ineffectiveness of existing safeguards with respect to Osirak-type reactors, Israel was clearly faced with a mortal danger. It was and is inconceivable that a country so threatened would entrust its fundamental security to an inspection procedure which is contractually limited, which is not unconditional or binding . . .". [52nd meeting, para. 55.]

111. Is it not a bizarre kind of irony that a State like Israel, with an assured nuclear arms capability, not subject to bilateral, regional or international supervision and inspection, could attempt to justify its attack against Iraq, a signatory of and party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, on the grounds that possession of a nuclear research installation by Iraq constituted a threat to Israel's "fundamental security"?

112. How right was Mr. Otunnu of Uganda when he said on 15 June before the Security Council:

"The Israeli argument is a tortuous attempt to force a square peg into a round hole. It amounts to a cynical perversion of the norms of international law . . .

"... they remind me of an armed bandit who walks into a courtroom, takes everybody hostage and then lectures the group on the virtues of being a law-abiding citizen."¹

113. Professor W. Thomas Mallison, Director of the International and Comparative Law Programme at Georgetown University, told the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee, at a hearing on 25 June this year:

"... it is less plausible for Israel to maintain that it did not violate the 'territorial integrity' of Iraq. It is clear that the Osirak reactor was on Iraqi territory and, in addition, the attack upon the reactor violated Iraqi airspace as well as Jordanian and Saudi Arabian airspace. Under the established criteria of self-defense, Iraq would have been legally justified in shooting down the Israeli aircraft. In the same way, Israel violated the last clause of Article 2, paragraph 4, [of the United Nations Charter] by conducting an aerial attack 'in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations'. Among the stated purposes of the United Nations in Article 1 of the Charter is the principle of maintaining 'international peace and security' by 'peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law'."

114. The international community as a whole should be concerned about the serious developments of 7 June and the grave consequences for international peace and security, particularly in the Middle East region. It is beyond any doubt that the bizarre Israeli concept of "national security" on which Mr. Blum based his defence of the 7 June attack is so limitless, vague and undefined that any legitimate activity in the region could be conceived and construed by Israel as a potential threat to its "security". Such an ominous development is a clear indication that Israel is dragging the world towards the institutionalization of State terrorism. It is imperative that the international community see to it that the response to such criminal acts by Israel is not confined to mere words of condemnation. It is high time for the General Assembly to address itself to the dangerous reality of the situation in the Middle East.

115. The General Assembly should call upon the Security Council to investigate Israel's nuclear activities and its collaboration with the racist régime of Pretoria for the perpetuation of the unholy alliance of *apartheid* and zionism. The Security Council should also be called upon to institute effective enforcement action to prevent Israel from further endangering international peace and security through its acts of aggression and continued policies of expansion, occupation and annexation. In view of its international responsibilities for this act of aggression and in order to comply with Security Council resolution 487 (1981), Israel should pay prompt and adequate compensation for the material damage and loss of life suffered as a result of this act of aggression.

116. The Charter provides for all the necessary effective measures designed to deter and punish such wanton acts of aggression as those perpetrated by Israel. The adoption and application of those measures depends mainly on the will and sense of responsibility of all the Members of the Organization. Only by opting for such a firm course of action will the Member States honour their commitment to the Charter and will the Security Council discharge its primary responsibility of maintaining justice and international peace and security.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

NOTES

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

² *Ibid.*, 2280th meeting.

³ *Ibid.*, 2283rd meeting.

⁴ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-sixth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1981*, document S/14513.