



President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA  
(Zambia).

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Gumucio Granier (Bolivia), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

AGENDA ITEM 24

Armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security: report of the Secretary-General

1. The PRESIDENT: (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to propose that the list of speakers in the debate on this item be closed this afternoon at 5 p.m. If I hear no objection it will be so decided.

*It was so decided.*

2. Mr. AL-ZAHAWIE (Iraq): The item before us, on the armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations, continues to be included in the agenda of the General Assembly because of the aggressor's intransigence in refusing to comply with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

3. In spite of the fact that Security Council resolution 487 (1981) concerning the Israeli attack still stands unimplemented, certain Western delegations have argued that the issue should no longer be pursued by the Assembly. It has even been alleged that since the Security Council arrived at a satisfactory conclusion—a unanimous vote on resolution 487 (1981)—no useful purpose would be served by continuing the debate in the Assembly.

4. Similar arguments will no doubt be reiterated during the present debate. The fallaciousness of such arguments and their grave consequences for the Organization as a whole have been admirably exposed by the Secretary-General himself in his report on the work of the Organization to the thirty-seventh session.<sup>1</sup> The Secretary-General stated:

“There is a tendency in the United Nations for Governments to act as though the passage of a resolution absolved them from further responsibility for the subject in question. Nothing could be further from the intention of the Charter. In fact resolutions, particularly those unanimously adopted by the Security Council, should serve as a springboard for governmental support and determination and should motivate their policies outside the United Nations. This indeed is the essence of the treaty obligation which the Charter imposes

on Member States. In other words the best resolution in the world will have little practical effect unless Governments of Member States follow it up with the appropriate support and action.”

5. Resolution 487 (1981), on the Israeli military attack, was adopted unanimously by the Security Council, and Member States are duty-bound, in accordance with their treaty obligations, to follow it up with appropriate support and action. The resolution demanded two important undertakings of the aggressor: namely, “to refrain in the future from any such acts or threats thereof” and “urgently to place its nuclear facilities under the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency”. The aggressor has openly denounced the Security Council's unanimously adopted resolution and refuses to this day to comply with all its provisions.

6. The General Assembly subsequently adopted resolutions which confirmed the unanimous decision of the Security Council and sought ways and means to ensure its implementation. In its resolution 38/9 for instance, the Assembly reiterated its demand that the aggressor “withdraw forthwith its threat to attack and destroy nuclear facilities in Iraq and in other countries”.

7. The Secretary-General has now been informed by the representative of the Zionist entity that the statements in document A/39/349 are his régime's response to the General Assembly's demand that it withdraw its threat to repeat the attack. A close examination of the statements quoted in that document, in the light of the threats issued by the Zionist leaders after their act of aggression, will show that, far from withdrawing those threats, the statements in fact confirm the previous Zionist assertions that they intend to carry out similar attacks again in the future.

8. My delegation quoted already, in the course of the debate at the thirty-eighth session [42nd meeting], the threats issued by the Zionists after their attack on the Iraqi installations; there is no reason for me now to repeat them here.

9. It is worth noting, however, that on 12 June 1981 *The Christian Science Monitor* reported that Israeli analysts insisted that the supervision called for in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons<sup>2</sup> is no longer adequate. Then on 14 June Menachem Begin appeared on the Columbia Broadcasting System news programme “Face the Nation” and, in answer to a question about the precedent that Israel's attack might have set for other countries which believe that their enemies are on the verge of acquiring nuclear weaponry, he said: “Now every country will decide for itself.”

10. What are the contents of the document that purports to demonstrate that Israel does not intend to attack nuclear facilities? The document before us contains two statements. One of them is by the

Director-General of the Israel Atomic Energy Commission, who, unlike the Zionist leaders who formulated the doctrine of pre-emptive attack on nuclear facilities, is not a policy-maker where military operations and strategy are concerned. Be that as it may, his statement is none the less highly revealing. When the Director-General states that Israel supports international efforts to arrive at an early arrangement directed to the purpose of regulating the status of nuclear facilities, he is clearly confirming his régime's refusal to recognize the international agreements already in existence. Nowhere in the statement, or, for that matter, in the whole document, is there any mention or reference whatsoever to the IAEA safeguards system. The Director-General does, however, repeat the ludicrous statement made last year that Israel "has no policy of attacking nuclear facilities", this time adding "and [it] certainly has no intention of attacking nuclear facilities dedicated to peaceful purposes anywhere".

11. The Zionists, to begin with, never had declared that they had a policy of attacking nuclear facilities. Yet they went ahead and attacked the safeguarded Iraqi facility because they, and they alone, had decided that it was not dedicated to peaceful purposes. There is nothing in document A/39/349 that even remotely indicates that the aggressor does not intend to repeat such an attack. Indeed, all the options are left open for him to decide which reactor is not dedicated to peaceful purposes, to appoint himself judge and arbiter and to take the law into his own hands.

12. Yitzhak Shamir's statement contained in the same document should raise far more serious apprehensions and objections once its full intent is revealed. There was more to Shamir's statement than the representative chose to convey to the Secretary-General. What Shamir really said is reported in the American publication *Nucleonics Week* of 10 May 1984 which stated that "In a May 2nd speech in Tel Aviv, Shamir said that 'Israel, which is poor in national resources and sources of energy, has an interest in building nuclear power plants'." However, he added, "some régimes violate agreements and rules of behaviour without fear of retribution". Accordingly, the Prime Minister advocated co-ordinated and unified action by democratic countries which "are capable of punishing the various international pirates".

13. Shamir's statement is not only a blatant affirmation of the aggressor's intention to repeat its act of aggression but also an open invitation to "democratic countries" to join the Zionist régime in punishing "the various international pirates". Those democratic countries invited to join this Zionist venture would no doubt include the "democratic" régime in Pretoria, which should be quite capable of punishing the so-called "international pirates", considering how well that "democratic" régime is collaborating with its counterpart in Tel Aviv to improve their respective military and nuclear capabilities.

14. The Zionist threat to repeat the attack on nuclear facilities was also reiterated in August 1983, when Yuval Ne'eman, the Minister for Scientific Research, was quoted in *Nucleonics Week* of 25 August as saying that:

"As long as there is no agreement turning the Middle East into a nuclear-free zone, Israel is compelled to disrupt any Arab project when it

becomes clear beyond doubt that the intention is to produce nuclear weapons. Israel has succeeded in disrupting several such programmes during the past 20 years, and we believe it is possible to prevent the entry of nuclear arms into the Middle East in the future." [See A/39/406.] Those boasts and threats were uttered by the man who is himself regarded as the father of the Zionist atomic bomb.

15. My delegation's views on the Israeli statements are contained in document A/39/406. Those statements are, furthermore, but a deliberate attempt to mislead the United Nations so that the culprit may be rehabilitated, its crime forgotten, so that it may now have the freedom to recruit others to join it in committing similar acts of aggression in the future.

16. In no circumstances should the United Nations allow itself to be misled once again by the false pretences of the Zionist régime. Having admitted that régime to membership in the Organization on similar false pretences was one mistake too many, for which the Organization is paying dearly to this day.

17. I should point out here that the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency, at its twenty-eighth session, held at Vienna last September, decided by an overwhelming majority, in its resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/425, that the Israeli statements did not fulfil the provisions of the resolution adopted at the twenty-seventh session of the General Conference which had urgently called upon Israel to withdraw forthwith its threat to attack nuclear facilities in Iraq and in other countries.

18. How the Assembly chooses to deal with this item will not only decide the final outcome of the unprecedented Israeli act of aggression against Iraq, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the IAEA and its safeguards system and the future uses of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, but also affect the whole system of the United Nations as laid down in the Charter.

19. This item provides a classic example of what the Secretary-General meant when he said that resolutions unanimously adopted by the Security Council should serve as a springboard for further governmental action, and when he affirmed that that was indeed the essence of the treaty obligations which the Charter imposed on Member States.

20. This item provides a historic opportunity for the United Nations to redeem its credibility and the role that was intended for it by its founders and in its Charter. The United Nations can do no better than turn again to the wisdom of the Secretary-General and heed his advice when he says in his report on the work of the Organization to the thirty-seventh session:<sup>1</sup>

"I believe that in reviewing one of the greatest problems of the United Nations—lack of respect for its decisions by those to whom they are addressed—new ways should be considered of bringing to bear the collective influence of the membership on the problems at hand."

21. That is the challenge. That is the test which the General Assembly faces today. In the interest of survival of the whole United Nations system, the Assembly should have the determination and the will to confront that challenge with firmness and fortitude.

22. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): As surely as the seasons turn, the Government of Iraq, with annual regularity, resurrects its proposal to vilify Israel.

Every year since 1981 the United Nations has had to endure the spectacle of Iraq's delegation, full of feigned innocence and indignation, spluttering outrage. I am afraid we will see much more of that today, and before the end of this debate.

23. There are many serious and complex questions about attacks on nuclear facilities that deserve to be addressed. Israel, as much as any nation represented here, welcomes disinterested international attention to the problem of regulating the status of nuclear facilities. We have noted that issues such as the kind of facilities to be protected, legal questions, zone definition and questions of compliance and verification are now being discussed by relevant bodies, particularly at the Conference on Disarmament at Geneva. The work under way there is valuable for shedding light on these difficult problems. Many differences, however, need to be reconciled before final conclusions can be reached, but I think we can all see that what Iraq is engaging in here today bears little relation to this important and necessary work. The Iraqi exercise in fact is a diversion, even an obstacle to such work. It has nothing to do with furthering peace or with the elucidation of these questions.

24. Israel, on the other hand, has shown its good faith by clarifying its own position and by seeking a broader international understanding of those issues. Our position has been stated clearly and repeatedly, for example, by our representative in his letter of 12 July 1984 [A/39/349], by the Director-General of the Israel Atomic Energy Commission on 28 September 1984 and most recently by Minister for Foreign Affairs Shamir in the general debate here on 3 October 1984 [18th meeting].

25. The main points of my Government's position are as follows: first, that Israel has no policy of attacking nuclear facilities and no intention of attacking nuclear facilities dedicated to peaceful purposes anywhere; secondly, that Israel holds that nuclear facilities dedicated to peaceful purposes should be inviolable from military attack; thirdly, that Israel supports international efforts to reach agreement as soon as possible on regulating the status of nuclear facilities and to enhance the role of the IAEA in ensuring that nuclear energy is a safe and credible source of peaceful development; and fourthly, that Israel will accept the conclusions of those negotiations, including the definition of nuclear facilities for peaceful purposes.

26. Israel has thus gone on record and defined its position. We wonder if other Member States would have made an equal declaration of policy on this matter.

27. Iraq's repeated efforts to attack Israel, and its latest effort—and those representatives who are reading it now can see this—exhibiting still greater extremism and even more impossible demands, are, unfortunately, taking much of this Assembly's valuable time. This is the kind of time, the time that has been seized and squandered, which could have been devoted to real and terrible problems that beset other nations, problems such as the threat of famine that now hangs over so much of Africa. It is matters like this that deserve our prolonged, undivided and undiverted attention.

28. I must tell the Assembly that I feel there is a kind of "Alice-in-Wonderland" quality to this whole business. Iraq comes forward with its anti-Israeli

draft resolution, and we all recall that just a few weeks earlier its rival, Iran, presented its own anti-Israeli measure. These two despotic and cruel régimes battle each other up and down the Shatt al-Arab and in the Persian Gulf. But on Turtle Bay they engage in a different but equally grotesque competition to see which of them can appear more anti-Israeli and use up more of this body's time. They are like Tweedledee and Tweedledum in the famous story by Lewis Carroll—an "Alice in Wonderland" that becomes "malice in blunderland".

29. Each accuses the other of being a "Zionist agent". And in whipping up the frenzy of its troops, each claims that the road to Jerusalem leads through the other's capital. One might note that on this point, at least, the Iranians have the globe on their side.

30. Now comes Iraq invoking international law. This is a régime, let us remember, which has recently and repeatedly employed chemical warfare—a kind of weaponry strictly outlawed by a treaty to which Iraq is a solemn signatory. And, despite Iraq's denials, the unanimous conclusions of a team of specialists appointed by the Secretary-General "substantiate the allegations that chemical weapons have been used" [see A/39/210, para. 8].

31. By the way, Iraq's military leaders do not even bother to feign moral inhibitions. Alluding to chemical warfare, Major-General Maher Abed Al-Rashid, Commander of the Iraqi Third Corps, told *Time* magazine on 19 March: "If you give me some insecticide that I could squirt at this swarm of mosquitoes, I would use it so that they would be exterminated, thus benefiting humanity by saving the world from these pests."

32. Then, too, over the past year Iraq has been happily bombing neutral shipping in the Gulf. It has killed or wounded countless innocent seamen from a dozen countries—countries incidentally having nothing to do with the Iran-Iraq war.

33. Finally, it may not be irrelevant to note that Iraq, which presents itself so much as an aggrieved party, itself recently bombed an Iranian nuclear power plant. The official Iranian complaint on 1 June of this year described the action:

"At 03.33 hours on 24 March 1984, the Bushehr nuclear power plant, located on the Persian Gulf, 15 miles south-east of the city of Bushehr, was attacked from the air by Iraqi missiles."

34. I raise these matters because a dose of reality may provide a salutary shock, even to the delegation of Iraq. But I must also declare my sorrow that yet again so much important work has had to be derailed because Iraq insists on indulging one of its most cherished obsessions.

35. When Iraq, as many representatives will remember, first introduced its draft resolution three years ago, there were those who argued that it would be a good thing if Baghdad were permitted to "let off steam". Some were even prepared not to oppose the draft resolution on the theory that that would be the end of it. They can now see how wrong they were. Iraq is now attempting to provoke blunt interference by the General Assembly in the affairs of the IAEA. Yet another non-political functional international agency is to be corrupted.

36. The only way to put an end to such time-consuming and destructive efforts is to make the costs outweigh the benefits to those who stand behind them. One way to ensure that they will not

burden us with a similar draft resolution next year, or, for that matter, for each of the next 10 years, is to defeat it this year. At the very least a significant number of nations should demonstrate by their vote that they find this a pointless and distasteful exercise.

37. Iraq and others of similar disposition would eventually take heed and this body might once again free itself from the obsession with Israel, an obsession that has become a curse.

38. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The General Assembly is considering today the question of Israeli armed aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations in 1981 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.

39. The delegation of Egypt is participating once again in the debate on this question because this aggression is a clear infringement of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, a flagrant challenge to the independence and territorial integrity of States and a violation of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States [*resolution 3281 (XXIX)*] and the fundamental principles of the new international economic order. Moreover, Egypt's consistent denunciation of the use or threat of the use of force is well known. The international community has always denounced Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear facilities in 1981. My delegation does not accept the arguments put forward by Israel. The question of Israeli aggression was examined and debated at length in the Security Council, which condemned the aggression in its resolution 487 (1981), which was adopted unanimously in June 1981. The Security Council regarded this aggression as a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations. Its resolution took a firm and salutary stand, on the basis of an examination of all aspects of the question by the Council. Egypt reaffirms that this resolution must be applied. It does not accept the pretext of self-defence, which is not applicable in this case. Moreover, we do not agree that there was any right of preventive attack, an argument by Israel used to try to give legitimacy to the aggression, which, as is well known, had such serious consequences.

40. The study of this question undertaken by the Group of Experts on the Consequences of the Israeli Armed Attack against the Iraqi Nuclear Installations<sup>3</sup> stresses, among other things, that Israel must comply with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the safeguards system of the IAEA. It states also that Iraq, a signatory of the Treaty, had placed its nuclear activities under the safeguards of the IAEA. It reaffirms that the nuclear installations near Baghdad were a part of Iraq's efforts for economic, scientific and technical development and that these installations were at the service of the welfare of the Iraqi people.

41. Our condemnation of this barbarous act is all the greater because these activities by Iraq were, as we have already shown, fully in keeping with the safeguards of the IAEA. Hence, one can hardly forget this aggression.

42. Israel, which by its aggression violated the rules of international conduct, has not withdrawn its threat to attack and destroy nuclear installations of Iraq and other countries of the region. It has not to this very day adhered to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation

of Nuclear Weapons. It has not placed its activities under the safeguards system of the IAEA and disregards the numerous resolutions adopted by that Agency, the most recent of which is resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/425, adopted in September 1984, which once again urgently called on Israel to withdraw its threat to attack and destroy the nuclear installations in Iraq and other States. This threat is a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of the basic system of the Agency, which urgently calls on Israel to place its nuclear installations under the Agency's safeguards. The attitude taken by Israel clearly demonstrates that it has contempt for these resolutions and is defying the international community. That is why we must all call on Israel to undertake not to resort to such action in the future.

43. The brother country of Iraq has every right—within the context of the international safeguards system and in conformity with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to which it is a party—to use nuclear energy for its social and economic development. As everyone knows, all States have the sovereign right to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Installations such as those that were destroyed in Iraq are an instrument of scientific research, contributing to independence and international co-operation in the development and use of nuclear energy, and thereby to the welfare of all States.

44. Accordingly, the General Assembly must, first, condemn Israel once again for its premeditated aggression and call on it not to resort to such action in the future. Secondly, in our view, the General Assembly must ask Israel to abide by Security Council resolutions and withdraw its threat to attack Iraqi nuclear installations. It must provide clear-cut assurances to that effect. So long as such assurances are not given, the Security Council must in our view contemplate taking the necessary steps to prevent resort to such attacks against nuclear installations in the future.

45. In conclusion, the delegation of Egypt believes that the draft resolution before the General Assembly reflects all the views and concerns we have expressed. We therefore call on Member States to condemn every act or every threat that, in violation of the Charter provision concerning the sovereign equality of States, could prevent or limit the exercise by Iraq or by any other State of its legitimate rights.

46. Egypt has supported all the resolutions of the United Nations and the IAEA on this subject. The item before us relates to a Member State that has adhered to the safeguards system of the Agency as well as to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Indeed, everything confirms the conclusions reached in the study to which I have already referred.

47. Mr. ABULHASSAN (Kuwait) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The General Assembly is once again discussing the armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations designed for peaceful purposes, and it is thereby demonstrating that the international community is determined not to permit the passage of time to erase the memory of this crime committed by Israel against the aspirations of peoples to a better life and to the exercise of their right to use modern technology to improve their standards of living. This crime took the form of the bombardment of the nuclear reactor of a State that is a party to the

Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, a State that has placed its nuclear activities under the safeguards system of the IAEA.

48. The discussion today is a reflection of the international community's refusal to hide this aggressive act behind a curtain of forgetfulness. It reminds everyone of the very serious consequences of resort to force or the threat of force in international relations—a policy that Israel has constantly pursued in the Middle East since it was implanted there by force. By claiming that its aggression was nothing but an act of self-defence, Israel is flouting the values and ideals enshrined in international covenants. The Charter of the United Nations and the rules of international law cannot be interpreted in accordance with the selfish interests of States or the circumstances of the moment. If this logic were to apply in international relations it would open wide the door to the use of force without control or deterrent, and this important principle would become a legitimate formula allowing military force intent on hegemony to overrun all the principles of justice and national sovereignty, under the cloak of which the international community can live in security.

49. The principle recognizing the right of each State to choose nuclear energy as an alternative source in the development of its national economy is acknowledged and well established in international practice. As is known, nuclear research centres play a vital role in strengthening the scientific and technical potentials of economic development programmes in non-nuclear fields. In view of the specific character of this form of technical knowledge, the developing countries, in their attempts to choose nuclear energy as a resource for economic development, are obliged to seek and to resort to bilateral and multilateral co-operation with countries advanced in this field. Thus, the developing countries are obliged to expend enormous sums in order to achieve this end. Therefore, the security of nuclear installations and means of safeguarding them against any danger or threat of danger are of capital importance for any country wishing to benefit from that form of energy and the possibilities it offers. That is why the General Assembly, at its last session, in resolution 38/9 reiterated its demand that Israel withdraw its threat of repeating its attack against nuclear facilities in Iraq and in other countries, so that the sword of Damocles, brandished by Israel against all the countries of the Middle East, can no longer be used to prevent them from making the scientific progress that would improve their economies and guarantee prosperity for their peoples.

50. However, Israel, persisting in its policy of rejection of and contempt for any United Nations resolutions which reflect international will, has not yet complied with that resolution, nor has it withdrawn its threat. Nor does Israel recognize the international control system for nuclear facilities intended for peaceful purposes, the definition of which it has left subject to its whims, caprices and aggressive objectives, without taking into account the nature of the installations or of the nuclear reactors concerned, or referring to guarantee or control systems or having regard for international law, or any relevant agreements through which the aid of international expertise is resorted to for setting up such facilities.

51. This being the situation, the General Assembly must spare no effort to prevent the Zionist aggressive régime from implementing its policy, which is a threat to international peace and security, and oblige it to comply with Security Council resolution 487 (1981). This is only possible through obtaining from Israel a clear and definite declaration and pledge to withdraw its threat to repeat its attack against nuclear facilities in Iraq and in other countries.

52. That is why my delegation considers that draft resolution A/39/L.13 now before the General Assembly is a reflection of all of the considerations and fears to which I have just referred. It is important for the international community that the Israeli aggressor not be permitted to create a precedent which might be invoked or followed in the future. We will always find this item on the agenda at future sessions of the General Assembly as long as Israel does not categorically commit itself, through the highest authorities in Israel, to withdraw its threats to attack once again the nuclear facilities in Iraq and in other countries.

53. Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): For the fourth consecutive year the Assembly has been called upon to consider the manifold and serious implications of the unjustifiable aggression perpetrated by the Israeli forces of aggression in June 1981 against the nuclear facilities of a sovereign State which were used for exclusively peaceful purposes.

54. In violating the airspace of two Arab States of the region and then destroying these facilities, which it has been established were being used for exclusively peaceful purposes, in conformity with the conditions and guarantees set forth by the IAEA, the Zionist forces deliberately violated the principles contained in the Charter and adversely affected international standards of behaviour and international law.

55. The General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency was not wrong in affirming, in a resolution adopted three days later, that this attack was an infringement upon the sovereign and inalienable rights of all States to use nuclear energy to develop their economies and industries for peaceful purposes and said that this attack showed total contempt for the Agency's safeguard system and for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and could do considerable damage to the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

56. Indeed, while tirelessly pursuing their development plan for nuclear energy for military purposes in collaboration with their racist allies of South Africa, and by refusing to submit their installations to the control of the IAEA, the Israeli leaders threatened, directly after the attack, to act in a similar fashion against any nuclear facility that might be installed in Iraq or the region.

57. Unanimous in its emphatic condemnation of the Israeli attack, the Security Council, in paragraph 2 of its resolution 487 (1981), called upon Israel "to refrain in the future from any such acts or threats thereof". This condemnation was reiterated twice by the General Assembly, which almost unanimously called on the Israeli entity to withdraw its threat to destroy any nuclear facility situated in Iraq or in any other country.

58. Today, in spite of the injunctions and appeals that have been addressed to it by the various bodies

of the Organization, the Zionist régime, entrenched in its obstinacy, still refuses to comply with the pertinent resolutions of the United Nations and to withdraw its threats.

59. Nothing in the statements of the Israeli leaders indicates or makes it possible to hope that Tel Aviv, which has made threat and intimidation its favourite weapon of expression, and aggression its principal means of bringing about its designs of expansionism and domination, is ready today to make it possible for the region to install nuclear facilities designed for the fulfilment of the civil needs of the population of the region.

60. In fact, the Zionist leaders, who have constantly placed themselves above the law and the rules of law, have now arrogated to themselves the inadmissible and exclusive right to determine whether the nuclear activities, whether or not submitted to the control of the IAEA, are peaceful or military in nature. Accordingly, they have arrogated to themselves the discretionary right to destroy any nuclear facility which they perceive to be some kind of threat to their security.

61. Nothing has therefore changed in the Israeli attitude. The threat is always there and the countries of the region remain exposed to the danger of seeing any effort they might have undertaken to develop nuclear energy in the service of their peoples and their development needs reduced to naught.

62. The action is always the same. It continues to be inspired by the same purposes and is designed to achieve the same ends. The only new element in the past few years has been the resort to a theory that is as surprising as it is dangerous, because of the serious and disruptive consequences it could have for the quality of international relations through the attempt to give an appearance of legality to a policy of aggression and criminal adventurism—namely, preventive war. It is by resorting to this abhorrent theory that the racist régime of Pretoria attempts to justify its repeated acts of aggression against the States of southern Africa. It was on the basis of that same theory that, in June 1981, the Zionist forces of aggression destroyed the Tamuz nuclear reactor, and one year later, virtually to the day, invaded Lebanon and perpetrated in that country the most horrible massacres that the world had witnessed since the Second World War.

63. Once the bellicose nature of the Zionist régime, its natural propensity to use force and aggression and its total contempt for the decisions of the Organization and the international community are recognized, it is impossible not to accept the irrefutable fact that this entity, all of whose actions constitute a constant challenge to the law and to the universal conscience, is beyond redemption and that it will remain outside any rule of law.

64. Three decades of daily acts of aggression against the Palestinian people, who have been deprived of their most fundamental rights, and of wars imposed upon the States of the region have shown too clearly the irredentist nature of the Zionist régime for us to hope that it will be possible, except by the imposition of the mandatory measures provided for in the Charter, to bring it one day to change its ways.

65. The Assembly must therefore reiterate once again its firm condemnation of Israeli threats to destroy the nuclear facilities in Iraq and in other countries, just as it must call on the Security Council,

as the organ with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, to take all possible measures, including those under Chapter VII of the Charter, to ensure compliance with Security Council resolution 487 (1981), which was adopted unanimously more than three years ago.

66. It may thus be possible to safeguard the inalienable right of each State to develop in full security its programme for the peaceful use of nuclear energy, in accordance with the principles in the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States [resolution 3281 (XXIX)] and in the Declaration on the Use of Scientific and Technological Progress in the Interests of Peace and for the Benefit of Mankind [resolution 3384 (XXX)], until the day when the Security Council decides to shoulder its responsibilities with regard to the whole problem of the Middle East.

67. Ms. KUNADI (India): The explosive situation in the Middle East which has resulted from the aggressive actions and expansionist policies of Israel has been considered by the General Assembly on numerous occasions in the past. In total disregard of the repeated calls by the international community and in clear violation of the canons of international law and the principles governing the conduct of relations between States, Israel has continued to hold on to the illegally occupied Arab lands and to deny the people of Palestine their fundamental right to a homeland of their own. Israel continues also to defy the will of the international community to find a just, lasting and comprehensive solution to the conflict in the Middle East. The Israeli military attack on the Iraqi atomic reactor near Baghdad in June 1981 was yet another dark episode in Israel's history of aggression and military adventurism against Arab countries.

68. The Government of India unequivocally condemned the Israeli action immediately after the attack. We expressed our solidarity with the Government and the people of Iraq, a nation with which India has close and cordial relations. The world saw in the Israeli action a new threat to international peace and security and a new form of international terrorism at the State level. The Israeli action was condemned by the Security Council, the General Assembly and the IAEA, as well as in several world capitals.

69. In a world which is scarce in resources, the right of sovereign States to acquire and develop nuclear technology for peaceful purposes for their developmental programmes has been widely recognized. Iraq's nuclear installations which were wantonly destroyed were part of Iraq's endeavour to develop and utilize nuclear energy for its socio-economic development. Iraq had all along declared that its nuclear programme was devoted to the utilization of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The exercise of the right of sovereign States to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes should not be thwarted through discriminatory practices or policies and certainly not by such acts of aggression as the one committed by Israel. Israel's contention that it chose to destroy the nuclear installations of Iraq since the latter was on the verge of producing nuclear weapons was a gross distortion of the truth.

70. In our view, the General Assembly should censure Israel once again for this premeditated act of aggression and warn it against any such act in the future. It should be ensured also that Israel does not

build a nuclear arsenal, which could threaten the entire West Asian region. Apart from paying adequate compensation to Iraq for the damage caused, Israel should be asked to declare and undertake a commitment forthwith that it will not resort to such actions in the future.

71. My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.13 because it clearly expresses condemnation by the international community of the blatant act of aggression committed by Israel against Iraq on 7 June 1981.

72. I wish also to emphasize that our support for the draft resolution is without prejudice to our well-known views on references to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its related full-scope system of safeguards, which figures in the draft resolution as well as in the title of the agenda item itself. Our vote in favour is based on the understanding that nothing in the draft resolution will be interpreted or used in any manner to strengthen the Treaty or the associated safeguards régime.

*Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) took the chair.*

73. Mr. JESENSKÝ (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): The General Assembly is again considering the question of the armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear research centre. The fact that the Organization has again reverted to this piratical attack, three years after it was committed, is evidence that the international community continues to consider the problems connected with that action, which flies in the face of international law, to have lost none of their relevance.

74. Together with other Member States of the United Nations, Czechoslovakia has categorically condemned that barbarous attack, which the Security Council unanimously described as an unprecedented act of aggression.

75. The United Nations not only has condemned that act of aggression but has adopted specific measures aimed at eliminating its causes and consequences and ensuring that such piratical acts are not repeated. However, the decisions adopted have not been implemented. Israel continues its aggressive policy against neighbouring Arab States and continues to flout the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. Israel resorts to this policy of the use of force in order to realize its selfish and mercenary concepts of a Middle East settlement. It does not take into account the elementary rules of international law or the just demands of the international community. The basis for that long-standing policy is the Israeli paraphrase "preventive self-defence". The fact that that version directly conflicts with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, especially those of Article 51, has often been demonstrated at the United Nations. In spite of this, to this day Israel has disregarded that fact, because in all its actions it has enjoyed the support of the United States. There is nothing surprising about that; after all, the Israeli paraphrase and the American doctrine of "vital interests" have the same meaning and purpose, and both present a danger to the international community. The purpose is expansion by means of force and diktat, though, as is known, they are prohibited by international law.

76. Israel and the United States are cynically flaunting the fact that they are achieving their strategic purposes in contravention of international law, disregarding the will of the international community.

77. In the Secretary-General's report on the consequences of the armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations intended for peaceful purposes [A/39/379], there is a clear statement of the serious negative consequences of Israel's aggressive raid for international peace and security, for a Middle East settlement and for the development of international co-operation concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. With this action, Israel has blatantly ignored the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the safeguard systems of the IAEA. Such actions create barriers to the peaceful development of nuclear energy and raise obstacles to international co-operation in the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

78. It is with regret and concern that we must observe that there is no evidence that Israel intends to change its policy. It remains unwilling to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Such a position cannot be viewed as anything other than an expression of Israel's plan to settle matters in the Middle East by means of nuclear weapons. That is why it is necessary to take collective action to draw up and implement measures effectively to prevent the use of nuclear energy for the improper purpose of carrying out aggressive and expansionist designs.

79. Bearing in mind the exclusive responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace, we must, on the occasion of our consideration of the armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations, draw attention to the fact that that hostile act is part of a policy of aggression aimed in particular at the developing countries. International imperialism is striving in this way to secure its neo-colonialist influence in a number of States of the world.

80. We very much appreciate that progress has been made this year at the Conference on Disarmament in discussion of the question of protection against armed attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations designed for peaceful purposes. Participants in the Conference held a detailed exchange of views on the problems under consideration. A positive aspect is the fact that they unanimously called for an immediate settlement of the problem.

81. Czechoslovakia has always rejected, and continues to reject, a policy based on strength. That rejection extends to direct or indirect support for such a policy. We are firmly opposed to the policy of State terrorism, whose purpose is the subversion of the social and political systems of sovereign States and the inhibition of the progressive development of social relations. That is why we support the initiative of the Soviet Union [A/39/244], which has put forward the problem of State terrorism for comprehensive examination by the General Assembly at the current session.

82. Our delegation is convinced that the United Nations will adopt further effective measures aimed at ending the aggressive policies of Israel and safeguarding the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Arab States, safeguarding the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine and halting Israel's dangerous nuclear ambitions.

83. Mr. MADADHA (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Security Council adopted resolution 487 (1981) unanimously. The General Assembly also adopted a series of resolutions at its sessions in 1981,

1982 and 1983. It is deplorable that Israel has complied with none of those clear and precise international resolutions, which condemned the Israeli aggression and called upon Israel to cease its threats of acts of military aggression against nuclear installations designed for peaceful purposes.

84. If we briefly review those resolutions we note that the General Assembly, in 1981 [*resolution 36/27*], condemned Israel for its premeditated and unprecedented act of aggression. The Organization warned Israel to cease its threats and the commission of such armed attacks against nuclear facilities and called upon all States to cease forthwith any provision to Israel of arms and related material which enable it to commit acts of aggression against other States. It demanded that Israel pay prompt and adequate compensation for the material damage and loss of life suffered as a result of its act.

85. In 1982 [*resolution 37/18*], the General Assembly condemned Israel's refusal to implement Security Council resolution 487 (1981) and demanded that it withdraw forthwith its officially declared threat to repeat its armed attack against nuclear facilities. It considered the Israeli act of aggression to be a violation and a denial of the inalienable sovereign right of States to scientific and technological development. The international community requested the Security Council to consider the necessary measures to deter Israel from repeating such an attack on nuclear facilities. It requested the Secretary-General to prepare, with the assistance of a group of experts, a comprehensive study on the consequences of the Israeli armed attack against the Iraqi nuclear installations devoted to peaceful purposes.

86. In 1983, a group of experts transmitted to the General Assembly a detailed study on the consequences of the Israeli aggression.<sup>3</sup> The General Assembly [*resolution 38/9*] reiterated its condemnation of Israel's refusal to implement Security Council resolution 487 (1981). It noted that statements made so far by Israel had not removed apprehensions that its threat to repeat its armed attack against nuclear facilities would continue to endanger the role and activities of the IAEA as well as all installations to be used in the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The General Assembly considered that any threat to attack and destroy nuclear facilities in Iraq and other countries would constitute a violation of the Charter of the United Nations, and reiterated its demand that Israel withdraw forthwith its threat to carry out such an attack. It also requested the Security Council to consider the necessary measures to deter Israel from repeating such an attack on nuclear facilities. It reaffirmed its call for the continuation of the consideration, at the international level, of legal measures to prohibit armed Israeli attacks against nuclear facilities to ensure the safe development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

87. The letter and the spirit of these resolutions indicate that Israel has so far refused to implement these resolutions, and the text of draft resolution A/39/L.13 is similar to that of other resolutions adopted by the Organization on this subject. That is why Jordan, in keeping with the will of the international community, is a sponsor of the draft resolution and will vote in favour of it. We ask the international community to support the draft resolution as a demonstration of solidarity with the developing countries, which seek to protect their resources and use energy of all kinds for peaceful purposes.

88. Iraq had put its nuclear installations under the IAEA safeguards system, which verifies its use for peaceful purposes and for development. Israel, on the other hand, has refused to accord the world and the IAEA the right to exercise any control at all over its nuclear reactor. There is no doubt at all about the main purpose of Israel's reactor. The unprecedented act of international piracy committed in a French port when a cargo of plutonium was stolen and taken away by Israel, for purposes clear to all, is still fresh in our memories.

89. The Assembly had previously adopted resolutions confirming the collaboration between Israel and the racist South African régime in the sphere of both conventional and nuclear weapons within the framework of what would appear to be a plan to create a South African nuclear monopoly on the African continent and a similar Israeli monopoly in the Middle East.

90. Although we live in a world in which there is an increasing number of international tragedies, the aggressor and the tyrant frequently unjustly escape any sanction because of their tyranny. That is why we—and we are certainly not the only ones—have been surprised to see in this forum law and justice being trampled upon. Only the other day the representative of Israel shed crocodile tears over the critical economic situation in Africa, calling for assistance to alleviate the economic problems caused by the drought. That same position was reiterated today, but I will not dwell on the somewhat strange contradictions.

91. So that our picture of the international and African tragedies may be a true one, we must stress the close collaboration between the enemy of Africa and mankind, the South African régime, and Israel. That is why we must compel Israel to put an end to its acts of aggression against the Arab States and the Palestinian people so that they may be able to use their natural resources for peaceful purposes and for development and devote their efforts to international economic co-operation and disarmament and so that all the resources of mankind may be concentrated on efforts to alleviate the suffering of the brother continent of Africa.

92. Israel has refused to co-operate and place its nuclear facilities for peaceful purposes under international control. It has also refused to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and has not agreed to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Israel, through military aggression against the Iraqi nuclear reactor and by digging a canal linking the Mediterranean Sea and the Dead Sea, has demonstrated how far it will go to flout international resolutions and appeals and how far it is going in order to monopolize nuclear and atomic energy in the region and prevent any other State from benefiting from the facilities provided by nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. It falls upon the international community to assume the responsibility of preventing Israel from attaining its goals.

93. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

94. Mr. AL-ZAHAWIE (Iraq): My delegation could have interrupted the representative of Israel on a point of order, since he totally veered away from the subject before the Assembly and raised matters



concerning a separate item on the agenda, and he could have said all that he did say when the Assembly took up that item.

95. My delegation allowed him to continue in his vain attempt to divert the subject of the debate so that he might fully expose the paucity—indeed the bankruptcy—of his position. He feebly attempted to be witty; he repeated the meaningless statements made by his régime and wondered whether any other Member State of the United Nations would have made an equally forthcoming declaration of policy. No other Member State of the United Nations has committed such an act of aggression as have the Zionists. No other Member State has been condemned for such an act by the Security Council or requested by the Council to refrain from repeating it in the future or threatening to do so. For the same reason, the Security Council has not requested any other Member State to place its nuclear facilities under the safeguards of the IAEA. It was the enormity of the Israeli act of aggression that led the Council to adopt such a unique resolution.

96. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): I think the representative of Iraq must surely wish to hide his embarrassment at the information I revealed today on the bombing by Iraqi forces of the Bushehr nuclear power plant. Iraq cannot hide that, should not try to hide it and should not try to obfuscate its position.

97. But I must say, as a new representative here, that I am startled at being lectured on the importance of international law by a representative of a country which has used poison gas and made war on its neighbours on the slightest pretext, violated agreements it had solemnly signed a few years earlier, bombed cities, killed hundreds of thousands of young men and children. I do not think we need these

lectures from the representative of Iraq. It is about time we removed this pointless exercise from the floor.

98. Mr. AL-ZAHAWIE (Iraq): My delegation is equally surprised that the representative of the Zionist entity should speak about international law and lecture members of the Assembly on commitment to treaties they have signed. Israel's whole behaviour is but a catalogue of violations of the Geneva Conventions, the Charter of the United Nations and various other undertakings which his Government has stated it was committed to. He should be the last person to lecture us here on these matters.

99. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): I am sorry that in a lapse of memory I neglected to mention Iraq's contribution to international law in its rather diligent promotion of international terrorism, its promotion of the Abu Nidal group and the Wadia Haddad group, which have set aflame the capitals of many States represented here today in clear contravention of international law. We could go on and on with this, but I think the question before us is an exercise by the Iraqi régime, which is really pointless and should not take up the time—the valuable time—of the Assembly.

*The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.*

---

NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 1.

<sup>2</sup>United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 729, No. 10485.

<sup>3</sup>A/38/337, annex.