

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records



56th
PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 9 November 1984,
at 10.45 a.m.

NEW YORK

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

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 (continued)

1. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The issue before the General Assembly is not confined to the immediate consequences of the bombing of the nuclear installations outside Baghdad on 7 June 1981. The long-term consequences affect the ability of third world countries to achieve their development objectives in the area of technology through the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The third world countries have an inalienable right to move into the nuclear era in order to enjoy the benefits of the atom as a source of energy and a subject of scientific research as well as for other peaceful purposes.

2. As indicated by the title of this agenda item, the context in which consideration of this matter is taking place affects all developing countries and establishes the responsibility of all States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.¹ This Treaty is based on the principle of the transfer of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes, and commits non-nuclear States not to acquire nuclear weapons.

3. Undoubtedly, the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations has aroused real fear among most of the developing countries, because of the possibility of aggression against their nuclear installations. Those developing countries defined their positions in the light of Israel's actions, and in the light of the threats of the Governments of Tel Aviv and Pretoria against Arab and African States, were they to put into effect nuclear projects for peaceful purposes.

4. That situation has shaken the confidence placed in the system which prohibits the proliferation of nuclear weapons, all the more so since countries have been led to believe that the provisions established in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons offer no guarantees to the non-nuclear States in respect of a nuclear or non-nuclear military attack against them or against their installations devoted to peaceful purposes.

5. If the General Assembly wished to give effective attention to this question, it would have to take into account the following considerations. First, the Israeli threat to attack similar installations in all developing countries is a fact. Secondly, Israel has not adhered to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons because Israel arrogates unto itself the right to produce nuclear weapons in all freedom. Published information indicates that Israel has nuclear capacity in the military field; yet certain countries, headed by the United States of America, deal with Israel as if it were a State that had no nuclear military capability. Thirdly, Israel accumulates nuclear military capability while enjoying American assistance in establishing nuclear projects to supplement military projects that have already been carried out, in particular, the Dimona reactor. Fourthly, what applies to Israel to a large extent also applies to South Africa which, in collaboration with Israel, has carried out a nuclear explosion, as all the world knows. Nuclear co-operation between the racist entity in Tel Aviv and the equally racist entity in Pretoria is being extended and enlarged in all fields, especially the nuclear field. This gives South Africa and Israel the capacity to destroy peaceful nuclear installations in vast regions of the world situated between Western Asia and North Africa on the one hand, and the entire African continent on the other. Fifthly, the developing countries have the absolute inalienable right of acquiring nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. Any military or political or economic act which represents a threat to that right is a first step towards the restriction of the nuclear weapons non-proliferation system which is based on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

6. Starting from this premise, the General Assembly, like the Security Council, is in duty bound once again to establish fully and unequivocally the right of the developing countries to have access to nuclear technology and to peaceful scientific research within the framework of the IAEA system of safeguards.

7. We know that Israel and South Africa, despite the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, are intensifying their policy of force and aggression to destroy the economic, social and cultural infrastructures of the developing countries which, for their part, defend their people, their homelands, their independence, their sovereignty and their territorial integrity.

8. What has enabled Israel to increase its threat to destroy peaceful nuclear installations is a fundamental error, committed as far back as the time when the Security Council first began to consider the question of Israeli aggression against the nuclear installations of Iraq. On 19 June 1981 the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 487 (1981) which merely "condemned" Israel. The Council at that time

was unable to take the necessary measures against Israel under Chapter VII of the Charter. That imbalance, in the face of the situation which threatens all developing countries, whether they are parties or non-parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, stems from pressure on the part of the United States and the threat to use the right of veto against any resolution that would inhibit such Israeli acts of aggression. The United States has helped Israel to elude the sanctions which should have been imposed on it by the Security Council, as everyone expected. The Administration in Washington violated its own domestic legislation which prohibits the use of American arms, except in cases of legitimate defense. It also violated its own domestic legislation by permitting the use of American aircraft in acts of aggression. It is for this reason that Israel, following erroneous logic, thought that it could bomb objectives that it believed increased the economic, technological and cultural capacity of the Arab countries, a point of view based on the Israeli racist doctrine and on the need to keep the Arab nations barred from making progress, especially in the technological field. The Israeli doctrine asserts that the weakening of the Arabs strengthens Israel; that the progress of the Arabs means delays and backwardness for Israel. So long as this colonialist and racist doctrine of Israel remains, Israel, faced with international reaction against its aggression, has intensified its incursions against the economic, social and cultural institutions of the Arab world. The most recent sabotage operation was the total destruction of the economic, social, cultural and agricultural infrastructures in southern Lebanon after the Israeli invasion and after the cessation of military operations. During this aggressive and criminal war, Israel used weapons which have been prohibited globally.

9. The terrorist thinking which characterized the Zionist gangs under the old Mandate has remained the thinking of the Zionist State, which has adopted State terrorism as the official policy against the Arabs. Israeli practices inside the Arab territories occupied since 1948 provide irrefutable proof that Israeli terrorism is both a means and an end. That is why the bombing of the Iraqi reactor is but one link in the chain of State terrorism practised by Israel to achieve a fundamental objective. Israel wants to warn the Arabs against attempts to gain access to the modern technology necessary for their development, which could affect the balance in every other field. That balance, according to Israel and its allies, must always tilt in favour of the Israeli usurper.

10. It is to be regretted that Washington should have encouraged Israel to pursue its policy of State terrorism in connection with the matter under consideration, which cannot be divorced from other Israeli practices since the aim is the same—that is, to prevent the Arabs from making progress in all fields through warfare directed against the Arabs, the destruction of their installations, the occupation of their lands and the expulsion of their nationals. Suffice it to mention some of the American reactions following the bombing of the Iraqi reactor in June 1981.

11. Alexander Haig, the former Secretary of State in the Reagan Administration, in his memoirs entitled *Caveat: Realism, Reagan and Foreign Policy*,² said this by way of reaction to the Israeli bombing of the reactor:

“Yet my feelings were mixed. The suspicion that Iraq intended to produce nuclear weapons was hardly unrealistic. In that context, Begin’s action in destroying the plant where they might be made was understandable and might well be judged less severely by history than by the opinion of the day.”*

12. According to Israeli radio on 16 June 1981:

“President Reagan announced in Washington that Israel was justified in its worry about the Iraqi nuclear reactor that its planes destroyed. He said that Israel must have honestly believed that its attack on the Iraqi reactor was a defensive action. In his statement made at his first press conference after the attempt on his life in March, the President added that one must confess that Israel has the right to worry, in view of Iraq’s record.”*

13. According to Israeli radio on 17 June 1981:

“Arthur Goldberg, previous United States envoy to the United Nations and once a Justice of the United States Supreme Court, declared that according to international law Israel had full right to strike the Iraqi nuclear reactor.”*

14. Such statements show clearly the extent to which the United States seeks to justify Israeli actions, actions which as a sop to international public opinion it condemns in the Security Council but which it blesses outside the Council, since they are compatible with its interests and those of world Zionism.

15. Israel has respected neither Security Council resolution 487 (1981) nor the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. Those resolutions state that Israel should place all its nuclear facilities, without exception, under IAEA safeguards and control. But Israel has no intention of doing so because it is determined not to recognize that the Dimona reactor could produce nuclear weapons. Referring to the Israeli letter distributed as document A/39/349, in which Israel rejected paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 38/9 on this same agenda item, a paragraph in which the Assembly demanded “that Israel withdraw forthwith its threat to attack and destroy nuclear facilities in Iraq and in other countries”, Israel has merely said that it has no intention of attacking nuclear facilities dedicated to peaceful purposes in any part of the world. The use of the word “intention” or the word “policy” does not satisfy anyone, because those words have nothing to do with the demand that it “withdraw forthwith its threat”. Israel’s reply shows that it arrogates to itself the right to assess the nature of reactors that might be bombed. I would add that so far Israel has refused to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and this shows that its policy and intentions are to continue to develop its nuclear arsenal by all possible means, which accounts for the theft of nuclear fuel from certain European and American sources, for eventual use in the Israeli reactor.

16. In conclusion, for as long as Israel does not accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and place its nuclear facilities, whatever and wherever they may be, under IAEA safeguards, the Israeli threat will remain and have very serious consequences for the people of the world, especially in the region of the Middle East, and therefore threaten international peace and security. For this reason we feel that the

*Quoted in English by the speaker.

General Assembly has an obligation to draw the attention of the Security Council again to the need to take appropriate measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations to prevent Israel from resuming its attacks on nuclear installations in any part of the world. Moreover, the Security Council is duty-bound to take practical and institutional measures to put an end to the nuclear capability of Israel and South Africa by applying strict international controls to prevent those two régimes from committing genocide against Arabs and Africans. We are convinced that so long as measures and binding sanctions are not taken against Israel and South Africa in the nuclear field the world will suffer from the nuclear blackmail of those two régimes, which are allied to imperialism. The strategic alliance between the United States and Israel is such that the American military arsenal is placed at the service of Israel's ambitions and its policy of expansion and aggression. There is no doubt that that alliance, which expands constantly to cover every field, strengthens the wave of American and Israeli domination over the Middle East, one of the most important regions of the world from the strategic, geographic and economic points of view. This creates a situation which threatens international peace and security in a manner unprecedented in modern history.

17. That is why the United Nations, in the common interest of all the members of the international community, should, today and without further delay, face up to this situation and give proof of its sense of responsibility. It must assess the consequences of actions which could have disastrous effects on the interests of the whole world and on international peace and security.

18. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The General Assembly has once again been forced to return to the question of armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations devoted to peaceful purposes and its serious consequences for international peace and security.

19. The piratical Israeli raid was one of the manifestations of a policy of State terrorism carried out by Israel against neighbouring Arab States. It struck a new blow to the cause of peace in the Middle East region and has had serious consequences for international peace and security. But the problem does not end there.

20. Tel Aviv has once again demonstrated that it is challenging the right of States to make use of the benefits of nuclear energy for the purpose of economic and social development. Israel has also tried to undermine one of the most important international agreements in the field of the limitation of the nuclear threat, namely, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to which Iraq became a party from the moment that it entered into force.

21. The Soviet Union, like many other countries, firmly condemned the criminal acts of Israel against the nuclear reactor at Tamuz. Such was also the reaction of the international community. For several years now, resolutions have been adopted by the General Assembly and the Board of Governors and the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency aimed at putting an end to the Israeli threat to carry out a new attack on nuclear installations in Iraq and in other countries.

22. However, it is clear that there is still a long way to go before United Nations and IAEA resolutions on this subject are implemented. Israel has not yet given satisfactory assurances that it will renounce its threat to destroy nuclear installations in Iraq and other countries. This fits quite logically into the general policy of Israeli aggression directed at neighbouring Arab States and aimed at a constant build-up of tensions in the Middle East region. For many years now Israel has been carrying out an expansionist policy directed against Arab States and peoples, continuing illegally to occupy the Arab lands which it seized in 1967 and stubbornly resisting the restoration of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. Still fresh in our memories are the barbaric acts of Tel Aviv in Lebanon, where an attempt was made to impose by force an agreement with Israel that would in fact have been capitulation.

23. It should be stressed here that Israel has been able to trample under foot the sovereignty and independence of a number of Arab countries and to bomb the Iraqi nuclear installations for one reason alone—that is, the comprehensive support of Israel by the United States, which shares responsibility for the crimes systematically committed by Israel.

24. The expansionist policy of Tel Aviv becomes particularly dangerous in the light of its well-known nuclear ambitions. Those nuclear ambitions have been repeatedly condemned by the international community, which has demanded and continues to demand that Israel accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and that it put all its nuclear installations under the safeguards of the IAEA.

25. Israel's refusal to heed these appeals eloquently testifies to the fact that its real objective is the acquisition of nuclear weapons in order to establish its own domination in the region of the Middle East. In this connection our attention is drawn to the report by the Carnegie Endowment and the Congressional Research Service of the United States Congress, which was published only a week ago. According to that report, Israel already has 20 nuclear bombs. On the other hand, according to an assessment published this year by the Center for Strategic and International Studies of Georgetown University, in Washington, by the year 2000 Israel could have accumulated some 60 nuclear bombs. These appraisals give us serious food for thought. It is difficult even to imagine what consequences might result from these adventurist plans if they are not brought to an end.

26. The Soviet Union believes that the most decisive measures possible should be undertaken to curb Israeli nuclear ambitions. The United Nations must achieve the implementation of its decisions aimed at limiting the chances of Israel conducting a policy of aggression and blackmail directed at the Arab countries.

27. Mr. AL-BOAININ (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The criminal Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installation is not a passing event which comes to an end when the event is over, as if nothing had happened. For the international community it is a very serious event, given its implications and dangers. We must dwell on it, and discussions are renewed year after year and will have to be until Israel is punished for its criminal aggression and is prevented from repeating such acts of aggression and

from continuing to defy the international community by threatening to repeat such actions against Iraq or any other State which, according to it, should dare build nuclear installations for its peaceful needs.

28. The Iraqi nuclear reactor was not a military target, and there was no effective state of war between Iraq and Israel, yet Israel disregarded this, and, on the basis of a fallacious pretext, namely, that there was a state of declared war between Israel and Iraq, carried out its destructive air raid against the Iraqi nuclear reactor as if it were a military target. This is not the first time nor will it be the last for Israel to arrogate to itself the right to claim certain justifications and invent excuses. Israel arrogated to itself the right to qualify the nuclear reactor as being destined for the manufacture of nuclear bombs, contrary to what has been stated by international agencies such as the IAEA, whose experts inspected the Iraqi nuclear reactor and drew up a document of information on the subject, entitled "Guarantees and the Iraqi Nuclear Centre". In that document the IAEA states categorically that it found no violation of the safeguards agreements.

29. We face a terrible situation. Iraq builds nuclear installations for the peaceful uses of atomic energy towards its own development, becomes a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and places its nuclear installations under international safeguards in order to establish the necessary guarantees. In exchange, Israel builds a nuclear reactor, is not a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and refuses to place its nuclear installations under international safeguards. There is definite evidence that Israel possesses nuclear weapons; there is no proof that Iraq possesses or intends to acquire or to manufacture nuclear weapons. Yet it is Israel that launches an attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations and threatens to repeat such an attack in the future.

30. Thus, we are faced with an irregular situation created by an irregular State, Israel, which continues to bring proof of its irregular character and the disrespect in which it holds all norms of behaviour by its acts of aggression and flagrant threats.

31. My country is on the side of those who unanimously condemn Israel's barbarous act against the Iraqi installations, as an international precedent the very serious consequences of which cannot be foreseen. Six experts from many countries, including the Soviet Union, the United States of America and India, entrusted with a special mission by the Secretary-General, drew up a study of the Israeli act of aggression and its consequences. In that study³ they stated that the installations that were bombed were part of Iraq's efforts to achieve economic, scientific and technological development. That raid led to loss of life and considerable material damage and entailed the suspension of scientific programmes in Iraq in the field of nuclear energy for at least five years. The study adds that "the Israeli attack was dysfunctional to the disarmament aims of the United Nations and the world community".

32. My delegation supports all that is contained in that study, although we wish to add that the results of the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installation go far beyond what it contains. It is extremely difficult to foresee the serious consequences of such an attack. Suffice it to mention some of those possible consequences and the great danger they

entail. First, it is a violation of the inalienable right of every people to follow the path of economic and technological progress. It is a violation of the spirit and letter of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States [*resolution 3281 (XXIX)*]. Secondly, it runs counter to the objectives of the consolidation of co-operation among States, especially in the scientific and economic fields. Thirdly, it adds a new factor to the many other factors of destabilization in the Middle East and hampers efforts to find a peaceful and equitable solution to the Middle East question. Fourthly, it endangers the role and activities of the IAEA and other international organizations which are engaged in the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and seek to ensure safeguards against the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Fifthly, it could encourage other countries than Israel to follow the same example in respect of the peaceful nuclear activities of other States. Sixthly, that act of aggression affects the disarmament cause, which is based on the principle of the non-use of force.

33. Moreover, as stated in that study, the destruction of the nuclear reactor could have radioactive consequences to which the people not only of Iraq but of the entire region could be exposed.

34. The threat to repeat such aggression is a clear and flagrant warning to Arab and non-Arab countries seeking to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes in the context of development and that threat could be directed against other countries if they dare to encroach on what Israel regards as its vital field.

35. Those are some of the serious consequences and implications of the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and the threat to repeat such aggression. The question arises: what was the international community's reaction to this aggression?

36. This aggression was a flagrant act of defiance of the international community. The international community faced up to it by adopting, in the Security Council, the General Assembly and the specialized agencies, clear-cut resolutions. All the countries of the world, without exception, also reacted to this aggression, including those that continue to maintain friendly as well as normal diplomatic relations with Israel. It was perfectly natural for all countries to condemn this aggression and warn the world, in view of its grave consequences.

37. That was the reaction we had the right to expect from the international organizations and the world. But what was Israel's attitude? Israel not only flouted the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, as well as the condemnations by all States, but also defied them by threatening to repeat its aggression. Is that not international terrorism, beside which individual or collective terrorism pales? My delegation condemns terrorism in all its forms and at all levels, but especially terrorism carried out by a State that has unjustly become a member of the international community. If countries adopt measures against terrorism by individuals and groups, then the international community must adopt measures against the terrorism by Israel.

38. My delegation urges the General Assembly and the Security Council to face up to the terrorism practised by Israel, in the form of its aggression and threats of further aggression, by adopting more effective measures under the Charter in order to put an end to this unprecedented international terrorism

and to make sure that Israel stops forthwith its acts of aggression or its threat to commit aggression.

39. My delegation is convinced that the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions can be effective only if all States respect them and implement them. Since there is not a single State that approves the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations, all States and especially those providing assistance to Israel have the duty to compel Israel to respect the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

40. Mr. SHIHABI (Saudi Arabia) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your unanimous election to the presidency of the General Assembly. That was an expression of the Assembly's appreciation for you personally as well as for your friendly country, and for Africa, the great continent that has struggled and continues to struggle against all forms of injustice and all types of aggression. In the weeks since your election, we have witnessed you leading the proceedings of the General Assembly with great ability, wisdom and efficiency, and that deserves our gratitude and appreciation.

41. I have referred to forms of injustice and types of aggression, and the Zionist aggression of 1981 upon the Iraqi nuclear reactor strikes us as being one of the most provocative, because it summarizes, in one criminal act, the intentions, methods and objectives of the Israeli design in the area. It further reflects the danger of destruction that Israeli concepts pose to the international community as a means of interaction, and, moreover, constitutes a factor disruptive of the foundations of the family of nations.

42. Israel attacked the Iraqi nuclear reactor in the heartland of Iraq, which has subjected its nuclear programme to the provisions of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons since 1970. Meanwhile, Israel continues to refuse to subject its secretive nuclear production to verification and inspection—for obvious reasons. Also, Zionist agents assassinated an eminent physicist who had participated in Iraq's peaceful nuclear research, and they did this while he was out of his country. Israel has declared that it will attack every Arab nuclear facility, irrespective of the purpose of that facility. What an ugly picture these designs of the Zionist establishment present. At the same time, it claims that it wants to live in peace and security in the midst of the Arab world, whose security and peace and means of human and material progress and development are simultaneously being attacked by Israel.

43. Security Council resolution 487 (1981) strongly condemned this aggression and assigned the full responsibility for it to Israel. Concomitant General Assembly resolutions of 1981, 1982 and 1983 confirmed this same position. General Assembly resolution 37/189 B, in particular, stressed the importance of compliance by all States with the purposes and principles of the Declaration on the Use of Scientific and Technological Progress in the Interests of Peace and for the Benefit of Mankind, in order to promote human rights and fundamental freedoms. It noted that "scientific and technological progress is one of the important factors in the development of human society". In spite of all this, the Zionist authorities have never stated a position contrary to the one proclaimed by Israeli officials—namely, that they will attack Arab nuclear activities anywhere and everywhere.

44. This aggression threatens science and technology in the whole Arab world, in whose heartland Israel has usurped a place and where it is surrounded on all sides by a population which outnumbers it by a ratio of 40 to 1. This is an affront to and violates all the principles of modern civilization, the concepts of science and respect for the rules of international co-operation. It is a rejection of all norms: an act of aggression against a sovereign State in the heart of its own territory where its scientists were attacked and the means of progress and science of the Arab world represented by 22 States in this Hall were destroyed. This Arab world, which in the past has transmitted knowledge and technology to the West, is now threatened by the Israeli machine which attempts to hold back its technical and scientific progress. That is the height of aggression. If the United Nations was not established to prevent such attacks, then what is its *raison d'être*?

45. The Iraqi nuclear reactor was the minor victim. The innocent people who were killed in the attack, and the scientists whose lives were abruptly ended in order to kill their knowledge, were the human victims. But Israel, which is trying to bar the Arabs access to science, killing their scientists and preventing them from achieving a scientific and technological level commensurate with the rest of the world, is at the root of the issue. The Israeli reasoning in justification of the attack is the most dangerous factor of all. By that reasoning, Israel proves itself to be a danger to the Arab nations, a threat to the region, to the developing world, and indeed, to all norms of behaviour within the international community, not only from the point of view of day-to-day security and regional and international stability, but also from the standpoint of the dissemination of science, the accumulation of knowledge and the crossing of the threshold to development, which constitutes the most important stage in the destiny of any nation.

46. In spite of all this, Israeli authorities still receive assistance and enjoy technical and material support to continue such aggression. Moreover, Israel and South Africa, two entities that rival each other in the crime of racism, the violation of laws and the perpetration of attacks upon the lives of peoples, offer mutual support in this field. But whereas South Africa remains outside this Hall, Israel, regrettably, is still sitting amongst us, thinking that its seat here justifies its crimes.

47. The responsibility for this dangerous and threatening situation is shared with the Israeli authorities by all those who did not respond to General Assembly resolution 36/27 of 13 November 1981, in which the General Assembly called upon all Member States "to cease forthwith any provision to Israel of arms and related material of all types which enable it to commit acts of aggression against other States". This prohibition was reiterated in similar resolutions adopted in 1983, but Israel still persists in following the path of aggression and continues to receive assistance, while it still challenges the international community and all that the Organization stands for.

Mr. Sallam (Yemen), Vice-President, took the Chair.

48. This aggression is flagrantly directed towards the Arab world as its principal target and against the developing world in its efforts to achieve growth, progress and advancement. Indeed, it is directed

against the entire international community, as represented by the General Assembly, the IAEA and UNESCO. Can there be an uglier aggression than this, directed against a modest effort on the long journey towards science, knowledge and progress? Does there exist a stronger challenge than this for all members of this Assembly and for all that they represent for the family of nations?

49. Are we going to take a stand in compliance with our commitments to halt this challenge? Is the international community going to teach Israel a lesson for an action that, if allowed to go unchecked for a long period of time without deterrence, will set a precedent that threatens the security of the third world, in particular, and consequently will endanger the security of every State in the world whose scientific and technological achievements might not suit some other State in no matter what corner of the globe? This concept is a grave danger that threatens all States, meek and mighty. It is a theme that was used as a justification for fascism, that was nourished by racism and sustained by terrorism. I do hope that while we recognize the aims and objectives of this dangerous course, we shall face up to the challenge that it represents.

50. Mr. AL-SABBAGH (Bahrain) (*interpretation from Arabic*): For the fourth consecutive year, the General Assembly is studying the question of the Israeli military aggression on Iraqi nuclear installations and its serious consequences. The annual repetition of this discussion in no way diminishes the seriousness of the subject, and until the question has been settled, the item will be likely to appear again on the agenda of the General Assembly. The IAEA, the organization which is competent and empowered to discuss the matter and which, indeed, has done so, has nevertheless not yet found a solution to the serious political and economic aspects of this problem.

51. I do not think that any Member of the United Nations wants to see this question become a permanent item on the agenda of the General Assembly. This was confirmed by the representative of Iraq during consideration of the question last year.

52. That Israeli acts of aggression are a flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, of international law and of the norms of international conduct is perfectly obvious to everyone. This has had most serious consequences for international relations and specifically for the special relations in connection with nuclear matters and the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

53. Thus, legal measures should be taken to prevent a repetition of the military aggression against nuclear installations, especially since the Group of Experts on the Consequences of the Israeli Armed Attack against the Iraqi Nuclear Installations, in their report,³ stressed the need to ensure the safe development of nuclear power for peaceful purposes. Therefore, we believe that it is necessary to set up an effective world system of safeguards concerning the use of nuclear technology. It is also necessary to take strict and effective measures to prevent a repetition of such acts of aggression.

54. Needless to say, the Israeli raid, which took place on 19 June of 1981 and completely destroyed the Iraqi nuclear reactor, which was designed for peaceful purposes, was premeditated. It was planned

in flagrant disregard of United Nations resolutions and world public opinion.

55. As we all are well aware, that act of aggression destroyed the Iraqi nuclear reactor and impeded technical and industrial progress to which Iraq aspires for its further social development and the improvement of the well-being of the Iraqi people.

56. This was a military adventure, an act of organized terrorism, to which Israel has accustomed us since its creation. It is part of a long series of acts ceaselessly perpetrated against many Arab countries. Such acts tarnish Israel's history and add to the long list of acts of aggression by that country. It is a fact that the Israeli nuclear arsenal now threatens that entire part of the world. Suffice it to say that Israel has decided to attack and destroy all nuclear installations, even those for peaceful purposes, which might pose any danger to Israel. The declared policy of Israel is based on destructive, preventive attacks.

57. It is our task in this international forum to see to it that the law replaces the use of force in relations between States and that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States are respected. This would keep our region free from all outside interference and conflict.

58. While Israel proclaims its desire to maintain peace and security in the Middle East, it does not hesitate to persecute the Palestinian people and deprive them of their legitimate, inalienable rights.

59. Given the aggressive behaviour of Israel, the General Assembly must shoulder its collective responsibility. Those States which give technical, economic and military assistance to Israel must cease to do so, because Israel continues to reaffirm its aggressive, expansionist tendencies, to the detriment of neighbouring countries.

60. In considering this agenda item we should demonstrate greater interest in achieving positive, constructive measures, for there is real danger of a repetition of this act of aggression. Israel has not withdrawn its threat. It is the responsibility of the General Assembly to demand that Israel undertake not to repeat its aggression. It is not enough for Israeli officials to state that they will not adopt a policy of attacking nuclear installations for peaceful purposes in neighbouring countries.

61. The Security Council, in resolution 487 (1981), demanded that Israel take certain measures but, of course, Israel did not comply with the Security Council's demand. The United Nations must ensure compliance with that resolution and take all necessary measures.

62. Israel must accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and place its activities under the IAEA safeguards system. Israel must respect the numerous resolutions adopted by the Assembly.

63. Mrs. DIAMATARIS (Cyprus): For the fourth year the General Assembly is devoting its attention to the Israeli attack against the Iraqi Osirak nuclear installations, which remains one of the most unprovoked military acts in recent years. Fortunately, time does not bring oblivion in such cases.

64. Last year, the General Assembly adopted resolution 38/9, in which it denounced the Israeli attack in the strongest possible terms and condemned Israel's threat to repeat such an attack as endangering international peace and security. The whole world

denounced the bombing and the destruction of the Iraqi nuclear installations, which were devoted to peaceful purposes.

65. The Government and the people of Cyprus expressed their indignation immediately after the attack by Israel, which added an extra burden to an already aggravated political situation and opened wider the chasm between the two sides of the as yet unresolved Middle East problem.

66. Cyprus, having been itself a victim of foreign invasion and occupation, considers it its moral responsibility—indeed its duty—to come to the support of Iraq and to reiterate its condemnation of this Israeli aggression.

67. Iraq intended to use its nuclear installations for peaceful purposes. Those installations were devoted to the prosperity of the people of Iraq. Moreover, Iraq is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its nuclear facilities were under the IAEA safeguards system at the time when that unacceptable attack occurred.

68. This act of Israel can be justified neither on moral grounds nor on technical grounds. It is a flagrant violation of the letter and the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, the most relevant paragraph of which states:

“All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.”

69. It is obvious, then, that Israel acted in disregard of the Charter and of every principle of international law and international relations; it acted in a lawless fashion, with grave consequences for international peace and the future of mankind.

70. No one can deny the inalienable sovereign right of any State to proceed with peaceful nuclear programmes that aim at the development of its economy, as long as they are in conformity with internationally adopted steps designed to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

71. Cyprus believes that the United Nations must reiterate its condemnation of Israel's aggression and its refusal to implement repeated General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

72. We wish to draw the attention of this Assembly to the dangerous precedent set by Israel's unprovoked attack against the nuclear installations of Iraq, and deplore Israel's non-compliance with United Nations resolutions. On this point, my Government believes that it is high time for steps to be taken to strengthen the United Nations, so that acts of aggression such as the one perpetrated against the people of Iraq may not be repeated.

73. Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The General Assembly is once again considering this item because its previous resolutions have not been implemented. Three factors must be considered during the debate on this question. The first is the Israeli aggression of 1981 against the Iraqi nuclear installations designed for peaceful purposes. The second is Israel's refusal to undertake not to repeat such aggression. The third is the grave consequences of that aggression for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation

of nuclear weapons and international peace and security.

74. The first factor, the aggression perpetrated in 1981, represents a violation of the Charter of the United Nations, international norms and the rules of international law. The members of the Security Council categorically rejected Israel's attempt to justify its aggression by saying it had resorted to the right of self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter. The General Assembly also rejected that pretext in its successive resolutions on the subject. International law and legislation, confirmed by the international Organization and its main organs, establishes two fundamental conditions for the exercise of that right. The first is urgent need and the second is proportionality in the use of force in existing situations.

75. Those two criteria are not met by the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations. The urgent need criterion demands that the danger be real and imminent, leaving no choice or no time to think of possible alternatives. No one with a minimum of reason or logic could claim that international bodies have not proved that the Iraqi nuclear reactor was designed for peaceful purposes. The second criterion must be discarded, since that aggression constituted a violation of the sovereignty of three States, whose airspace was violated, and because of the extent of the destruction and losses caused by the aggression. In any case, international law does not permit a State to be the sole judge of whether it may have recourse to such a right; only the Security Council and the United Nations in general can justify recourse to such a right or deny it.

76. In view of those three elements, together or individually, the three cases set out in Chapter VII of the Charter apply to the act of aggression committed by Israel: namely, threat to the peace, breach of the peace and act of aggression. That being the case, the Security Council has the right to apply sanctions against Israel under that Chapter. We all know why those sanctions were not applied.

77. With regard to the second aspect of the debate—namely, Israel's refusal to undertake not to repeat such acts—we all remember the declarations of Menachem Begin, former Prime Minister of Israel, who repeatedly declared that Israel would destroy any new reactor installed by Iraq on its territory. He went even further, as did other Israeli leaders, by threatening to destroy any nuclear installation established by any Arab State on its territory. The intention to repeat that act of aggression was evident from the letter addressed on 12 July 1984 by the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General [A/39/349]. That letter contains no explicit or implicit commitment not to repeat such an act of aggression.

78. That is also obvious from the declaration of Israel's Minister for Scientific Research in August 1983, published in the American magazine *Nucleonics Week* in its issue No. 35 of 25 August 1983, which speaks of Israel's determination to attack any Arab nuclear installation that Israel, without reference to the IAEA safeguards system or international law, regards as being designed for the production of nuclear weapons. In other words, Israel has arrogated to itself the right to judge the situation, which shows Israel's contempt for the established international system and its machinery and international legitimacy.

79. As regards the third element of the discussion of this question—the repercussions of the Israeli aggression—the IAEA reports confirmed the heavy damage caused by that act of aggression to the IAEA system of inspection of nuclear installations in the States parties to the international instrument concerned. By its action Israel called into question the IAEA system and sought to make it ineffective.

80. That act of aggression constituted a violation of the sovereign right of all States, especially developing States, to carry out nuclear programmes for peaceful purposes in order to develop their economies and use their resources for the development of their peoples.

81. In the light of the consequences of the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations, it is the major responsibility of the Organization to find ways and means to punish Israel and prevent it from repeating its aggression. My delegation is ready to contribute, with other delegations, to the achievement of that objective.

82. Mr. ALEXANDROV (Bulgaria): We are faced with a question that reflects most glaringly the insecurity of the present international situation and more particularly the danger of nuclear war, which has grown in the early 1980s. Moreover, the raid by Israel's Air Force against the Iraqi nuclear reactor in June 1981 has been entered in international annals as an unprecedented act of aggression that points directly to the principal source of tension in various regions and in the world at large, namely, the policy of acting from a position of strength, a policy of aggression and State terrorism.

83. For the last four years the international community has repeatedly condemned that unprovoked attack against particularly sensitive and important facilities of a foreign State. The competent organs of the IAEA have unequivocally demonstrated that the attempts at justification by the aggressor do not stand up to scrutiny since they had uncovered no sign whatsoever that the aforementioned installations had been producing nuclear materials for military purposes. The vast majority of Member States denounced that Israeli act of aggression as unwarranted, provocative and extremely dangerous for peace and security in that troubled region and in the entire world. Unfortunately there has been no change to this very day in the position of those responsible for that illegal and hostile act nor in the unswerving support they receive from their allies and mentors.

84. The evolution of this question has confirmed the alarming fact that Israel has continued to flout the basic provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as important decisions of the world Organization dealing with this matter, such as Security Council resolution 487 (1981) and General Assembly resolutions 38/9 and 38/64, as well as other relevant documents. Israel has refused to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and has continued to build up, in co-operation with the racist régime of South Africa, its military nuclear arsenal with the sole aim of gaining total military superiority in the region and facilitating its expansionism in that part of the world. A pinnacle of this aggressive policy is Tel Aviv's stated threat to attack and destroy nuclear facilities in Iraq and other countries.

85. A typical example in this respect is the position taken by the Government of Israel in its letter of 12 July 1984, addressed to the Secretary-General

[A/39/349]. In that letter, Israel, while paying lip service to the inviolability of peaceful nuclear installations, nevertheless implies that it has arrogated to itself the right to determine which nuclear installations are for peaceful purposes and which are not. Thus Israel has once again defied the international community by claiming a birthright of sorts to violate blatantly the sovereignty of independent States, to commit acts of armed aggression against them and to blackmail at will the world with the threat of nuclear conflict.

86. In its previous statements on the item under consideration, the Bulgarian delegation touched on the more important political, legal and moral aspects of the situation created by the aforementioned armed aggression. More particularly, we have been emphasizing the extremely negative consequences of such an attack against nuclear installations in endangering the safeguards system of the IAEA and the measures against further proliferation of nuclear weapons. At this juncture, I should like to reiterate that it is high time that Member States of the Organization, whose primary responsibility is the maintenance of world peace and security, took all possible steps to avert further adventures of this kind.

87. I would like also to stress that these Israeli actions, which in themselves have a very negative impact on international stability, cannot be viewed in isolation or apart from the overall strategy of violence and conquest pursued by Israel *vis-à-vis* the Arab countries and peoples. These actions are made possible thanks to the total military and political support that the United States has extended to Tel Aviv and its militaristic policy. It goes without saying that neither this militaristic policy nor its open encouragement could ensure the security of any State, as illustrated, in particular, by the aforementioned piratical act, which has only exacerbated tensions in the area.

88. The road to strengthening the security of the States of the Middle East region, including Israel, passes through a comprehensive, peaceful settlement of the conflict on a just and lasting basis. The Soviet proposals of 29 July 1984 [A/39/368], which in effect constitute a comprehensive, profoundly realistic and constructive programme for the solution of the Middle East problem, contain a major positive potential in this respect. These proposals are consonant in their essence with the principles set forth two years ago at Fez at the Arab Summit Conference.⁴

89. At the same time, it is perfectly clear that until a comprehensive settlement of the conflict in the Middle East is reached, resolute measures should be taken to avert excesses which endanger peace in the region and throughout the world, such as the said terrorist attack by Israel against the peaceful nuclear installations of Iraq.

90. Mr. AL-GHAFARY (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): This is the fourth year, from the thirty-sixth session to the thirty-ninth session, that this item has been placed on our agenda. It was placed also before the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency at two regular sessions, the twenty-fifth and the twenty-sixth, and was put for consideration before the Security Council in the period from 12 to 19 June 1981. The feelings of outrage and alarm that swept the international community in the wake of the brazen Israeli attack on the peaceful Iraqi nuclear reactor reached such a

level as to lead the representative of Mexico, then President of the Security Council, to declare in all sincerity when the issue was placed before the Security Council: "Few times in the life of the Council have more than 50 speakers come to consider an item. Few times have so many voices been raised to express the same things: alarm, indignation and condemnation."⁵

91. The strength of that reaction resulted from the fact that such an attack was in total disregard of humanitarian principles and international instruments which affect the existence of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. The best evidence of this is that the international community has condemned the attack unanimously in resolutions such as Security Council resolution 487 (1981), the resolution adopted by the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency on 12 June 1981 and General Assembly resolutions 36/27, 36/87, 37/18, 37/19, 37/75 and so on. All of this constitutes clear evidence, which requires no further verification, investigation or information. It proves that there is no doubt about the aggressor and that explicit condemnation of that aggressor is the indisputable duty of all members of the international community, in order to safeguard human freedom and existence and the right of each State to choose its path to self-preservation and well-being.

92. Iraq is a party to and is bound by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the partial test-ban Treaty.⁶ Iraq has always placed its nuclear activities under the IAEA safeguards system. As for Israel, we all know that it refuses to do likewise. It is not and vows it never will be bound by any such explicit and clear international treaties and instruments. This situation does not need profound analysis because Israel's internal nuclear capability and its external links with the racist régime of South Africa and the like are common knowledge. It should lead all of us to condemn the aggressive State and its attacks against the peaceful nuclear facilities in Iraq and other countries, as well as its well-known acts of aggression since 1948, when it occupied the land of Palestine.

93. We call on the international community to give special attention and effect to actions which will deter such attacks, and to participate in discussions on such matters seriously and with a sense of responsibility. We can only do this if we condemn the Israeli aggression and oblige its perpetrator to undertake here not to carry out such attacks in the future against any Member State of the international Organization and to agree to make full reparations for all losses which have resulted or could result from such acts, which are totally rejected by all countries that cherish peace and freedom.

94. Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): I have the honour to address the Assembly on the item under discussion on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community.

95. The deep concern of the Ten over the issue of the Israeli military attack on the Iraqi installations and its serious consequences has been made clear in their previous statements before the Assembly. The attitude of the Ten with regard to this attack was and remains clear. The Ten believe that it was a violation of the principles of the Charter and of the rules of international law. They have therefore strongly condemned this attack in the past and their views, as

stated at the thirty-sixth, thirty-seventh and thirty-eighth sessions of the Assembly, remain unchanged.

96. The Ten repeat once more their call upon Israel to comply fully with Security Council resolution 487 (1981) in all its aspects. In this connection they have noted the recent statements of Israeli authorities, distributed in document A/39/349, which they regard as a positive step. The Ten would stress again the vital importance for all countries of refraining from any act of violence which might result in an escalation of tensions in the Middle East.

97. The Ten would also reaffirm their conviction that all States have the right to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy under appropriate safeguards and in strict accordance with the goals of the international non-proliferation régime.

98. While realizing the seriousness of the Israeli act, the Ten are not convinced, given the evolution of the situation, that any useful purpose would be served if this issue were to become a matter of annual discussion in the General Assembly.

99. Mr. SEKULIĆ (Yugoslavia): There is no controversy as to the nature of the act perpetrated by Israel against the Iraqi nuclear installations, an issue which we are considering in the General Assembly for the fourth time.

100. There is general agreement that this was an unprovoked act of armed aggression, an act of State terrorism and a flagrant violation of sovereignty. The political assessments of this act given by the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency and numerous Governments are very clear.

101. Any attempt to justify the attack on grounds of security and the right to self-defence is completely unfounded and unacceptable. Israel had neither been attacked nor had its security been threatened. The nuclear installations near Baghdad, which were the target of the attack, were an integral part of Iraq's efforts to create conditions for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and achieve economic, scientific and technological development. This is the sovereign right of every country and is in accordance with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to which Iraq is a party.

102. Iraq's nuclear activities were being carried out in compliance with the safeguards and nuclear guarantees of the IAEA. All this was confirmed in the study elaborated by a Group of Experts from India, Nigeria, Sweden, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America and Yugoslavia, which was presented to the General Assembly last year.³

103. On the other hand, Israel is not a signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and persistently refuses to agree that its own nuclear installations be placed under international control. Moreover, the report of the Group of Experts confirms that Israel possesses enough fissionable material to produce nuclear weapons in a very short period, if it has not already done so.

104. The claim that the attack was perpetrated in self-defence is totally unacceptable. In contemporary international relations the right of self-defence is often invoked to justify actions which are not only disproportionate to the acts of the State against which they are taken but, as in the case of so-called preventive attacks, are illegal and constitute a violation of the basic norms of international law. We

believe that the element of the use of armed force is precisely the condition that has to be fulfilled *sine qua non* if a State is to invoke the right of self-defence as a circumstance that precludes the wrongfulness of its act. This is clearly stated in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, which determines the right to individual and collective self-defence only "if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations".

105. The complexity and controversy of this issue, and particularly the frequency of very dangerous attempts to disguise the use of force and intervention by the right to self-defence, make it incumbent upon the international community to deal with this matter in a more comprehensive way.

106. Israel's attack represents a serious warning and calls for the adoption of additional legal instruments and guarantees against possible similar attacks on nuclear installations used for peaceful purposes, especially since such attacks, according to the report of the Group of Experts, can have grave consequences not only for the region where the attack occurs but also for neighbouring countries, with broader implications for international peace and security.

Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) resumed the Chair.

107. Proceeding from such views, the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in 1983, categorically condemned the Israeli attack and invited the Security Council and all countries, as well as international organizations and agencies, "to take the effective necessary measures to deter Israel from threatening and the repetition of such acts of aggression which gravely endanger international peace and security".⁷ The Conference also called for the early consideration and conclusion of an international agreement to prohibit military attacks on nuclear installations.

108. Deeply committed to the principles of non-alignment and of the Charter of the United Nations, Yugoslavia has never accepted or approved the use of force, intervention, interference in internal affairs, foreign domination and occupation. Consequently my Government, immediately after the attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations, resolutely condemned the Israeli action as an act of State terrorism and the most flagrant violation of sovereignty in international relations.

109. We support the legitimate demand by Iraq that Israel should adequately compensate it for the damage resulting from the attack. We also consider it necessary that Israel give guarantees that it will not repeat the attack on nuclear installations and that it will respect the sovereign rights of States to scientific and technical development.

110. Confidence, which is the essential prerequisite for negotiations on peace and stability in the Middle East, cannot be built concurrently with the policy of force and expansion.

111. It is utterly beyond comprehension that after almost 40 years of war psychosis in that extremely explosive region, some still do not see that the solution cannot be imposed by force, that the continuation and deepening of hostilities are not and cannot be in the interest of any people, including that of Israel. It seems that some have still not been convinced by the truth of history that the freedom and independence of any nation cannot be secured by

the usurpation of and encroachment on the freedom and independence of others.

112. Peace and co-operation in the region could be established only on the basis of a comprehensive, just and lasting solution of the Middle East crisis. Such a solution must include the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to the establishment of their own State, the withdrawal of Israel from all Arab and Palestinian territories occupied since June 1967 and the establishment of guarantees of equal security for all peoples and countries of the region.

113. The international community has to oppose violation of the principle of sovereignty in international relations and every form of international terrorism. This is indispensable, as the consequences of such acts for peace and stability in the world are serious and indeed unforeseeable.

114. Mr. HAKTANIR (Turkey): The unprovoked and thus untenable Israeli attack against the Iraqi nuclear research installations of Osirak has been the subject of protracted discussions in various forums for nearly three and a half years now, owing both to the appalling nature of the attack itself and to its alarming implications as regards the development and promotion of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

115. As is well known, Turkey has condemned Israel's aggression against Iraq's nuclear-power plant devoted to peaceful uses as a flagrant violation of international law and of the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. This position remains unchanged.

116. Since we shall, later in this session, have ample opportunity to discuss the situation in the Middle East and the question of Palestine, my delegation deems it fit not to expound, at this point, Israel's policy and actions, which are responsible for the lack of peace, justice and stability in that part of the world.

117. We should none the less like to remind Israel, which all too often complains about actions directed against it, that it has created and still feeds animosities which in truth are due to nothing else and nothing less than the untold suffering it has caused and is still causing in the Middle East through its aggressive policies.

118. We are convinced that if and when that country manages to marshall its energies and be bold enough to make a genuine effort aimed at vanquishing its real rather than its fictitious enemies, such as the Iraqi nuclear installation in question, the Middle East will be a much better place for all those concerned to live in, including Israel.

119. In this context and with particular reference to the agenda item in question, the Turkish delegation would like to renew its call to Israel to comply with all the elements embodied in Security Council resolution 487 (1981) which, as a unanimously adopted document, contains sound guidance.

120. I must add that Israel's unwarranted attack was all the more shocking for it also involved Israel's direct disrespect for and challenge to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the IAEA system of safeguards, as has been underlined in the study by the Group of Experts on the consequences of the said armed attack by Israel.³

121. In this context, we must also reaffirm the right of all States to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, under appropriate international safeguards and in accordance with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

122. We believe that if all Member States adhere to the régime of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and fully observe the safeguards system, the international community would have a reasonable prospect of ensuring that nuclear energy would be used for peaceful purposes only.

123. Here it should be noted that Iraq, a party to the Treaty, had submitted details of its activities in the field of nuclear energy to the monitoring and inspection of the IAEA. Therefore, by attacking the Iraqi nuclear-power plant, Israel has seriously damaged, *inter alia*, the international safeguards system. We cannot and should not permit this action to constitute a precedent. Consequently, Israel should be strongly urged to reconsider its stand *vis-à-vis* the Treaty and accede to it, thus permitting the application of international safeguards to its nuclear activities.

124. Mr. SALLAM (Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The General Assembly adopted resolution 38/9 in which it condemned Israel for continuing to reject the implementation of Security Council resolution 487 (1981), which was adopted unanimously by the Council. Although three years have elapsed since that heinous crime was perpetrated by Israel—the destruction of the Iraqi nuclear installations—and despite the adoption by the General Assembly of successive resolutions demanding that Israel withdraw its threat to attack and destroy nuclear installations in Iraq or other countries, Israel totally ignores the views of the Organization and continues to flout its resolutions and recommendations.

125. The delegation of Yemen listened to the representative of Israel yesterday restating the main points of his Government's position on this issue. In my Government's view, however, his response on this item is totally unacceptable. He tried to disregard the specific demand of the General Assembly that Israel withdraw forthwith its threat to attack and destroy nuclear facilities in Iraq in particular and in other countries in general. The first of the main points of the Israeli Government's position was this: "Israel has no policy of attacking nuclear facilities and no intention of attacking nuclear facilities dedicated to peaceful purposes anywhere" [*see 55th meeting, para. 25*]. To us this paragraph means that perhaps right now Israel has no policy or intention of attacking nuclear installations dedicated to peaceful purposes anywhere, but Israel does have a policy and the intention of attacking nuclear installations dedicated to non-peaceful purposes anywhere, and without distinction. Does Israel agree that its policy and intention should apply when its security is threatened? For what we are talking about here is, as we know, a State that has nuclear reactors for non-peaceful purposes.

126. Thus, Israel's threat is that it has a policy and the intention of attacking nuclear installations throughout the world. It is clear that such statements can come only from an arrogant and insolent Government and an equally arrogant and insolent people, which claim that they are the "chosen people".

127. By a note dated 15 March 1984, the Secretary-General requested quite specifically that Israel in-

form him of the action which Israel has taken or envisaged taking in regard to paragraph 4 of resolution 38/9, in which the General Assembly "reiterates its demand that Israel withdraw forthwith its threat to attack and destroy nuclear facilities in Iraq and in other countries". In his reply to the Secretary-General's note, the Israeli representative made no mention of Iraq; in his statement yesterday to the General Assembly he made no mention of Iraq.

128. The delegation of Yemen cannot accept such a reply and such distorted logic. The delegation of Yemen repeats its condemnation of Israel, which refuses to implement Security Council resolution 487 (1981) as well as the relevant General Assembly resolutions.

129. The delegation of Yemen will insist that this item be included on the agenda of each session of the General Assembly until Israel withdraws its stated threat to attack nuclear installations in Iraq or other countries.

130. Mr. S. M. KHAN (Pakistan): The Israeli air attack on the Tuwaitha Nuclear Research Centre in Iraq on 7 June 1981 was a naked act of aggression which resulted in the destruction of the Tamuz-I reactor and damage to other facilities at the Centre. As a direct result of this unprovoked and totally indefensible act, Iraq sustained a financial loss of several hundreds of millions of dollars. Further, the Israeli attack set back the peaceful nuclear programme of Iraq, a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, by at least five years.

131. The serious consequences of this attack were not, however, limited to the direct losses sustained by Iraq. By attacking the nuclear facilities, under IAEA safeguards, of a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Israel posed a serious challenge to the international nuclear non-proliferation régime, which, on the one hand, aims at preventing nuclear proliferation and, on the other, recognizes the right of non-nuclear-weapon States to acquire and develop nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. Israel's action was tantamount to the denial of this right. Further, it called into question the belief that the adherence by a State to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its acceptance of full-scope safeguards on its nuclear facilities should be considered sufficient to prevent it from developing nuclear weapons. The Israeli attack was therefore a serious threat both to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to the IAEA safeguards régime.

132. But, above all, the attack on Iraq's nuclear facilities was a wanton act of aggression which violated Iraq's sovereignty and territorial integrity in total disregard of the Charter of the United Nations and recognized norms of inter-State behaviour. It therefore constituted a serious breach of international peace and security, and called for an appropriate response from the international community to redress the situation and to contain its serious consequences.

133. Pakistan was amongst those countries which promptly condemned this unprovoked and premeditated Israeli attack on Iraq's nuclear facilities. We assured Iraq, at the highest level, of our total solidarity in the face of this blatant aggression.

134. The Security Council's response to the serious situation created by the Israeli air attack was to adopt

unanimously in June 1981 resolution 487 (1981), which condemned the Israeli attack, called upon Israel to refrain in the future from any such acts or threats thereof and recognized Iraq's right to appropriate redress for the destruction it had suffered. The General Assembly has also adopted a number of resolutions since 1981 condemning Israel for its premeditated and unprecedented act of aggression and reiterating its demand that Israel withdraw forthwith its threat to attack and destroy nuclear facilities in Iraq and in other countries.

135. In September 1981 the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency adopted resolution GC(XXV)/RES/381 which suspended immediately the provision of any assistance to Israel under the Agency's technical assistance programme. The resolution stated that the Israeli action constituted an attack against the Agency and its safeguards régime and called upon the States members of the Agency to end all transfers to Israel of fissionable material and technology, which could be used for nuclear arms.

136. Unfortunately, the world-wide condemnation and the resolutions of the Security Council, the General Assembly and the IAEA have not produced the desired results. Israel has not given categorical and unambiguous assurances of not staging attacks on the nuclear facilities of Iraq and other countries. It has refused to pay reparations to Iraq for the material damage and loss of life as a result of the attack despite provisions to that effect in Security Council resolution 487 (1981) and General Assembly resolution 36/27.

137. It is necessary, therefore, that the international community should keep the issue under its consideration with the objective of preventing the recurrence of similar blatant acts of aggression in the future with the serious consequences of the Israeli air attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations.

138. Pakistan has consistently extended its support to proposals aimed at achieving these objectives. In the Conference on Disarmament, Pakistan has worked in close co-operation with other delegations with a view to negotiating an effective prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities. Fortunately, there is a growing realization by the international community of the harmful effects of radiation from attacks against nuclear facilities. During the current year several new and interesting ideas in regard to the prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities have been put forward in the Conference on Disarmament. We therefore remain optimistic that, given the political will, it should be possible to reach an agreement on the subject in the not-too-distant future.

139. We also fully share the belief that the international community must maintain pressure on Israel so that it renounces categorically and unambiguously its threats to attack nuclear facilities in Iraq and in other countries and complies fully with the other provisions of Security Council resolution 487 (1981). We have, therefore, joined other delegations in sponsoring draft resolution A/39/L.13.

140. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should like to begin my statement with a strong condemnation of all military attacks against the atomic installations of third-world countries which, in spite of all their economic problems, are trying, in the face of so many difficulties, to build a bit of their own technology and to move one step

towards self-reliance and self-sufficiency, no matter how small that step. My delegation strongly condemns the military attack launched by the Zionist air force against the Iraqi atomic installations. In this context, I wish to make three important observations.

141. First, the atomic installations which were destroyed by the Zionist air force did not belong to President Saddam Hussein himself or to the ruling clique around him; they were the property of the Iraqi people, and therefore, the Islamic Republic of Iran feels duty-bound to defend them, just as it is to defend its own territory. We are, therefore, defending the right of the Iraqi people, and it has nothing to do with the present conflict, which has so sadly been imposed upon us.

142. Secondly, the representative of the Zionist occupiers of Palestine tried yesterday [*55th meeting*] to take advantage of the prevailing conflict in order to divert the attention of the international body from the real issue. Thus, he referred to the Iraqi invasion of my country, Iraqi chemical warfare, Iraqi attacks on non-belligerent vessels in the Persian Gulf, and so on and so forth.

143. According to Islam, the testimony of the criminal has no legal validity. Thus, the evidence presented by the representative of a criminal State, the Zionist base, does not have any validity whatsoever from the legal and procedural point of view, because this evidence is presented by a criminal representing a criminal entity. This testimony is given by a criminal entity which has written the shameful record of Sabra and Shatila. Such testimony has no legal validity from our point of view and therefore we do not comment in any way on the substance of his testimony.

144. Thirdly, some previous speakers have mentioned that, as they put it, Israel has no regard for international law and violated it in its attack against the Iraqi atomic installations. Most regrettably, this argument was even produced by some of the Moslem delegations, which represent Muslim countries. To these Moslem brothers I wish to say that the very existence of the so-called State of Israel is the most blatant violation of international law. How can anyone expect an illegitimate entity which has come into being for illegitimate purposes to have any regard for international law? Do members not remember that the very creation of the so-called State of Israel was, and still is, the greatest blow to all legality and morality? Do they not see that the entire nation of Palestine has become homeless, displaced, their homeland totally occupied? Do they not see that Palestine has been annihilated and turned into a base for international Zionism and global imperialism? Is it not quite simplistic and naive to expect the embodiment of lawlessness to respect international law? On what grounds would the Zionist base accept international law when it is an entity based on lawlessness at the international level?

145. I ask members to remember—and I believe they do remember—that the most dangerous thing for all of us in the region and indeed for the whole world will take place only when criminal régimes, such as the régime occupying Al-Quds, can hide behind the law, misrepresent their nature and appear to show respect for international law?

146. At that moment—the moment when burglars can pretend to be the champions of compliance with

the law and criminals the advocates of morality and humanity—the end of humanity and civilization will have become a reality. We should all be happy to see that the Zionist criminal that has occupied Al-Quds cannot just change its cloak and become a law-abiding entity. If it were otherwise the main struggle could be forgotten.

147. Please do not accuse the criminal régime occupying Al-Quds of breaking international law. What that régime does is not contrary to the principle, for the principle is that legitimate entities defend the law and lawfulness generally because law underlies their very existence: they are based on legality and lawfulness. And the same principle implies that the illegitimate must, by nature, violate the law. Hence, what the Zionist base has done in Iraq, or in Lebanon, or elsewhere, is not contrary to the principle.

148. Dear brothers, remember that the solution to our problem is a united Islamic front. Make the full restoration and revival of Palestine your main objective and do not content yourselves with United Nations resolutions, of which you already have many. Remember that we have to liberate Palestine, and not simply by resolutions. Remember that the so-called State of Israel—the Zionist entity which is responsible for all the problems in our territory, in our region—is the strongest base of imperialism, backed by United States imperialism.

149. The Middle East is the most blatant, most outstanding victim of imperialism, and the powerful hand of imperialism in the Middle East is the Zionist base. This must be remembered by all, and particularly by Moslem representatives: they must all remember that each of the two candidates in the recent presidential election in the United States competed with the other in supporting Israel, because Zionism is a very important determinant in the administrative machinery of the United States, and particularly in United States foreign policy.

150. Fight the interests of imperialism, and the problems of the occupation of Palestine will be solved automatically.

151. As for draft resolution A/39/L.13, we strongly support it. We support the substance of that draft resolution, so if it is revised or modified or altered that will not affect our position in so far as the draft resolution is in defence of the property of the Iraqi people and against the Zionist base, which is our common enemy and the enemy of mankind.

152. However, we should have been much happier had the draft resolution also condemned all military attacks against all atomic installations, wherever and whenever such attacks might occur. Notwithstanding that preference, we still fully support the draft resolution without any reservations.

153. Mr. OULD BOYE (Mauritania) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The aggression perpetrated against the Iraqi nuclear installation was a very serious act that must be firmly condemned once again by the General

Assembly, which must adopt the measures necessary to deter the aggressive Zionist entity lest that entity repeat its acts of aggression by attacking not only Iraq but also any other State in the region which ventured to build nuclear installations for peaceful purposes.

154. Having attacked Iraq's peaceful nuclear facility, Israel continues to threaten Iraq and other countries in the region. Moreover, Israel is attempting to acquire a nuclear force for military purposes in collaboration with the racist régime in Pretoria. That is why Israel refuses to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. As usual, it is refusing also to abide by the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

155. This clearly demonstrates its deliberate intention to carry out further attacks and to expand its territory. It also emphasizes the responsibility of the IAEA and all the States Members of the United Nations for the safeguarding of world security and peace. It is their responsibility also to prevent Israel from participating in nuclear research activities.

156. Iraq is a third world country which is striving to develop its capabilities in all fields; it therefore has the right to make use of nuclear energy. All States have the right to access to the benefits of scientific and technological progress.

157. Mauritania reiterates its condemnation of Israel, which launched a criminal attack against Iraq, and which violated the airspace of other Arab countries.

158. We must take a firm stand against Israel's insolent attempts to prevent the development of technology in the Middle East.

159. On what authority does Israel arrogate to itself the right to install a reactor for military purposes on its own territory while at the same time it destroys another reactor designed for peaceful purposes?

160. If progress in the nuclear sphere in occupied Palestine and South Africa is not stopped, the Middle East and Africa, indeed, the whole world, may be exposed to very serious danger.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

NOTES

¹United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 729, No. 10485.

²Alexander M. Haig Jr., *Caveat: Realism, Reagan and Foreign Policy*, New York, Macmillan, 1984.

³A/38/337, annex.

⁴See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1982*, document S/15510.

⁵*Ibid.*, *Thirty-sixth Year*, 2288th meeting, para. 109.

⁶Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, No. 6964).

⁷See A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I, para. 109.