



*President:* Mr. Imre HOLLAI (Hungary).

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. The PRESIDENT: I should like to remind representatives of the decision taken by the Assembly at the 49th meeting to close the list of speakers on this item at 5 p.m. today.
2. Mr. CONSTANTINOU (Cyprus): This item was included in the agenda of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly at the request of 43 Member States.<sup>1</sup> Guided by the strong desire resolutely to oppose the act of aggression perpetrated by Israel on 7 June 1981 against the Iraqi nuclear installations near Baghdad, Cyprus was among those 43 countries.
3. The peace-loving nations could not remain indifferent to that totally unjustified, warlike act against a country whose ambition was to develop technological and nuclear programmes for peaceful purposes, in accordance with the internationally accepted objectives of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons.
4. As is well known, the victim of that aggression has been a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] since it came into force in 1970. During last session's debate, ample evidence was produced, from the most authoritative organ, IAEA, that Iraq had accepted from the beginning the Agency's safeguards on all its nuclear activities and that those safeguards had been satisfactorily applied. It has been widely noted—and is still noted today—that while Iraq adheres to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and accepts IAEA safeguards for all its nuclear activities, Israel does neither.
5. Under the terms of General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974, the Israeli bombardment of the installations near Baghdad is an act of aggression, which gives rise to international responsibility. This premeditated attack deep in the territory of another country is therefore a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations. It was on that ground that the Security Council, in resolution 487 (1981) of 19 June 1981, unanimously condemned that blatant aggression and called upon Israel to refrain from such acts or threats. It was on the same ground that the Assembly, in resolution 36/27, strongly condemned Israel for its premeditated and unprecedented attack against the Iraqi installations.
6. The Security Council resolution called upon Israel to refrain from such acts or threats. The General Assembly reiterated its request to the Security Council to institute effective enforcement action to prevent Israel from further endangering international peace and security through its acts of aggression and continued policies of expansion, occupation and annexation. What was the outcome? The violation of the airspace of Lebanon and the attack on Beirut, followed by the dramatic events of the massive invasion and occupation of the southern part of that country, the continuous bombardment and destruction of its cities and villages, the loss of so many lives, the inhuman blockade of Beirut and, most recently, the massacres at Shatila and Sabra.
7. The Security Council and the General Assembly called upon Israel to place its facilities urgently under IAEA safeguards. To this day, we have not noticed any change; Israel continues to refuse to comply with these repeated calls.
8. The Security Council and the General Assembly considered that, in view of Israel's international responsibility for its act, Iraq was entitled to appropriate and adequate compensation for the destruction it had suffered. Unfortunately, we have not noticed so far any measures taken by Israel to bring about the appropriate redress.
9. For the aforementioned reasons, this item appears today for the second time on the agenda of the General Assembly. For the same reasons, the General Conference of IAEA, at its twenty-sixth regular session, decided by a majority vote on 24 September 1982, not to accept the credentials of Israel.<sup>2</sup> Iraq has every right and reason to appeal to this Assembly for justice and for opposition to such aggression. The time has come for the international community to put an end to these acts. The United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, must take action to implement the Organization's resolutions and to institute effective enforcement action so as to prevent Israel from further endangering international peace and security.
10. My Government has already condemned the attacks upon Iraq, the other Arab countries and the Palestinian people. There can be no justification for military intervention, which runs counter to the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. Cyprus, itself a victim of invasion and occupation, is well aware of the pretexts used and attempts made by the aggressors to justify their actions and mislead the international community. The aims and objectives behind such actions are usually policies of

expansion, occupation or annexation. It is in this context that the allegation of "self-defence" put forward by Israel must be evaluated. This is also true of the situation in my country, as eloquently revealed on 20 July 1980, in a Turkish newspaper, by Mr. Turan Günes, the Foreign Minister of Turkey, at the time of the invasion of Cyprus. He openly admitted that Turkey invaded Cyprus to further its expansionist aims and not, as Turkish officials allege, "to restore constitutional order" or "to protect the Turkish Cypriot community".

11. I repeat again my Government's firm view that the Middle East crisis can be settled only by a comprehensive, just and lasting solution and not by the threat or use of force or by aggression and domination. It will not be solved without the withdrawal of Israel from all territories it has occupied since 1967, without the solution of the Palestinian question with the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO], and without the recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to establish their own State.

12. In conclusion, I should like to express my delegation's attachment to the inalienable sovereign right of all States to establish, if they so wish, technological and nuclear programmes aimed at developing their economies for peaceful purposes, in conformity with the internationally accepted objectives of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

13. Mr. AL-QASIMI (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): This is the second time that the General Assembly has considered the present item in its two aspects. The first is the armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations, and the second 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.

14. As for the first part—the armed Israeli aggression—the whole world denounced this aggression. Both the Security Council and the General Assembly rejected Israel's attempt to justify the aggression by resorting to the right to self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter. This distortion by Israel of the letter and the spirit of the principle of the right of self-defence is not new. It violated that principle when it committed aggression against Egypt in 1956, and again in its aggression against Egypt and Syria in 1967. It resorted to fabrications and allegations. Israel's attempt to twist the facts, manufacture lies and then disseminate them has been exposed in subsequent documents.

15. The recent Israeli aggression against Lebanon provides irrefutable proof of Israel's violation and abuse of this principle. Israel alleged that the aim of its aggression was to protect the Israeli settlements in the northern part of Israel against the attacks of the Palestinian commandos. But the whole world, including Israel's friends, refused to accept this allegation and exposed its lack of validity. It was also exposed by the subsequent painful events in Lebanon.

16. International jurisprudence and law support the verdict of the Security Council and the General Assembly, which have rejected the resort by Israel to

the justification of the principle of self-defence. Israel cannot have the exclusive power to decide on its right to resort to that principle. With regard to jurisprudence, this fact was confirmed by the jurist Oppenheim in his treatise on international law, in which he said:

"It does not follow from the character of the right of self-defence—conceived as an inherent and natural right—that the State resorting to it possesses the legal faculty of remaining the ultimate judges of the justification of its action."<sup>\*3</sup>

17. With regard to law, this fact was also confirmed by a Tokyo court in 1948, in connection with law suits submitted to it on behalf of Japanese war criminals. The defence in these law suits was that the country resorting to the right of self-defence is the sole judge in the matter, that this can never be submitted to any court and that no other country can express an opinion about a State's resort to the right of self-defence. The court of justice rejected this justification on the ground that this right of self-defence did not confer upon the State resorting to war the authority to make a final determination upon the justification of its actions.

18. International law and jurisprudence lay down two main conditions for resort to this right. They are, first, the urgency of the situation and, secondly, the proportionality of the use of force as compared with the actual danger. Those two requirements were not met by Israel in its aggression against the Iraqi nuclear reactor, which is used exclusively for peaceful purposes and which cannot constitute any danger whatsoever—as has been pointed out in the reports of the experts and the statements of IAEA.

19. Concerning the first condition, the urgent need to use the right of self-defence, Mr. Webster, Secretary of State of the United States, used the following definition in the *S.S. Caroline* case: "Self-defence: instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means and no moment for deliberation".\*

20. The manner of the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear reactor showed that the second condition, proportionality in the use of force relative to the actual danger, was lacking. The violation of the territory of three sovereign States and the complete destruction of a nuclear reactor used for peaceful purposes, with the loss of priceless material and lives, cannot be described as being proportional to Israel's alleged danger.

21. All those points show that there is a stark contradiction between Israel's claim and the principles of international law on the exercise of the right to self-defence. Therefore, the Israeli aggression should be denounced and efforts should be made to prevent its repetition. But, despite the clear expression of the international will in denouncing the aggression and despite the rejection of the Israeli justifications for it, Israel has repeatedly declared through its Prime Minister, Menachem Begin, that it will destroy any nuclear reactor that Iraq builds on its territory. It has even gone so far as to say that it will destroy any nuclear installations in any Arab country.

\* Quoted in English by the speaker.

22. One measure to prevent that is to be found in General Assembly resolution 36/27, adopted at the last session, which calls upon all 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. My delegation regrets the way in which the United States has respected that recommendation; all the weapons used by Israel were made by the United States. Providing it with arms encourages it to commit fresh acts of aggression against Iraq and other Arab countries. The United States cannot absolve itself of the resulting responsibility.

23. With regard to the second part of the agenda item, that is, the grave consequences of the Israeli aggression, the reports of IAEA have documented the terrible damage caused by that aggression to the system of controls and inspection used by the Agency in the countries that have acceded to the relevant Treaty. Israel's aggression casts doubt on the system of inspection and even endeavours to nullify and eliminate it. It also constitutes a breach of the inalienable sovereign right of all States, especially the developing countries, to formulate technological and nuclear programmes for peaceful purposes, to develop their economies and improve their productive capabilities.

24. For these reasons, and in the light of Israel's non-compliance with resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly on the matter, we call for the adoption of stringent measures against Israel to punish it for its aggression and to prevent a repetition of its actions. We regard Israel's suspension from IAEA as the first step to putting an end once and for all to the law of the jungle adopted by Israel.

25. The whole world well knows that Israel has acquired the capacity to produce atomic bombs, and is aware of the international piracy to which Israel has resorted in order to do so. It also knows of the close nuclear collaboration between Israel and the racist régime in South Africa. But the world will reject Israel's false concept of international principles, systems and laws. The world does not want to revert to the law of the jungle and to the Middle Ages. It will undoubtedly hold Israel alone responsible for the consequences of its actions in resorting to the law of the jungle.

26. Mrs. SINGH (India): On 7 June 1981, the Osirak atomic reactor near Baghdad was destroyed by Israeli F-16 jet aircraft, adding yet another dark episode to Israel's long history of stark military adventurism and blatant intervention in and aggression against Arab countries. The entire world strongly condemned that act of naked, blatant and unprovoked Israeli aggression against Iraq. The universal condemnation of Israel's action reverberated not only in this Hall, but also in the Security Council, in IAEA and in virtually every forum that has examined the international situation since June 1981. 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, with an unimaginable potential for death and destruction.

27. The Government of India unequivocally condemned the Israeli action immediately after the attack, and we expressed our concern over the incident during

the debates on the subject in various international forums. We expressed our solidarity with the Government and the people of Iraq, a nation with which India has close and cordial relations. We characterized the Israeli action as a flagrant violation of all the canons of international law and of the principles governing the conduct of relations between States. We stated categorically that Israel's attempts to call its action self-defence and to ascribe aggressive motives to the victim of its aggression were aimed at turning the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations upside down. We pointed out that, if the argument of pre-emptive attack were to be accepted, the sovereignty and territorial integrity of any State could be violated on any pretext at any time, and that this would make a mockery of all the rules governing the conduct of relations between States. We viewed the Israeli action as part of its overall policy aimed at denying the rights of the people of Palestine, continuing its occupation of Arab lands and creating a situation of instability, tension and conflict in the region in order to further its own political interests.

28. Israel has argued that it chose to destroy the nuclear installation of Iraq because the latter was on the verge of producing nuclear weapons. There has been no evidence whatsoever to support this argument. Iraq has repeatedly declared that its nuclear programme had all along been devoted to the utilization of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The sovereign right of the developing countries to acquire and develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes should not be denied or thwarted through discriminatory practices or policies, and certainly not through such a criminal act of aggression as the one committed by Israel. It was therefore manifestly absurd to allege that the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes by Iraq could constitute a threat to Israel. On the other hand, the whole world knows that it is Israel that has been making systematic efforts towards the acquisition of a nuclear weapons arsenal.

29. Our review of the events following the Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear installation on 7 June 1981 should not be diverted by allegations and counter-allegations regarding the observance of obligations of countries under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and related agreements on safeguards. The gravity of the Israeli crime would not have been any less had Iraq not been a signatory to the Treaty or had the attack been directed against any other industrial plant or installation of Iraq. As the Security Council declared last year, the attack was a clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations and contrary to the norms of international conduct.

30. An armed attack on a nuclear reactor is different from an attack on any other installation only in terms of the magnitude of the death and destruction that the nuclear fall-out from a destroyed reactor would entail. The Israeli attack should therefore be condemned, first and foremost, as a violation of Iraq's territorial integrity and secondly, as an inhumane act. Our views on issues such as the Non-Proliferation Treaty and full-scope safeguards are well known, and our attitude in regard to the references to these issues as they appear in the agenda item in question and in the

resolutions adopted in various forums should be seen in the context of our position.

31. In our view, the General Assembly should censure Israel once more for its premeditated act of aggression in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and warn Israel again against committing any such act of aggression in future. We should reiterate the call made last year to all States to cease forthwith any provision to Israel of arms and related material of all types which would enable it to commit acts of aggression against other States. Israel's nuclear activities should be closely examined, with a view to ensuring that it does not build a nuclear arsenal which would threaten the entire region of western Asia. We should once again demand that Israel pay prompt and adequate compensation to Iraq for the material damage and loss of life caused by the attack. Finally, we should demand that Israel declare forthwith, and undertake a commitment, that it will not resort to such adventurist criminal actions in future.

32. Mr. ČIČANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia): It is said that time heals everything. However, Israeli aggression against nuclear installations in Iraq is an act which will not and cannot be forgotten by the international community.

33. It was a most blatant, unprovoked and unprecedented use of military force. As such, it became a warning to us all that those who use force in their international behaviour do so without any limits. The use of force and pressure is, regrettably, a characteristic of the international situation today in general, and the policy and conduct of Israel lend a particular dimension to this situation.

34. We are again considering an aggressive act by Israel which was a grave violation of the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security. We shall continue to consider the serious consequences of that act of piracy until Israel ceases to behave illegally and to carry out its "might is right" policy towards its neighbours in the region by constant aggression and intervention in all forms. This is not a debate aimed only at condemning Israel; it also constitutes a demonstration of the clear commitment of the international community to oppose such acts of State terrorism and the most flagrant violations of the principle of sovereignty in international relations.

35. The nuclear installations at Baghdad were designed to enhance the development and prosperity of the Iraqi people. Like every other country, Iraq has the sovereign right to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The right to embark speedily upon the road to development and to break the bonds of economic and technological dependence is an inalienable right of all countries. This has also been confirmed within the United Nations system in connection with the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

36. Iraq is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and has consistently adhered to its provisions, while Israel has neither acceded to that Treaty nor placed its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. Furthermore, its nuclear installations are constructed and operated without any international control. According to the report of the Group

of Experts to Prepare a Study on Israeli Nuclear Armament,<sup>4</sup> there is no doubt that Israel already has enough fissionable material to produce nuclear weapons in a short period of time, if it has not already done so.

37. Israel continues to arrogate to itself the right to be the one and only arbiter in the entire region. Its recent aggression against Lebanon, its genocidal attacks against the Palestinian people, its illegal annexation and occupation of Arab territories, causing the suffering of defenceless civilians—these are unequivocal proof of the fact that its aggressive policy continues unabated in defiance of the whole international community.

38. It was obvious that Israel had been neither attacked nor threatened by the Iraqi nuclear installations. Israeli aircraft in the skies over Baghdad were an indication of yet another act arising from the policy of force, *faits accomplis*, occupation and domination practised by Israel against its Arab neighbours.

39. The interpretation given by the Israeli Government to the effect that the raid on the Iraqi nuclear installations was carried out as an act of self-defence is unacceptable and dangerous. The Charter of the United Nations is precise and unambiguous in explaining the right of self-defence, which may be used "if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations". The Charter cannot be interpreted outside this framework and subjected to the needs and interests of the moment. The logic Israel wishes to impose upon the international community would lead us to lawlessness and anarchy. Arbitrary interpretations of the right of self-defence cannot be accepted, since that would constitute justification of the use of force and of the "might is right" policy.

40. The Security Council and the General Assembly have condemned the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations, but that action has not changed the aggressive policy of Israel. On the contrary, it has continued that policy, which prevents a comprehensive, just and lasting solution of the crisis in the Middle East through the withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories occupied in the 1967 war, the solution of the Palestinian problem, the exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable right to self-determination, including the right to their own State, and the establishment of guarantees of equal security for all countries and peoples of the region.

41. The non-aligned Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has not accepted or approved of aggression, interventions, interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States and peoples or the use of force in international relations for whatever reason and under whatever pretext; nor will it do so. The Government of Israel has shown, by the attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations and by its subsequent aggressive acts, that it believes only in the brutal use of force aimed at spreading the fires of conflict and deepening the crisis in the Middle East. Therefore, everything must be done to arrest Israel's continuous encroachment upon the sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence and freedom of countries and peoples of the region.

42. No one can ensure his own freedom and security without respect for the freedom, legitimate rights and security of others. Force will yield no lasting results, and such a policy always boomerangs against its proponents.

43. Mr. ROSE (German Democratic Republic): The German Democratic Republic is in agreement with the vast majority of States that the prevention of nuclear war and the cessation of the nuclear arms race are the most pressing concerns of mankind. Israel's attack on the Iraqi nuclear facilities on 7 June 1981 suddenly illustrated the dangers arising from attacks on peaceful nuclear facilities.

44. The Israeli adventure, which is in contravention of international law, took place in a region where the already tense situation might at any moment lead to new armed conflicts that could not be limited, in terms of either territorial extension or the means employed. That flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Iraq was followed by Israel's aggression in Lebanon with the purpose of physically wiping out the PLO.

45. The attempt by Tel Aviv to justify the attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations by invoking Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations and its right of self-defence is a manoeuvre designed to camouflage its own nuclear ambitions. These are also the reason why Israel, despite the appeals of the international community, has refused to subscribe to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. Israel continues its activities in the manufacture of nuclear weapons and in acquiring the means of delivery of such weapons. This aim is also served by its nuclear collaboration with the racist South African régime. In resolution 36/98, the General Assembly notes with deep alarm Israel's technical capability to manufacture nuclear weapons. The Israeli act of piracy against Iraq in June 1981 was directed against the entire system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and constituted a direct attack on IAEA and its safeguards régime.

46. In speaking about Israeli acts of aggression, we cannot pass over in silence the role of those circles which are behind Israel and encourage it to carry on and expand its policy of the use of force. It must be stressed very clearly that the United States is an accomplice in Israel's breach of international law, because of its comprehensive military, economic, political and diplomatic assistance. This is evident from the fact that the bombing of the Iraqi nuclear research centre was carried out with the help of the most up-to-date United States military technology. The close and comprehensive co-operation of the United States with Israel is motivated solely by its desire to create an imperialist sphere of influence in the Middle East with the help of Israel. The consequences of such disastrous so-called strategic co-operation between Washington and Tel Aviv became manifest only recently in Lebanon. They have evoked horror and shock all over the world.

47. The Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations and the subsequent escalation of further acts of aggression must prompt the United Nations at last to take effective measures against the aggressor.

Having condemned Israel's attack, the Security Council is called upon to impose appropriate sanctions against Israel and to compel it to compensate for the damage it has caused.

48. It is imperative to institute practical action so that such acts of aggression will not happen again. Any intentional destruction of peaceful nuclear facilities is equivalent to an attack involving the use of nuclear weapons. Such an act can only be qualified as a grave crime against humanity. Therefore, the effective outlawing under international law of the intentional destruction of peaceful nuclear facilities is an important and necessary complement to the commitment to renounce the first use of nuclear weapons. Concrete agreements to this effect are the order of the day.

49. Mr. AL-SABBAGH (Bahrain) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is hardly necessary to recall that the flagrant Israeli act of aggression against the Iraqi nuclear reactor in June 1981 caused great concern in the international community. That premeditated act of military aggression against a Member State of the United Nations constituted a flagrant violation of the principles and rules of international law and affected relations among States, which are governed by international custom and charters.

50. The entire international community condemned that act of aggression from the highest rostrum—that of the United Nations—and stated that it was a premeditated act, in violation of the Charter, of the United Nations, aimed at shaking confidence in the Organization as the stronghold of international peace and security. That act of aggression made it absolutely clear that the sovereignty of many States was exposed to violation for any reason or on any pretext invoked by a militarily stronger party.

51. Israel, as usual, claimed that this act of aggression was an act of self-defence against an anticipated act of aggression and that it was merely a preventive security measure. There is no doubt that this Israeli act of aggression effectively created an explosive situation in the Middle East region and exacerbated tension, conflict and instability therein. All these factors taken together serve the declared political objectives of Israel, which are based on expansion, occupation and the annexation of other people's land by force, without any fear of international deterrent measures. The invasion of Lebanon has confirmed the conviction of the majority of Member States of the Organization that Israel is determined not to withdraw from that country and to continue to establish settlements there. In fact, it has established vast settler colonies on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip. Every day the press contains information on the creation of a new settlement, the consolidation of Israeli occupation of the Arab lands and the rejection of the demand of the international community that the Israelis withdraw.

52. The Security Council unanimously condemned that act of aggression in its resolution 487 (1981) of 19 June 1981. The Director General of IAEA, in his statement to the Security Council at that time,<sup>5</sup> said that the Israeli act of aggression against the Iraqi nuclear reactor was tantamount to an attack on the Agency's safeguards system and that Iraq has accepted the Agency safeguards regarding its nuclear activities

and had been a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons since 1970.

53. The Director General of IAEA emphasized the impact of this aggression on international relations as far as nuclear matters were concerned. That impact would also affect the present and future development and security of all States. The Director General pointed out Israel's persistence in opposing any scientific and technological progress for the States of the Middle East. The attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor will hold up Iraq's programme for the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

54. Israel has acknowledged quite frankly its total responsibility for the widespread destruction caused by its attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations, which were designed for peaceful development purposes, and has not heeded the international appeals for appropriate compensation to be paid to Iraq for the great economic loss it has sustained. Israel continued to boast that, since its aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations, the Middle East has become free of nuclear weapons and the nuclear threat. Yet everybody knows that Israel possesses nuclear weapons, as confirmed by evidence given by international institutions. Israel justifies its aggression by saying it was preventive action in self-defence against a potential attack. It thus confirms its aggressive, expansionist nature, and its claim that it is entitled to strike at any peaceful nuclear target in the region as long as this serves its plans and ambitions in the area.

55. Iraq is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and has accepted IAEA safeguards on its nuclear activities, whereas Israel refuses to adhere to that agreement and continues to expand its nuclear activity. It thus endangers the efforts to bring about a just and comprehensive solution of the Middle East conflict.

56. It is high time that the international community acted effectively to put an end to Israel's acts of aggression and continued violations by applying sanctions against it under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

57. Mr. ABULHASSAN (Kuwait) (*interpretation from Arabic*): This is the second time that the General Assembly has discussed the armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations. At the last session, we had an extensive debate on that aggression, its grave repercussions on the established international system concerning the peaceful use of nuclear energy and its implications for international peace and security. The General Assembly adopted resolution 36/27 on this question. The fact that we are now debating this question for a second time is the clearest evidence of Israel's disregard of the resolutions adopted by the United Nations and other international organizations, in the aftermath of that aggression, to deal with its consequences. This fact also reflects the serious consequences of that aggression, which continue today and affect not only Iraq but the entire region as well.

58. The Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations was one link in the chain of its continuous attempts to undermine anything central to the progress of the States in the region. The Iraqi nuclear instal-

lations were established for peaceful purposes and to further the process of economic development. They were a demonstration of a resurgence of science and civilization, and Iraq was intending to train a generation of Arab technicians and specialists in this field, thus not merely participating in mankind's latest achievements in science and progress, but also putting them to use in the service of peace and development. But Israel, motivated by a racist philosophy and an expansionist policy, does not want to be surrounded by advanced States that are working so as to join together in the march forward, nor to contribute to the progress and prosperity of mankind. Israel wants to have the monopoly not only of military strength, but also of economic strength. This can be seen clearly from the repeated statements by the Israeli Prime Minister that Israel will strike again any time it feels that Iraq or any other Arab country is close to developing a nuclear capability—although Israel knows better than anyone else that the purpose of such a capability is entirely peaceful.

59. That statement, albeit a continuation of the aggressive approach for which Israel is renowned and on the basis of which it was established, constitutes a new challenge, as it ties the security, peace and prosperity of the region to the good-will of Israel. That provocative statement provides the evidence necessary to prove that the aggression was not a military action aimed at protecting Israel's so-called security, as it claims, because Israeli security was not threatened in any way.

60. Israel is itself the real threat to peace and security in the area, whether through its well-known expansionist and aggressive policies or through its possession and development of nuclear, bacteriological and chemical weapons prohibited by international laws and instruments. And Israel not only owns those weapons, but also uses them to carry out its aggressive policies. The last theatre in which these internationally prohibited weapons were used, as admitted by Israel's military authorities, was against the fraternal land and people of Lebanon and against the unarmed Palestinian people. World public opinion has denounced Israel's use of cluster bombs and excessively injurious fissionable weapons in its recent attack against Lebanon. The report of the Group of Experts to Prepare a Study on Israeli Nuclear Armament<sup>4</sup> indicates that Israel has acquired an independent nuclear capability and that it has its own sources of uranium, which we all know it might even steal from any place in the world, including the United States. Israel has a major nuclear reactor facility that is not subject to any safeguard; it also has the scientific capacity and the means to turn uranium into nuclear weapons.

61. Israeli co-operation with South Africa in the nuclear field does not need any further elaboration or confirmation. Accordingly, we think that it is the responsibility of the international community to exert pressure on Israel, through the means provided for in the Charter, to prevent that State from persisting in threatening the legitimate elementary right of all States to develop and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, according to the internationally recognized safeguards established by IAEA. The international community must compel Israel to submit all its nuclear facilities to IAEA safeguards, since that

Agency can guarantee the verification of the real purposes of nuclear facilities.

62. Kuwait believes that it is necessary to concentrate efforts on limiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons and guaranteeing the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Kuwait also believes that scientific progress is the legitimate legacy of all States, which they can all exploit to serve their people, develop their economies and progress. Nuclear energy should not be monopolized by anyone, in any way or under any pretext.

63. Although more than a year has passed since Israel's unjustified aggression, and despite the international rejection and denunciation that followed it, Israel's deliberate intention to repeat that criminal act is as imminent today as it was before. Kuwait therefore believes not only that the draft resolution now before us should be endorsed, but that Israel should be forced to implement it and comply with it so that the fundamental right of peoples and States to prosperity, peace and progress may be safeguarded.

64. Mr. TAJOL (Malaysia): The attack on Iraqi nuclear installations near Baghdad by Israeli aircraft on 7 June 1981 demonstrated beyond any shadow of doubt Israel's policy of aggression and its blatant disregard of the accepted international norms of behaviour. Israel's premeditated and unprecedented aggression against a sovereign country constituted a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and aggravated the already volatile situation in the Middle East. The Government of Malaysia strongly deplored this act of aggression and urged the international community to ensure that Israel be appropriately punished for this premeditated action, which constituted a dangerous escalation of tension and a threat to international peace and security.

65. Israel's attack on Iraqi nuclear installations should not be viewed in isolation. This act of aggression is yet another manifestation of Israel's mischievous inclination to terrorize the Arab world and to deflect world attention from the plight of the Palestinians, whose territory it has stolen and whose people it has displaced to make way for Jews brought in from the places where they had settled following the Diaspora.

66. In order to camouflage its wrongdoing, Israel came up with preposterous arguments to justify the attack. Israel alleged that Iraq was hostile to it and insisted that Iraq was on the verge of manufacturing nuclear weapons which threatened Israeli security. In other words, Israel wants us to believe that its aggressive behaviour was indeed legitimate and was committed in self-defence. Such logic, coming from Israel, though contemptible, is understandable. Iraq was not the first victim of Israeli aggression. The pre-emptive strikes on Jordan, Syria and Egypt were all committed on the pretext of self-defence and national security. Such blatant and arrogant disregard of the right of others must be corrected. Israel must learn to respect others if it desires others to respect it.

67. Iraq has been a victim of Israeli aggression. It has therefore every right to appeal to the international community to ensure that justice is done. This is an appeal that deserves international support and backing. Iraq—and for that matter any other country—

has a right to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, under appropriate international safeguards and in conformity with the principles of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. This is the inalienable right of any sovereign State. In this regard, the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy should make a further study to ensure that this right is guaranteed and respected.

68. Iraq is a signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and it is committed to the principles and objectives of the United Nations. Iraq regularly and strictly submits to the inspections agreed to under this international agreement. From the factual evidence submitted by the French authorities with regard to the characteristics, capabilities and objectives of the Osirak reactor installations, it is clear that it would have been next to impossible to transform that reactor to produce nuclear bombs. How do we reconcile these findings of the French authorities with Israel's allegation that Iraq was using the reactor to produce an atomic bomb? Was the Israeli accusation not too far-fetched? Or was it, as has constantly been its character, crying "wolf" to manifest its passion for aggression?

69. In this regard, my delegation fully associates itself with the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization [A/37/1], particularly concerning the need to see to it that United Nations resolutions are taken seriously. That is necessary to ensure that Israel respects this body and ends its defiance of the United Nations, and to guarantee that peace and stability are restored in the Middle East, thus contributing towards the enhancement of international peace.

70. Peace and security in the Middle East cannot be achieved by way of aggression or by embarking on pre-emptive strikes on neighbouring countries, but only through the elimination of suspicion, hatred and fear, and through serious and responsible efforts to ensure a durable and comprehensive solution of the Middle East problem, the core of which is the Palestinian question and the Palestinian people's legitimate right to a homeland, to self-determination and to establish their own free and independent State. Suffice it to say at this juncture that such a lasting solution will continue to be elusive unless and until Israel demonstrates its commitment to peace by its actions and refrains from such unbridled acts of aggression as that unleashed on the nuclear installations in Iraq. The international community must continue to intensify international pressure on Israel to ensure its compliance with the relevant United Nations resolutions, which provide a firm basis for a just and durable peace in the Middle East. Such a solution alone can provide the guarantee necessary for all the States in the region to live at peace with one another.

71. Mr. ALEXANDROV (Bulgaria): The time that has elapsed since the terrorist Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations on 7 June 1981 has provided us with sufficient opportunity to analyse this event that caused such deep alarm throughout the world. The invasion of Lebanon and Beirut, the massacre of the civilian population and the use of chemical, phosphorous and cluster weapons remind us that Israeli militarism will stop at nothing to crush

the will of Arab peoples to resist aggression and impose upon them its diktat. Against the backdrop of the tragedy which has befallen the region in the last several months, the responsibility for which has been unanimously attributed to the Begin régime, the piratical raid against Baghdad appears once again as a cold-blooded and meticulous operation, the aim of which was to demonstrate to the Arab peoples and the world at large the determination of Israel to turn the region into a nuclear battlefield whenever it deems it necessary for its security.

72. The air raid by Israeli bombers against the nuclear reactor at Tamuz confirmed most dramatically the worst fears in this respect, expressed for many years by the representatives of various countries, in different public and scientific circles.

73. A number of knowledgeable studies have already proved that the destruction of peaceful nuclear facilities during an eventual military operation would release large amounts of radioactive substances and would lead to the contamination of wide areas. The destruction of such installations even by using conventional weapons would, in practical terms, have consequences similar to those of the use of nuclear weapons. At the thirty-sixth session, the Director General of IAEA, Mr. Eklund, warned that:

“We should also bear in mind the grim possibility of an armed conflict involving civilian nuclear installations. From recent experience it is evident that, unless effective precautionary measures are adopted at the international level, certain nuclear installations could become the target of hostilities and therefore radiological warfare could be, in effect, initiated by the use of conventional weapons. One shudders to think of the consequences of military attacks on any of the 260 existing nuclear power reactors or the 300 research reactors.” [50th meeting, para. 35.]

74. Research has shown unequivocally that an attacked nuclear reactor, whose peaceful use capacity is measured in kilowatts and megawatts, could become the source of deadly radiation comparable only to that of a nuclear explosion, whose blast power is measured in kilotons and megatons. In fact, it was only by good fortune that the bombing of the Iraqi nuclear installation did not result in the mass killing of the Iraqi capital's population.

75. My country—like all other Member States except two—explicitly stated, at the thirty-sixth session [54th meeting], its position of condemnation of the Israeli attack of 7 June 1981 against the Iraqi nuclear reactor. It fully supported resolution 36/27, adopted by the General Assembly on 13 November 1981. I should like to reiterate the firm conviction of the Bulgarian delegation that the action of Israel constitutes a most serious breach of international law and the basic norms of civilized international conduct. Furthermore, it constitutes an act of armed aggression which, by virtue of its nature, scope and possible consequences, is tantamount to the use of nuclear weapons, an act that has been denounced by the United Nations as the gravest crime against humanity.

76. The Israeli attack against the Iraqi peaceful nuclear reactor, which had been placed under IAEA safeguards, constituted an attack against the Agency and its safeguards régime. It threatened and impaired

the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and has infringed the sovereign right of States to build their own national economy. Its aim was to compromise the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the entire system of international agreements in the field of the maintenance of peace and disarmament, as well as to undermine the authority of the United Nations and its organs.

77. I wish to reiterate that those that are still inclined to view this piratical raid as an accidental, though condemnable, incident are deeply deluding themselves. The very train of events has incontrovertibly proved that it was an integral part of a long-term strategy, the ultimate end of which is to defeat the national liberation movement in that part of the world and to restore the domination of imperialism in the Middle East.

78. Israel has espoused a policy of strengthening its security through expansion and the dispensing of death and destruction among its neighbours. It has been bolstered in this respect by relying on its “strategic alliance” with the United States, a country which has long sought to turn the Middle East and the Persian Gulf into its own sphere of influence. The United States, through the Camp David accords, has cleared the way for the aggressor, enabling the latter to launch selective strikes against individual Arab countries. The United States provided the financial resources and the modern weapons which were used in the aggression. It is, above all and exclusively, the help of the United States which is strengthening the hand of Israel, whose brazen challenges fly in the face of the Organization. This very help has encouraged Israel to commit crimes in the hope of getting away with it and enjoying impunity.

79. The universal condemnation of the Israeli attack against Iraq's peaceful nuclear installations, which is under consideration for the second time at a regular session of the General Assembly, has shown ever more convincingly the extremely destabilizing impact of Israel's aggressive policy on the situation in the Middle East and beyond. A grave consequence of this policy is that it has confronted the world with a direct threat of nuclear conflict. By resorting to military operations which erase the dividing line between the use of conventional and of nuclear weapons, the Israeli militarists have, in effect, taken the initiative of being the first to use nuclear weapons.

80. The solution of the Middle East crisis is incompatible with separate deals, which only serve further to aggravate and exacerbate the conflict. The only viable way of securing lasting peace and security for all countries of this long-suffering region is through a comprehensive solution of the crisis in the Middle East. This solution should be effected on a broad and representative basis by convening an international conference, with the participation of all parties concerned, including the PLO.

81. Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At a time when the Secretary-General has rightly and candidly warned, in his report, against the consequences of the United Nations falling into the snare of inaction and deadlock, and when speakers in the general debate have commended the vision and insight of the Secretary-General, supporting his em-

phasis on the need to ward off the dark fate that threatens the Organization, the question arises of the meaning of the reconsideration by the General Assembly of the item entitled "Armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security". Did it not conclude consideration of this question and act on it at the time? There is no doubt that the answer to this question is linked with the question highlighted by what I have just mentioned.

82. Perhaps we may answer this question with another. Can a particular international problem be solved by adopting a resolution concerning it? Or can we say that the adoption of a resolution *per se* will end the problem, especially if that resolution remains unimplemented, a dead letter? This simple question sums up the predicament which confronts the Organization today. Conflicts and problems continue to accumulate and resolutions concerning them are regarded merely as dead letters. What is lacking is the practical solution. Hence, major problems and issues, such as the Palestinian question and the Namibian question, to cite but two, are carried over from one session to the next. This is not an exercise in irrationality: the aim is to confirm certain facts, of which I shall cite a few.

83. The first is the right of all peoples to self-determination, which does not become obsolete and is not lost because the usurper of that right denies it. The second is confirmation of the will of the international community and its refusal to give up that with which it has been entrusted. Thirdly, acquiescence with the usurper, the aggressor, the stronger, in most cases is tantamount to the death sentence for the Organization. Those are some reasons for keeping the important issues open, even if there are certain side-effects, such as highlighting the predicament to which I have referred, which can be candidly described as the inaction of the United Nations. There is no wisdom in burying our heads in the sand.

84. The file on Israel's heinous international crime in making a flagrant military strike against the Osirak nuclear reactor on the outskirts of Baghdad, in the course of which it committed another crime by violating the airspace of more than one Arab country, has not been closed by the adoption of resolutions denouncing it. Among the bodies to condemn it were the Security Council and the General Assembly. The crime was also denounced by all the peoples and Governments of the world, including the United States, which provided Israel with the F-16 fighters that enabled it to commit that crime.

85. I turn from the international reactions to the international consequences of the crime, which went far beyond the denounced act itself. If we put the reactions on one side and reflect deeply on this armed aggression, we can easily see that Israel aimed to deprive Iraq of its right to the benefits of science and technology, by destroying the symbol of its national aspirations, in the form of its nuclear installations. Israel aimed to destroy the legitimacy of international treaties and to impose instead the law of the

jungle, which gives it the right to choose its prey and attack it whenever it likes, with impunity.

86. Iraq was one of the first States to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which it signed early in July 1968 and ratified on 29 October 1969. In 1972, it concluded an agreement with IAEA to subject all its nuclear activities to the Agency's safeguards, in accordance with the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Furthermore, believing in the importance of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy, Iraq concluded bilateral co-operation treaties with many countries. The Iraqi Atomic Energy Authority joined other bodies in organizing many conferences and seminars with a view to consolidating co-operation in scientific and technical research. From all this we conclude that all Iraq's nuclear activities were carried out in the light of day and under the umbrella of international legitimacy, including the subjection of its activities to IAEA safeguards. Iraq had nothing to hide.

87. The picture will not be complete unless it is made clear that Israel bases its nuclear activity, which dates back to 1949, on clandestine operations and secrecy. I do not need to repeat the details of the illegitimacy of its activities: the acts of piracy, theft, kidnapping and assassination at sea, in the heart of Europe and in the United States—as Western officials, including officials of the United States Central Intelligence Agency, have recognized. In addition, Israel received help from some Western countries, particularly the United States. Intelligence reports, furnished by secret services, reports deliberately leaked, admitted that Israel had acquired nuclear weapons.

88. We still remember those mysterious explosions in September 1979 near the coast of South Africa, monitored by a United States satellite, which disclosed collaboration between Israel and the Government of Pretoria to carry out a joint programme to develop nuclear weapons. We can say without fear of being mistaken, that it was in the light of those facts that Israel refused to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty. What is worse, the outlawed Zionist entity is trying to impose its special law on the Middle East through the power of its weapons and nuclear blackmail.

89. The Qatar delegation warns that Israel's persistent refusal to comply with the resolutions of international bodies concerning the armed attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations, especially Security Council resolution 487 (1981), is a precedent that could undermine the basis of established international relations and conduct. In addition, the Security Council's failure so far to impose stringent deterrent sanctions on Israel could have serious significance, for what is the use of some nations adhering to international treaties and agreements arrived at after years of painstaking debate if a Member of the Organization, such as Israel, can contemptuously flout them?

90. Therefore, the delegation of Qatar stresses the importance of taking the necessary measures to preserve respect for international treaties, on the one hand, and, on the other, to impose sanctions, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter, on any Member that breaches them.

91. The delegation of Qatar warns that unless Israel's nuclear activities are subjected to international safeguards and controls, in accordance with the Non-Proliferation Treaty, Israel will persist in its repeated acts of aggression against the Arab countries, using all the weapons at its disposal, including nuclear blackmail.

92. Mr. LIANG Yufan (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): On 7 June 1981, the Israeli Government unscrupulously dispatched military aircraft to bomb an Iraqi nuclear installation. This was a serious crime of aggression, arousing universal indignation. The Security Council, in resolution 487 (1981), and the General Assembly, in resolution 36/27, sternly condemned this outrage and demanded that Israel pay prompt and adequate compensation for the material damage and loss of life suffered as a result of its aggression.

93. A year has passed. Israel has not only refused to pay any compensation to the victimized party, in defiance of the United Nations resolutions and world opinion, but has even stepped up its aggression. By a legislative act, it brazenly annexed the occupied Syrian territory of the Golan Heights. It launched a large-scale invasion of Lebanon and laid siege to Beirut with massive armed force. Then it proceeded to massacre Lebanese and Palestinian civilians in cold blood, a crime that outraged the world. Up to now it has refused to withdraw its troops from Lebanon.

94. We pointed out earlier that Israel's attack on the Iraqi nuclear installation was by no means an isolated incident, but a calculated step in Israel's aggressive and expansionist policy towards the Arab countries. This has been borne out by the sequence of events in the past year. The recklessness of Israel is attributable to the support and connivance of a super-Power. The redoubled frenzy of Israeli aggressiveness in the past year has aggravated tension in the region and threatened world peace and security.

95. Israel has resorted to various pretexts in an attempt to whitewash its criminal raid on the Iraqi nuclear installation. Its main pretext was that the installation was allegedly being used to develop nuclear weapons which could be a threat to Israel's security and, therefore, it had to take the so-called pre-emptive action. Almost all of Israel's acts of aggression have been carried out under the pretext of ensuring its own "security". This is a gangster's logic which we recognize all too well. Iraq had repeatedly declared that its nuclear installation was for peaceful purposes. It was completely futile for Israel to justify its aggression by such a preposterous pretext.

96. In view of Israel's persistence in a policy of aggression and expansion, and its refusal to comply with the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, and especially its threat to launch a new attack on Iraq's nuclear installation, it is necessary to consider this question again at this session. Israel should be condemned again for its criminal aggression and expansion. The sovereign rights of Iraq and all other Arab countries, including the right to peaceful uses of nuclear energy and the right to pursue scientific and technological progress, must be safeguarded.

97. Mr. MARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic decisively condemned the piratical raid by Israeli aircraft on the Iraqi nuclear centre near Baghdad, which was a premeditated and unprecedented act of aggression, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international conduct.

98. Israel's aggressive act must not be viewed in isolation. As has been emphasized by every delegation, without exception, that has spoken today, that act of aggression was another link in the long chain of Tel Aviv's crimes against Arab countries and peoples, and another step in the dangerously escalating threat to international peace and security.

99. The premeditated act of armed aggression against the Iraqi peaceful nuclear centre constitutes not only a gross violation of the sovereignty of other countries and a brazen encroachment on their inalienable right to develop science and technology, including the peaceful use of nuclear energy for the benefit of their peoples, but also an attempted blow against the non-proliferation régime and the system of international safeguards on the use of nuclear energy established by IAEA. The development of international co-operation in this field is impossible without respect for and strict compliance with the established international norms.

100. The Security Council, in resolution 487 (1981), unanimously condemned Israel's act of piracy as a clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international conduct, and unequivocally demanded that Israel refrain in the future from any such acts or threats thereof. Israel's aggression against Iraq was also condemned by the Board of Governors of IAEA<sup>6</sup> and the General Conference of IAEA<sup>7</sup> at the session concluded recently which, as is well known, did not recognize the credentials of the delegation of Israel.

101. The adoption by the General Assembly, by an overwhelming majority, of resolution 36/27, concerning Israel's act of aggression, was of great political importance. The Byelorussian SSR supported the direct appeal made in the resolution to all States to cease forthwith any provision to Israel of arms and related material of all kinds which enable it to commit acts of aggression against other States. Everyone knows that Israel's aggressive attack against Iraq was committed with United States military technology. The Byelorussian SSR also supports the request to the Security Council contained in that resolution to institute effective enforcement action against Israel to put an end to its policies of expansion, occupation and annexation.

102. The relevance of resolution 36/27 becomes even more clear in the light of the latest barbaric act of aggression committed by Israel against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples. Again, death and suffering have been caused to the Arab people by the United States weaponry placed in the hands of the Zionist vandals. The genocide in Lebanon has been committed by Israel in the context of its notorious strategic co-operation with the United States, which finances and arms Israel and encourages it to pursue a criminal

anti-Arab policy, in order, in the final analysis, to guarantee its own great-Power interests in the region.

103. Israel's attempts, with the support of its sponsors, to find all kinds of justifications for its actions and thus to place itself above international law and the elementary norms of international conduct, are clearly invalid. They would scarcely merit any attention at all were they not clearly aimed not so much at justifying the deed as at frightening neighbouring countries into believing that similar actions are possible in the future.

104. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR believes that it is the duty of the Security Council and the General Assembly, in view of the unceasing escalation of Israeli aggression, to adopt effective measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations to restrain the aggressor, and to defend the sovereignty, territorial integrity and legitimate rights and interests of the Arab countries and peoples.

105. Mr. NAWAZ (Pakistan): It would be hard to imagine an act of aggression more coolly conceived and ruthlessly executed than the wanton Israeli attack in June of last year on the Osirak nuclear reactor complex near Baghdad. Apart from its unprecedented character, this attack, which was a flagrant violation of Iraq's air space and territory, has an important bearing on issues relevant to international co-operation for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation régime, disarmament and international security.

106. In the words of the Director General of IAEA, the Israeli attack has undermined the international safeguards system for the peaceful application of nuclear energy. It also demonstrates that even adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons cannot ensure the safety of the peaceful nuclear installations of a State against the reckless action of a determined aggressor.

107. In the context of disarmament, the Israeli attack on the Osirak reactor raises a serious issue with regard to the safety of peaceful nuclear facilities against military aggression. Discussions within the Committee on Disarmament and IAEA, as well as expert scientific opinion on the subject, leave not the slightest doubt that an attack on a nuclear installation with conventional arms would have the same effect as one in which nuclear weapons were used and would cause widespread radioactive contamination in and around the State that had been the victim of such an attack. The Committee on Disarmament has responded to the issue by considering various proposals for strengthening the existing international law regarding the protection of civil nuclear facilities against military attack, including a proposal of Sweden for incorporating appropriate additional provisions in the body of the draft convention on radiological weapons.

108. Even minor incidents in nuclear reactors located in developed countries are known to have caused wide public consternation. The reaction of some of those countries to the Israeli attack on the Osirak reactor is, therefore, somewhat intriguing. Instead of weighing with due care and concern the serious implications of the attack and urging measures against its recurrence in the future, they are using the issue to divert atten-

tion to the wholly unrelated question of strengthening the internationally recognized safeguards system, which is adequate and free from any serious shortcomings.

109. In the regional context, Israel's attack reveals a sinister aspect of its policy of hegemonism. Having developed a nuclear-weapons capability itself, the existence of which has been confirmed by the testimony of United Nations experts, Israel has declared its intention to deprive other States in the region of the possibility of developing even peaceful nuclear energy programmes. Its aim is to establish and maintain a decisive technological supremacy in the region, even if it is done in violation of the norms of international law and in defiance of world public opinion.

110. The Security Council adopted resolution 487 (1981), condemning the Israeli attack and demanding that Israel refrain from such acts or threats thereof in the future. The Security Council also asked Israel to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. Instead of heeding the unanimous call of the Security Council, Israel rejected that resolution as well as the one subsequently adopted by the General Assembly demanding payment of adequate compensation for the material damage and loss of life suffered as a result of its action. Israeli arrogance and intransigence have now gone a step further. Israel has openly held out a threat to repeat such attacks in the future whenever it so chooses.

111. In the circumstances, it is not surprising that the States members of IAEA were left with no choice but to indict Israel by suspending its membership in the Agency. Obviously, Israel's continued presence in IAEA, enabling it to derive the full benefit from membership, would have been incompatible with its irresponsible action, which has damaged the prestige of the Agency and dealt a severe blow to its safeguards system.

112. In view of the grave consequences which attacks on peaceful nuclear installations could entail, there is need for the United Nations to consider the adoption of measures prohibiting attacks on such installations. It is as important to study the political implications of such attacks as to assess the extent of the damage these can cause to human lives and the environment. Such an exercise undertaken by the United Nations could serve to highlight the gravity of the Israeli action and the dangers for the development of peaceful nuclear programmes in the region inherent in Israel's openly declared threat to destroy at will the facilities for such programmes.

113. Mr. DJALAL (Indonesia): There have been numerous occasions when the Assembly and the Security Council have been seized of questions relating to Israeli violations of Charter principles and Israel's refusal to comply with the decisions of the international community. Its self-righteous and arrogant stance has led it into actions that even its closest friends could not defend. Thus, in our consideration of the question of the armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations, this must be viewed not as an isolated incident, but rather as a component of a grand Israeli strategy of intimidation and expansion through the unilateral use of force against its neighbours. Indeed, in the year since the attack by

Israel on the Iraqi nuclear installations we have witnessed constant and even more intensified Israeli violations of international law.

114. As if prophetically, exactly one year before its massive invasion of Lebanon, Israel, without provocation, attacked and ruined Iraq's peaceful nuclear installations. The implications of this attack are indeed manifold. First, it called into question the very viability of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to which Iraq is a party and which Israel has refused to sign. Secondly, it called into question IAEA's ability, through international legal instruments, to protect a State's nuclear development for peaceful purposes. Thirdly, it set a dangerous precedent for similar behaviour, which might further erode the effectiveness of that Treaty and the safeguards system. Fourthly, it would create tremendous danger and hazard to human life if an attack were launched against an operating nuclear installation.

115. Realizing the gravity of the situation, the Security Council adopted resolution 487 (1981), which established beyond doubt that "the military attack by Israel [was] in clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international conduct". It further called upon Israel to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards and to pay reparations for the destruction of the nuclear installation.

116. However, the Security Council was unable to ensure compliance with its own resolution. Since that resolution went unheeded, the General Assembly, at its thirty-sixth session, adopted resolution 36/27 by an overwhelming majority. That resolution called for "prompt and adequate compensation by Israel for the material damage and loss of life suffered as a result" of the aggression. It further called on the Security Council to institute effective enforcement action.

117. My delegation supported the two resolutions, not only because the attack violated the most sacred principles of the Charter, but also because it threatened the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes in developing countries. The Israeli action is particularly disturbing to my Government, which is now in the process of developing its own peaceful nuclear programme. This programme is consistent with our development goals and our obligations as a signatory to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and because we have accepted IAEA safeguards.

118. Israel's refusal to renounce its proclaimed pre-emptive right to attack and destroy the peaceful nuclear installations of other countries sets a dangerous precedent, in that no country with a peaceful nuclear programme under IAEA safeguards can feel secure from such attack. What is at stake here is the right of States to develop scientific and technological capabilities to fulfil the hopes and aspirations of the people in the developing countries. Therefore, in our statement before the Security Council last year,<sup>8</sup> my delegation urged the Council to adopt enforcement measures to compel Israel to pay reparations, thereby demonstrating before the world that such actions will not go unpunished.

119. It is clear that Israel's attack was not in any way associated with a military threat from Iraq's peaceful nuclear installations. The Director General

of IAEA and the two countries directly involved in the construction of the installation, France and Italy, have all testified that it could not be used for military purposes. The only conclusion that can be drawn in this case is that Israel is determined to use its overwhelming military might against non-military targets to ensure its dominance over the region.

120. On the basis of the foregoing, it is clear that Israel's claim that its action was taken in self-defence is clearly another attempt to pervert a sacred principle of the Charter to justify blatant aggression. Furthermore, Israel has not shown any remorse over its violation of Iraqi territorial integrity. It has also refused, under dubious pretexts, to pay reparations for its military attack. It has even asserted that it reserves the right to take similar action in the future. In view of all this, it is imperative that further measures be taken to ensure protection against attacks on peaceful nuclear installations.

121. My delegation, at the thirty-sixth session [55th meeting], first of all stated that we supported the call for reparations to Iraq; secondly, asked Israel to open its nuclear programme to IAEA inspection; and, thirdly, said that to do anything less would call into question the credibility of IAEA, the Non-Proliferation Treaty and even the United Nations itself.

122. In conclusion, we can only surmise that, had the Organization adopted enforcement measures with regard to this attack against Iraq, it could have mitigated subsequent Israeli acts of aggression. Indeed, Israeli arrogance will continue and the peoples of the region will face new instances of Israeli aggression unless the collective will of Member States is expressed and enforced.

123. Mr. SAHNOUN (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): For the second consecutive session, the Assembly is called upon to consider a question which is of extreme gravity because of its implications for international peace and security.

124. Eighteen months ago, the Israeli air force committed a blatant act of aggression against a State Member of the United Nations, namely, the Republic of Iraq, a country for which I should like to reaffirm here the support and the complete solidarity of my own country.

125. By attacking a nuclear installation which, according to all indications, was being used for peaceful purposes, Israel simply demonstrated that no country of the region was safe from its policy of aggression. That act of aggression against a sovereign country, in violation of the most elementary rules of international law, the sacred principles of independence and national sovereignty and the principles of the Charter, showed, unfortunately, that the Zionist entity, born of war, lives only by war. That shameful attack against Iraq took place, it must be noted, after the violation of the airspace of two other Arab countries. The Assembly, like the Security Council, has already had occasion to give its views on that act of aggression and to express its unanimous disapproval.

126. What is before the Assembly today is the consideration of the serious consequences and implications of that act of aggression for the peaceful uses

of nuclear energy in the region, on the one hand, and for international peace and security, on the other.

127. The destruction of a nuclear installation subjected to the safeguards system of IAEA in Vienna, while the Zionist entity, which, as is a known fact, has atomic weapons, obstinately refuses to submit its installations to the control of that Agency, constitutes a deliberate violation of the principles contained 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)].

128. But what is even more serious, and this is the main reason for my statement today, is that the Israeli leaders, who have refused to implement the provisions of Security Council resolution 487 (1981), which was unanimously adopted by the Council, are today threatening to repeat their crime against Iraq and against any other country of the region which intends to develop nuclear reactors for peaceful purposes. This sword of Damocles hanging over all countries using nuclear energy for peaceful purposes constitutes a serious threat to peace and introduces a new element of dangerous insecurity in international relations.

129. The theory of pre-emptive aggression, on which the Israeli leaders are today basing their policy against Arab countries, establishes a precedent which must be controlled, because it could lead to the serious disruption of international relations. Thus, any State which thought it detected a danger to its security in the activities carried out by any country in the economic, scientific or technical fields would feel entitled, according to that absurd theory, to take so-called preventive action against that country. The world would thus find itself subjected to the law of the jungle, where preventive self-defence would constitute new legal grounds for all acts of aggression and would open the way to all kinds of madness.

130. The threat is sufficiently grave and dangerous to be taken seriously. The Assembly must react firmly by condemning Israel for its systematic policy of aggression against States of the region, by adopting all the necessary measures so that armed attacks against nuclear installations never happen again and by demanding the dismantling of the Israeli nuclear arsenal which itself constitutes a definite threat to neighbouring countries and, more generally, to international peace and security.

131. Mr. ULRICHSEN (Denmark): I speak on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community. Our views on the Israeli military attack on Iraq's nuclear installations and its serious consequences were clearly set out in the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the Community at the thirty-sixth session [53th meeting].

132. Those views remain unchanged. The 10 members of the European Community repeat their call upon Israel to comply fully with Security Council resolution 487 (1981) in all its aspects. They stress once more the vital importance for all countries of refraining from any act of violence which might escalate tension in the Middle East region, while reaffirming the right of all States to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, under appropriate safeguards and in

accordance with the goals of the international non-proliferation régime.

133. Mr. OULD HAMODY (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): The question of the premeditated attack against the nuclear installation used for peaceful purposes in Iraq may appear to be outdated, almost forgotten. And Israel has always counted on the short memory of the international community.

134. But we shall not forget that attack, which is part of a long record of similar actions. Above all, we shall not forget that the blatant aggression against the Arab nation and its aspirations to scientific and technological progress is also aggression against all developing countries, against peace and against IAEA. We will simply recall to the Assembly some of the real reasons for that unjustified attack by the Zionist enemy in June 1981 against the Iraqi nuclear installations at Tamuz.

135. The first fact of that aggression clearly demonstrates Israel's outrageous claim to decide unilaterally the destinies of the entire Arab region. That barbarous act gives further proof of Israel's claim to block the completely natural and justified acquisition by the Arab peoples of modern technology. But, more generally, the attack against the reactor at Tamuz is, above all, as was correctly noted by the Director General of IAEA, comparable to an attack against the Agency's safeguards system.

136. We also wish to recall that Israel, unlike Iraq, is not a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and that it has several nuclear installations of a military nature on the territories which it usurped in 1948.

137. The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania believes that the Assembly should compel Israel once again to respect international legality and to repudiate its declared intention to repeat its crime of June 1981 against Iraq. In this connection, we welcome the measures taken by IAEA against the Zionist State to prevail upon it to respect the Agency and the spirit and letter of its basic documents.

138. As has been stated frequently from this rostrum, the Arab peoples live in a land which has been theirs since the dawn of time. They will remain masters of that land, of the sky and the resources of their great nation. Neither the religious fanaticism nor the racial bigotry of Israel will change anything, any more than will the temporary strength which that country draws from the limitless aid it receives from its friends.

139. Nevertheless, despite the suicidal hysteria of the Israeli entity, the international community has a duty to consider also the security of the hundreds of thousands of people brought from all five continents to usurp a land by expelling its inhabitants. That objective can only be achieved by the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian and other Arab people and the condemnation of barbarous acts such as those recently committed against the Palestinian camps of Sabra and Shatila and also those against the nuclear installation in Tamuz, which we are considering.

140. Mr. KALINA (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): The piratical attack by the Israeli air force on the Iraqi nuclear research centre in the sum-

mer of 1981 continues to arouse feelings of indignation among the overwhelming majority of the Member States. At the time, the General Assembly stated its views on that brazen attack by the Israeli military clique and unequivocally condemned it on 13 November 1981 in resolution 36/27.

141. In sending its military aircraft—which, incidentally, are still being lavishly supplied by the United States—into the airspace of a sovereign, non-aligned State in order to destroy nuclear installations designed for peaceful purposes on its territory, Israel was blatantly disregarding the Charter of the United Nations and the basic principles of international law. That scandalous act clearly indicated the extremely dangerous role of Tel Aviv, which obviously at that time was already planning a further escalation of its aggression in the Middle East.

142. Czechoslovakia, together with other States, condemned most vehemently that completely unjustified and unprovoked act and advocated the adoption of effective practical measures to prevent any new attempts by Israel to pursue its dangerous, aggressive and expansionist policies against Arab States, which constitute a serious threat to universal peace and security. The danger of acts such as the destruction of the Iraqi nuclear research centre is that they may trigger a large-scale military conflict, and this is even more likely in view of the critically tense situation obtaining in the Middle East. Furthermore, such actions in and of themselves could have the most dire and dangerous long-term consequences because of the fact that a large quantity of radioactive material is released.

143. Effective measures to prevent this type of action are contained in the proposal submitted by the Soviet Union at the present session [A/C.1/37/L.7] on the intensification of efforts to remove the threat of nuclear war and ensure the safe development of nuclear energy. We fully support the proposal that the General Assembly should declare the premeditated destruction of nuclear facilities designed for peaceful purposes, even by means of conventional weapons, in essence equivalent to a nuclear attack—that is to say, an action of the kind the United Nations has called the gravest crime against humanity. We believe that the adoption of that proposal would play a decisive part in preventing further aggressive actions of this kind by Israel.

144. Responsibility for the act of aggression against Iraq on 7 June last year must be borne also by the forces of imperialism, above all United States imperialism, without whose political support and military assistance Israel would not be in a position to perpetrate such piratical attacks, or other wide-scale acts of aggression, such as their unprecedented incursion into Lebanon but a few months ago, which the Government of Israel, with typical cynicism and demagoguery, continues to justify on the grounds of “preventive self-defence”.

145. As stated in the reply of my Government contained in the report of the Secretary-General on this matter [A/37/365], the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has consistently complied with the request, reiterated in resolution 36/27, to cease any provision to Israel of arms and related material. However, no

one can fail to recognize the fact that, even after the adoption of resolution 36/27, the conditions still exist for the continuance and further expansion of Israel's aggression, and they will continue to exist, given the virtually boundless political, economic and primarily military support provided by the United States.

146. The scale and character of the piratical attack on the Iraqi nuclear research centre and the other illegitimate acts committed by Israel in the Middle East are possible only because of that support. Indeed, the strategic alliance between Israel and the United States is the basis for all manifestations of Israeli aggression against sovereign Arab States and the Arab people of Palestine.

147. Czechoslovakia once more most vehemently condemns the aggressive policy of Israel and those forces which have helped in its implementation. My delegation hopes that the United Nations will take further effective measures to halt Israeli aggression, to guarantee the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Arab States and to restore the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

148. In view of its position, the Czechoslovak delegation supports draft resolution A/37/L.12 and will vote in favour of it.

149. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): At the start of the debate on agenda item 24 at the last meeting, the representative of Iraq clearly described the practical and criminal nature of the attack by the Israeli Zionists against Iraq's nuclear installations last year, as well as the very dangerous and negative influence it could have in the long term on the situation in the Middle East and on international relations in general.

150. More than a year after the destruction of the nuclear installation near Baghdad, as a result of bombardment by the most modern American-made aircraft piloted by Israeli Zionists, the entire world is, justifiably, continuing to condemn that very serious and unprecedented act of State terrorism carried out without any valid justification against a sovereign country, in flagrant violation of all the norms of international law. To commit their crime, the Israeli Zionists did not hesitate to violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of several Arab States, and to extend dangerously the sphere of action of their war machine to the other end of the Arabian peninsula.

151. The direct armed attack last year against Iraq by the Israeli Zionists added new dimensions to their continuous aggression against the Arab peoples and once again revealed the real aggressive and expansionist intentions of Israel, as well as the danger its practices constitute for peace and stability in the region. By the attack on the Iraqi installations designed for the peaceful use of nuclear energy, the Israeli Zionists deliberately intended to show that they put no limit on their military activity and their provocation in the pursuit of their dreams of a greater Israel.

152. The Zionists have advanced, and continue to advance, ridiculous, baseless pretexts to excuse their acts of terrorism and to support their aggressive obsessions and their outrageous threats to carry out new attacks of the same kind if Iraq decides to reconstruct its nuclear centre. It is hardly necessary to comment on such perverted logic. The Zionists not only dis-

regard the trend of world public opinion and refuse to listen to reason, but have the temerity to try to intimidate the entire world by threatening to repeat the same crimes for which they have been universally condemned. That is not surprising if we remember all their acts of aggression, and especially the massacres recently carried out by them in Lebanon. The aggressive war against and the military occupation of Lebanon have highlighted the sinister purpose of their premeditated attack against Iraq's nuclear installation. The arrogance of the Zionists has truly broken all records and should be condemned with the greatest vigour.

153. The absurdity of Israel's allegations about a pre-emptive attack or preventive war and sure and guaranteed boundaries is obvious to the entire world and in every sense. The main purpose of the attack against the Iraqi nuclear installation had nothing to do with military considerations; it was to strike a blow at the Arab countries, to provoke them or humiliate them, as the Zionists have been doing for so long. That attack was also for the precise purpose of preventing the Iraqi people making progress in the technical and technological spheres. The expansionist designs, the ambition for regional hegemony and the theory of racial supremacy which the Zionists foster are at the root of their attempts to deny the Arab people the right to put nuclear energy and technological progress at the service of their development. Israel goes to the absurd lengths of arrogating to itself the right to decide who can use nuclear power, and how. The Israeli Zionists use aggression to deny others the right to use nuclear energy, while for themselves they find it normal to have nuclear weapons. It is for that purpose that they have established very close co-operation with their associates, the racists of South Africa, thus constituting a serious threat not only to the Arab countries but also to the whole of Africa and to other regions.

154. The armed attack by Israel against Iraq's nuclear installation, like every other act of Zionist aggression, is the result of the very close co-operation and mutual assistance between the American imperialists and the Israeli Zionists. It is American aircraft and weapons which bomb and destroy in Iraq and Lebanon and which kill tens of thousands of people. It is the American imperialists who incite, encourage and support all the aggressive actions of Israel and offer the greatest political and diplomatic protection whenever the Zionists are condemned for their crimes. It is not only Israel, but also the United States which must be held responsible for the destruction of Iraq's nuclear installation and for the arrogant threats reiterated by Israel to commit such acts again when it sees fit.

155. The Soviet social imperialists cannot escape their share of the responsibility for all the evils inflicted on the Arab peoples and countries throughout the many years of imperialist-Zionist aggression and collusion between the imperialist super-Powers. The attack against the nuclear installation near Baghdad took place at a time when the situation in the Middle East was extremely tense because of the rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union. Israel took the opportunity to attack Iraq at a moment when the armed conflict in the Gulf area, provoked

by the two imperialist super-Powers, was giving rise to great difficulties for the two countries involved and dividing the Arabs and Moslems of the region. We all know that the Zionists never lose any opportunity to take advantage of the many enormous difficulties which imperialism and social imperialism create for the Arab peoples.

156. The Albanian delegation, during the debate at the thirty-sixth session [55th meeting], firmly condemned Israel's aggression against Iraq. Today we reiterate that condemnation. We also wish to express our indignation at the Zionist threats to engage in other such acts of aggression as that committed last year against the Iraqi nuclear installation. We wish to express once again our solidarity with the Iraqi people and the other Arab peoples in their struggle against Zionist aggression and threats.

157. Mr. BABBA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The whole world was taken by surprise when, on 7 June 1981, Israeli aircraft carried out a raid on the Iraqi nuclear centre near Baghdad, which led to material damage and loss of life. The international community strongly condemned this deliberate aggression as a flagrant violation of all the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the rules of international law.

158. The Security Council realized the gravity of this criminal aggression and its grave implications, not only for international peace and security in the area, but also for the established international system based on international law and international legal instruments, as well as on the United Nations Charter. It strongly condemned it and warned against the consequences of its repetition. It was the duty of the Security Council not only to condemn that act of piracy, but also to demand that Iraq receive the necessary compensation and that stringent sanctions against the Zionist entity be imposed, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. However, the use of the veto by the United States, a permanent member of the Security Council, prevented the Council from fulfilling its responsibility for maintaining international peace and security.

159. This item has been considered by the General Assembly both last year and this year because of the failure of the Security Council to take the necessary measures in accordance with the Charter to prevent a repetition of this criminal act. Because of the United States veto, there is continuing frustration of the collective will of the international community, which calls for determined sanctions against the Zionist entity for its criminal acts and its aggression against the Arab countries. That veto has not only guaranteed impunity for the aggressor, but has also encouraged it to commit further acts of aggression in the Middle East. This will lead to a grave state of chaos and insecurity in international relations. The Secretary-General referred to this fact in his annual report.

160. The Zionist act of aggression against the Iraqi nuclear reactor must be considered, as mentioned by many delegations from this rostrum, as one in a long series of acts of aggression by the Zionist entity against the Arab nation in pursuance of its expansionist goals and to impose its domination and hege-

mony on the area. Within the framework of the strategic tasks of this entity as a bridgehead of imperialism in the area, the Zionist aggression is carried out in stages under the strategic alliance between the Zionist entity and the United States. The strike against the Iraqi nuclear reactor, which is designed for peaceful purposes, the invasion of Lebanon and the occupation of its land, the slaughtering of its civilian inhabitants, the massacre and the genocidal crimes against the civilian inhabitants of Sabra and Shatila and the annexation of the Golan Heights are but examples of the actions committed by the Zionist entity in pursuit of its criminal design to dominate the area.

161. The Zionist act of aggression against the nuclear installation of Iraq constitutes a grave precedent in international relations. Above all, it is aggression by an entity that possesses nuclear technology and whose nuclear programmes are not subject to IAEA safeguards. A United Nations group of experts has confirmed that this entity can and probably already is producing nuclear weapons. We all know of the collaboration between the two racist régimes in Pretoria and Tel Aviv in the field of the production of nuclear weapons. This entity has carried out wanton aggression against a country conducting nuclear research in the interest of its economic and social development. As everybody knows, Iraq has signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty, accepted the international system of nuclear safeguards and subjected its installations to strict international control. In justifying its criminal aggression, the Zionist entity has claimed that it can not trust these safeguards and has made itself an arbiter of them.

162. The Director General of IAEA, in his statement to the Security Council last year,<sup>5</sup> considered the attack by Israel on the Iraqi nuclear reactor as an attack on IAEA, on the Non-Proliferation Treaty and on the climate of trust created by the Treaty. It was also an attack on the whole verification system.

163. Secondly, this aggressive act is seen as a serious precedent, because if the international community takes no deterrent action, the Zionist entity can have recourse tomorrow to lame excuses for attacking any university or scientific research institute in any part of the Arab region, under the pretext that it threatens its security. It may even use the same pretext to commit with impunity other criminal acts against any civilian installation, or fanatically intervene under the pretext of security.

164. In fact, the Zionist design is to keep the Arab world underdeveloped, to deprive it of the benefits of scientific advance, so that it may remain at the mercy of the Zionist entity.

165. The gravity of the Zionist act of aggression is increased by its having been carried out with the encouragement and support of a super-Power and a permanent member of the Security Council. I refer to the United States, which provides the entity with weapons, finances and sophisticated technology to enable it to implement its aggressive policy against the Arab nations and prevent them from advancing technologically and scientifically, as they need to do in order to serve the prosperity of their people and raise their standard of living. The best proof of what I have said is that the United States provided the Zionist entity with special devices to help in the destruction of the Iraqi nuclear centre, as one American newspaper reported.

166. The international community, which has strongly condemned this cynical act of aggression, demands the imposition against the Zionist entity of the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, in order to guarantee that such an act of aggression is not repeated. The international community must also condemn any nation that provides the Zionist entity with any weapons or related material that would enable it to commit similar acts of aggression against other States, thus jeopardizing international peace and security.

167. The PRESIDENT: A draft resolution [A/37/L.12] has been circulated this afternoon. As the draft resolution has financial implications, the vote will have to be postponed to a date to be announced later.

*The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.*

---

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-sixth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 130, document A/36/194 and Add.1 and 2.

<sup>2</sup> See International Atomic Energy Agency, *Resolutions and Other Decisions of the General Conference, Twenty-sixth Regular Session*, GC(XXVI)/RES/404.

<sup>3</sup> L. Oppenheim, *International Law: A Treatise*, 7th ed., H. Lauterpracht, ed., vol. II, Disputes, War and Neutrality (London, Longman's, Green and Co., 1955), p. 159.

<sup>4</sup> *Study on Israeli Nuclear Armament* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.2).

<sup>5</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year*, 2288th meeting.

<sup>6</sup> See GC(XXV)/643.

<sup>7</sup> See International Atomic Energy Agency, *Resolutions and Other Decisions of the General Conference, Twenty-fifth Regular Session*, GC(XXV)/RES/381.

<sup>8</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year*, 2287th meeting.