



## General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/40/PV.59

4 November 1985

ENGLISH

Fortieth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Friday, 1 November 1985, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. DE PINIÉS (Spain)

later: Mr. OYOUE (Vice-President) (Gabon)

- 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: [29] (continued)

(a) Report of the Secretary-General

(b) Draft resolution

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 29 (continued)

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

- (a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/40/783)
- (b) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/40/L.9/Rev.1)

Mr. SEKULIC (Yugoslavia): The Israeli armed attack against Iraqi nuclear installations for peaceful purposes was one of the most brutal examples on record of an unprovoked military act. The passage of time does not bring oblivion in such cases. Every new act of aggression against the exercise of the sovereign will of the Arab countries and the Palestinian people, as well as the stubborn policy to turn the whole region of the Middle East into an area of rivalry, brings back memories of the dramatic circumstances in which that act was perpetrated.

The political assessments of that Israeli aggression by the Security Council, the General Assembly and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), as well as of the majority of Governments, are a clear testimony to the rejection of such a policy of force and armed aggression. The Israeli assertions that the attack was committed in self-defence are completely unacceptable.

Israel's conduct does not lead us to believe that it is ready to abandon its intransigent policy of force, aggression and occupation of a foreign land.

The recent Ministerial Conference of Non-aligned Countries in Luanda condemned Israel's continued refusal to withdraw its threat to repeat its armed aggression on installations devoted to peaceful purposes, in disregard of the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

(Mr. Sekulic, Yugoslavia)

Unfortunately, the use of force and pressure continues to plague overall international relations, and Israel's policy and conduct invest them with a particular dimension. This is not a debate aimed only at condemning Israel, but it constitutes a clear resolve of United Nations Member States to oppose the flagrant violation of the principles of sovereignty in international relations.

The aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations was and remains in clear contravention of the United Nations Charter and the sovereign right of each nation to embark speedily upon the road of its own economic and technological development. The fact that Iraqi nuclear activities were being carried out in compliance with the safeguards and nuclear guarantees of the IAEA was widely endorsed.

Iraq is a signatory to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and abides by its provisions. Israel is not a signatory to that Treaty and develops and uses its nuclear installations without any international control whatsoever.

The Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-aligned Countries in New Delhi categorically condemned the Israeli attack and invited the Security Council and all countries, as well as international organizations and agencies:

"to take the effective necessary measures to deter Israel from threatening and the repetition of such acts of aggression which gravely endanger international security." (A/38/132, para. 109)

The Conference also called for the early consideration and conclusion of an international agreement to prohibit military attacks on nuclear installations.

We share the opinion that the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations undermines collective efforts aimed at disarmament and the prevention of the use of force in international relations. There is no doubt in our minds

(Mr. Sekulic, Yugoslavia)

that one of the consequences of such an Israeli act will be a new cycle of the arms race and the deepening of the controversies and mistrust in the whole area of the Middle East, which continues to be the most dangerous focal point of crisis in the world.

Yugoslavia rejects any aggression, intervention or interference in the internal affairs or the use of force of international affairs from whatever quarter and under whatever pretext. Immediately after the attack against the Iraqi nuclear installations, Yugoslavia resolutely condemned the Israeli aggression and supported the just demands of Iraq.

Israel should stop believing in the brutal use of force and should fully comply with the provisions of relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, as well as of the IAEA. Freedom and independence cannot be secured by trampling upon the rights of others. Words of good intention should be replaced by concrete deeds. Israel's desire for domination and the imposition of its own will on others must be checked.

Confidence, which is the essential prerequisite for negotiations on peace and stability in the Middle East, cannot be built on the basis of a policy of aggression, occupation and annexation. Peace and co-operation in the region can be established only on the basis of a comprehensive, just and lasting solution, which should include the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the establishment of its own State, the withdrawal of Israel from all Palestinian and Arab territories occupied since June 1967 and the establishment of guarantees of equal security for all peoples and countries of the region.

Mr. RAMAKRISHNAN (India): The General Assembly has on numerous occasions in the past considered the explosive situation in West Asia caused by the aggressive actions and expansionist policies of Israel. In total disregard of the

(Mr. Ramakrishnan, India)

repeated calls of the international community and in violation of canons of international law and of principles governing the conduct of relations between States, Israel has continued to hold on to the Arab lands occupied illegally and by force and to deny to the people of Palestine their fundamental and inalienable right to their homeland. To this day Israel has defied the will of the international community to find a just, comprehensive and lasting solution to the conflict in the Middle East.

The Israeli military attack on the Iraqi atomic reactor near Baghdad in June 1981 was yet another glaring incident in a lengthy catalogue of Israel's aggressive policies designed to intimidate its Arab neighbours with the threat and use of massive force. The Government of India unequivocally condemned the Israeli action immediately after the attack. We expressed solidarity with the Government and people of Iraq, a non-aligned country with which India has close and cordial relations. The world saw in the Israeli action a new threat to international peace and security and a new form of international terrorism at the State level. It was condemned by the Security Council, the United Nations General Assembly and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), as well as in several world capitals.

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

(Mr. Ramakrishnan, India)

In our view, the General Assembly should censure Israel yet again for this premeditated act of aggression. It should be ensured that Israel does not build a nuclear arsenal which could threaten the entire West Asia region. Israel should be asked to declare and to undertake a commitment that it will not resort to such actions in the future.

I would like to point out that Israel has consistently indulged in adventurism, attacking peoples and countries, resulting in heavy loss of property and innocent lives, culminating in the latest attack on Tunis, in total disregard of the crescendo of international opinion building up against its maverick expansionist policies and in violation of all canons of civilized behaviour. Israel feels that it can get away scot free. I wish to say that it will not, and that the dream of the Palestinian people for their homeland will soon become a reality.

My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/40/L.9 because it clearly expresses the condemnation by the international community of the blatant act of aggression committed by Israel against Iraq on 7 June 1981. I wish also to emphasize that our support for the draft resolution is without prejudice to our well-known views and position on references to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and related full-scope safeguards which figure in the resolution, as well as in the title of the agenda item itself. Our vote in favour of the draft resolution is based on the understanding that nothing in it will be interpreted or used in any manner to strengthen the NPT or the associated safeguards régime. It is also without prejudice to our position, often repeated in the Conference on Disarmament, in the context of negotiations on the prohibition of radiological weapons and related issues.

Mr. AL-SABBAGH (Bahrain) (interpretation from Arabic): We are once again considering the item on armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations, concerning the aggression that took place on 19 June 1981, as well as its grave consequences for the established international system in regard to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

That aggression was indeed a flagrant violation of the Charter and has been condemned by the whole international community because it endangered Iraq's integrity, independence and sovereignty. The Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 487 (1981). It was hoped that this would persuade all States to support this and other resolutions, particularly those adopted by consensus, out of consideration for the contractual obligations of Member States to extend support and take appropriate measures without hesitation.

The fact that five years have passed since that aggression and that the General Assembly is still considering this item does not diminish its importance. The item will continue to be inscribed on our agenda as long as Israel persists in its position, which is based on non-compliance with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

That aggression is indeed one committed against the principles of the new international economic order. At the time of the adoption of Security Council resolution 487 (1981), Israel condemned it and refused to comply with its provisions. The Israeli threat to repeat its armed aggression not only against the peaceful Iraqi nuclear installations but also against neighbouring Arab countries which wish to use modern technology for social and economic development still remains. Israel has not withdrawn its threat to attack and destroy the Iraqi nuclear facilities as well as other nuclear facilities in the region. Indeed, it has disregarded the resolutions adopted by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the latest of which is resolution 425 of October 1984, which unequivocally

(Mr. Al-Sabbagh, Bahrain)

calls upon Israel to withdraw its threat to attack the Iraqi installation as well as installations in other developing countries that aspire to use that energy to promote the utilization of their economic resources as the basis for scientific progress. In this respect, I should like to mention the valuable study prepared by a group of experts of the United Nations and contained in document A/38/337. That study confirms that the nuclear installations near Baghdad were part of the Iraqi effort to bring about socio-economic development for the welfare of the Iraqi people.

Israel has never accepted the Non-Proliferation Treaty or the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency, while Iraq has signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty and put its nuclear activities under the Agency's safeguards system. In past years we have appealed to the General Assembly, and we are now renewing our appeal, to condemn Israel for its aggression and to request it not to commit similar aggressive acts.

Security Council resolutions, even those adopted unanimously, are not sufficient. We must take effective measures to prevent the repetition of such acts. This question has wide-ranging implications for the United Nations as a whole and constitutes a challenge to the will of the international community as well as a violation of international laws and customs.

The paralysis of the political will of the international community, as well as the unlimited support and assistance extended by some great Powers, have encouraged Israel to commit its repeated acts of aggression against the Arab States. Israel commits such aggression under the pretext of self-defence. What, we are entitled to ask, are the limits of Israel's conception of self-defence? Indeed, this is nazi logic and organized State terrorism, practised by a State Member of this Organization. It endangers the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other



(Mr. Al-Sabbagh, Bahrain)

States while, in fact, respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other States is a basic principle of the Charter.

On 1 October, Israel committed a further act of aggression against fraternal Tunisia, thus violating its sovereignty and territorial integrity and endangering its security and stability. Israel said that this raid was directed against the headquarters of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). Thus we see a series of Israeli aggressions against Baghdad, Tunis, Syria, Jordan and Lebanon. We do not know where the next strike will take place.

All these acts have been committed in the name of self-defence. In fact, this is the logic of arrogance and muscle-flexing and is in complete contradiction with the world's conception of international law. We, for our part, reject the allegation that the Israeli aggression is part of an attempt to resist terrorism. In fact, that aggression is a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and international law as well as of the principles which govern relations among States on the basis of the Charter, among which figures the principle of the non-use or threat of use of force in international relations.

Experience shows that condemnation of Israel is not sufficient. Therefore, compensation for the material damage sustained by Iraq should be ensured. We should think of imposing comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. If such sanctions are not imposed, Israel will not hesitate in future to commit similar acts of aggression against the Arab peoples and countries, whether it is in a state of war with them or not.

Israel committed aggression against Iraq and Tunisia while those two countries were not belligerent parties. Such aggressive acts will lead to further violence and bloodshed. An Israeli peace based on aggression and expansion will never be achieved. Draft resolution A/40/L.9, which is before the General Assembly, expresses our aspirations, demands and fears.

(Mr. Al-Sabbagh, Bahrain)

In commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, we look forward to the day when the United Nations will restore its authority and credibility. That renewed confidence will not come about unless the Organization lives up to the challenges inherent in the maintenance of international peace and security and the insurance of the rule of law and international legality.

Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): In the light of its recent attack against Tunisia, the discussion of the item on the armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations assumes special importance, for the latest act of aggression confirms and reaffirms the logic of force and military power that Israel uses in dealing with the Arab countries. It also shows that Israel will not be deterred from carrying out further acts of aggression against Iraq or any other Arab country whenever such a country possesses a nuclear reactor for peaceful purposes.

Israel's act of aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations in June 1981 provided clear proof of the lengths to which Israel is prepared to go in flouting international law and the international system to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons established under the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which provide for visits of inspection and review by experts to ensure that commitments entered into under the NPT and safeguards agreement are being carried out. Iraq, in signing and ratifying the NPT, complied with all its provisions and was open to international inspection by the Agency.

The various reports issued by the Agency's experts after their inspections of the Iraqi nuclear installations, including the report of June 1981, confirmed that there was no evidence whatsoever that Iraq was in the process of producing a nuclear weapon. Those results of the inspections were confirmed by the General Director of the Agency and by the French experts working in the Iraqi installation.

In spite of all the investigations, evidence and reports, Israel carried out its aggression on the totally unfounded pretext that Iraq was producing nuclear weapons. It therefore arrogated to itself the functions of accuser, judge and executioner, and by carrying out its dangerous act of aggression it created an

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab  
Emirates)

extremely dangerous and serious precedent that undermines and casts doubt upon the international safeguards system. Israel's actions were, indeed, a rejection of that system.

At the time, Israel justified its aggression by so-called self-defence, under the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter, just as it did in its recent aggression against Tunisia. My delegation has on many occasions, and particularly during the discussions in the Security Council with regard to the aggression against Angola in September, revealed the falsity of all such pretexts. I shall not repeat our arguments again here. In the three acts of aggression that have taken place, the Security Council rejected the pretexts and justifications of the aggressors, and many States, including those which support Israel and the Government of South Africa, have rejected all such allegations and pretexts.

In light of the precedent set by Israel's act of aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installation and all its acts of aggression against the Arab countries, we are entitled to ask whether there are any international guarantees that would deter Israel from carrying out a further act of aggression against any Arab country that might come to possess a peaceful nuclear reactor. Such assurances and guarantees are extremely necessary, especially in view of the statements of Menachim Begin, the former Prime Minister of Israel, to the effect that Israel will destroy any new nuclear reactor that Iraq might build or that any other Arab country might build on its territory. Such assurances and guarantees are vital for international peace and security, for other countries might follow Israel's example. In such an event, we would have world anarchy.

For this reason, my delegation calls upon the General Assembly not to stop at the condemnation of Israel for its aggression. The international community should establish adequate guarantees to deter any future acts of this kind.

Mr. KOVACIC (Czechoslovakia): This year, for the fifth time, the General Assembly of the United Nations is dealing with the attack launched by Israel in June 1981 against the nuclear installations of a sovereign State that were designed exclusively for peaceful purposes in full compliance with article IV of the NPT. In so doing, Israel committed an act that seriously violated the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter and the norms of international law, for which there can be no excuse.

We resolutely reject the Israeli theory of so-called preventive defence. The United Nations Charter clearly states what is to be understood by the right to self-defence. The right to collective or individual self-defence cannot be applied in accordance with the United Nations Charter unless a State Member of the United Nations is attacked by military force. Israel was neither attacked nor even threatened. What threat could have been posed by nuclear installations designed for the utilization of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and with a view to promoting economic, scientific and technological progress and development? To build such installations is the sovereign right of every State fully complying with the NPT, to which Iraq is a party.

Israel, on the contrary, has persistently refused, despite numerous appeals, to accede to the NPT and to conclude the corresponding safeguards agreements. There are numerous reports that it has been pursuing the development of its own nuclear weapon. In carrying out that act of aggression, it manifested its utter disregard for the entire international system of peaceful uses of nuclear energy and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Kovacic, Czechoslovakia)

In accordance with the peaceful orientation of its foreign policy, Czechoslovakia has always rejected the policy of force as well as interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States. Immediately after the terrorist attack by Israel upon the Iraqi nuclear research centre, it voiced its principled disapproval of that act in a statement of its Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs and in a speech of its Permanent Representative to the United Nations in the Security Council. We classify the deliberate destruction of nuclear installations, even when carried out through the use of conventional weapons, as being equal to an attack involving the use of nuclear weapons, and thus as a most serious crime against humanity. We support Iraq's legitimate demand that Israel should provide compensation for the damage it has caused by its attack. We resolutely require that Israel give appropriate guarantees that it will never again attack nuclear installations and that it will respect the right of States to scientific and technological development.

When discussing the consequences of the gangster-like attack upon the Iraqi nuclear centre, we cannot fail to note that it was part of the broader Israeli aggression in the Middle East. The unprecedented attack upon peaceful nuclear installations had a clear purpose: to intimidate the Arab nations, to discourage them from waging a determined struggle against Israeli expansion and aggressiveness. At the Review Conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty, consideration of this question became one of the most difficult political issues as some Member States opposed a justified condemnation of Israel, arguing that the situation had changed since the time of the attack on the reactor.

The present situation shows that the resistance of nations and the United Nations measures against Israel have not had a sufficient effect. Israel continues to use its methods of pursuing the policy of State terrorism. In carrying out the recent attack on the PLO quarters in Tunis, it has proved that

(Mr. Kovacic, Czechoslovakia)

it has not abandoned this policy. Responsibility for that fact lies not only with Israel but also with those who support and justify its actions.

The justification of such a policy in the United Nations does nothing but undermine the Organization's importance, authority and ability to act. All its Members are in duty bound to observe all rules relating to their membership in the United Nations. This applies to Israel as well.

Czechoslovakia, along with the overwhelming majority of nations all over the world, desires that a lasting and equitable peace be established in the Middle East. Israel could find out that no aggression will allow it to impose an Israeli-style peace upon the Arab countries. The only way of terminating the protracted Middle East conflict is the way of negotiations among all States involved in it. Czechoslovakia therefore fully supports the proposal to convene an international conference on the Middle East to be attended by all the parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, under the aegis of the United Nations.

Mr. MARDOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): As everyone knows, nuclear energy is a promising source of energy with which to meet the steadily growing demands of mankind. Many countries are already receiving considerable benefits from the peaceful use of nuclear energy, and even more favourable possibilities lie in store in this field for the future.

Of course, each country has the inalienable right to develop its own research for the peaceful use of nuclear energy both for the production of electric and thermal energy and for other peaceful purposes. For that reason, any attempts, in particular any practical actions to destroy nuclear reactors, are totally inadmissible from all points of view, no matter what pretexts are adduced to justify these barbarous actions.

(Mr. Mardovich, Byelorussian SSR)

Meanwhile mankind has already witnessed the act of airborne banditry committed by the Israeli air force against the Iraqi nuclear research centre in the Baghdad area. The world community has branded that act as a premeditated act of aggression in violation of the United Nations Charter and the norms of international law, an act unprecedented in terms of its unforeseen consequences.

The attack on the Iraqi nuclear facility, which was covered by International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, and which was located within the territory of a State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, was an act of defiance by Israel, which shows that it disregards not only the Non-Proliferation Treaty but also the role and functions of the IAEA and the international safeguards system.

That act constitutes a threat not just to the lawful actions of sovereign States in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy but also to international peace and security in general. Such actions clash with the spirit and the letter of the United Nations Charter, the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and the Declaration and Programme of Action for the Establishment of a New International Economic Order.

It is necessary to discuss this agenda item in the General Assembly because Israel, in disregard of the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly that have been addressed to it, has been continuing quite openly to threaten to repeat such piratical acts in the future. For example, the Minister of Trade and Industry of Israel, Mr. Sharon, at a press conference held on 26 March 1985 in the town of Haifa, stated that Israel was entitled to strike at any nuclear reactor built by Iraq which constituted a threat to Israel's security. I refer to document A/40/283, annex.

The General Assembly cannot remain passive in the face of such aggressive and extremely dangerous intentions so brazenly expounded by the Israeli Minister.



(Mr. Mardovich, Byelorussian SSR)

The recent airborne banditry against Tunis shows that Israel has not renounced actions of brigandage and aggression against Arab States. This position of Israel, which continues to enjoy the comprehensive support of its overseas strategic ally, is a danger to international peace and security. It has heightened tensions in the Middle East and delayed the end of the acute crisis in the region for its countries and peoples.

L

(Mr. Mardovich, Byelorussian SSR)

The Israeli threat also makes it essential to continue to consider and to adopt at the international level effective legal measures to ensure that such armed attacks on nuclear facilities, and threats of such attacks, will not be allowed to occur again. This is exceedingly important for the promotion of the secure development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

The Byelorussian delegation, like other delegations that have taken part in the debate, wishes the General Assembly and the Security Council to take the most effective measures under the Charter to curb the aggressors and to put an end to their threats of attacks against the nuclear reactors of other countries and to ensure that such piratical acts will not be allowed to happen again.

Mr. HAMRA (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): Sudan has always participated in the discussion of the item on the armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, because we are extremely concerned about the situation and we are determined to find an adequate, radical solution so as to avoid a repetition, and we believe that the necessary sanctions should be imposed on anyone carrying out such acts.

Iraq was the victim of this aggression, which was carried out by the Zionist entity without any justification whatsoever, despite the fact that the Iraqi nuclear installations are under the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards and despite the fact that Iraq is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We believe that the international community should consider the situation very seriously, since it constitutes a threat to international peace and security, in order to avoid extremely serious consequences nationally, regionally and internationally, particularly in view of the fact that the theatre of operations is the Middle East, where Israel has been

(Mr. Hamra, Sudan)

responsible for aggression, destruction, continuous violations of sovereignty, occupation of territories and expulsion of people from their homes, thus challenging and rejecting all international conventions, international law and the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

My delegation has read with great interest the Secretary-General's report on this item and wishes to make the following comments, in the light of the response by the Government of the Zionist entity to the memorandum of the Secretary-General with regard to the measures it has adopted or intends to adopt in the context of paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 39/14.

First, the Israeli response is extremely vague and general and does not answer the question directly. It refers to a statement made in 1984 by the Executive Director of the Israeli Atomic Energy Agency. It states that nuclear facilities for peaceful purposes are not to be the object of military attacks and it states that Israel respects the measures adopted by IAEA with regard to safeguards.

We find a clear contradiction between the contents of that statement and the repeated declarations of the Government of Israel, which continuously threatens to launch further attacks against the Iraqi nuclear facilities - and here we refer to the statement by the Israeli Minister in March this year. He declared that Israel still maintains that it will repeat such acts of aggression. If Israel respects the system of the IAEA, why was Israel not satisfied with the guarantees and assurances given by the Agency with regard to the nature of the Iraqi nuclear facility before the attack, and why does Israel not submit its nuclear reactors to the IAEA safeguards system? Does this not reveal the true intentions of Israel, that is, to develop its nuclear capabilities for non-peaceful purposes? Indeed, we believe that Israel has done so a long time ago. It seems that Israel wishes to arrogate to itself the right to decide that it can act as an international

(Mr. Hamra, Sudan)

policeman, and deal with cases where, according to its own views, installations are not being used for peaceful purposes.

Thirdly, Israel continues to carry out acts of aggression against countries of the region regardless of condemnation by the international community. Its latest act of aggression against Tunisia is still fresh in all our minds. This act of aggression reflects Israel's expansionist and aggressive plans. Israel is always talking about peaceful boundaries. This is an excuse to carry out further acts of aggression and further annexation of Arab lands

We call upon the international community, represented in this General Assembly and in the Security Council, to adopt the necessary and appropriate measures to deal with this problem, in order to compel Israel to respect Security Council resolution 487 (1981) and in order to exert further pressure on Israel, so that it will ultimately accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and submit its nuclear installations to the IAEA safeguards system. That is an essential condition, and an essential undertaking that should be made by Israel to the international community. It should provide guarantees and assurances that it will not repeat such an attack against the Iraqi installations. We also call for compensation to be paid to Iraq for damage done by that act of aggression.

Finally, Sudan wishes to express its entire and total support for the draft resolution submitted on this item and we hope that this draft resolution will be adopted and will be implemented.

Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic):

During its thirty-ninth session the General Assembly once again condemned Israel for its refusal to comply with Security Council resolution 487 (1981). It also demanded that Israel withdraw its threats to attack and destroy nuclear facilities in Iraq and in other countries. Moreover, it requested the Security Council to consider taking the measures necessary to deter Israel from repeating such attacks on nuclear facilities. At the same time, it expressed its concern at Israel's refusal to comply with all the relevant United Nations resolutions.

One year after the adoption of that resolution, and five years after the air attack, we note that Israel has escalated its aggressiveness and stiffened its defiance of the United Nations. Israel has taken no action, either explicit or implicit, that indicates that it will not repeat its aggression.

Indeed, a spokesman of the Israeli Government, the war criminal Sharon, the perpetrator of the massacres at Sabra and Shatilla and other massacres, and the designer of the scheme to destroy Lebanon, said in March 1985:

"Israel had the right to attack any nuclear reactor installed by Iraq that constitutes a threat to Israel".

Instead of a clear-cut and absolute commitment not to attack any country's peaceful nuclear installations that are covered by the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Israel has given itself complete freedom to decide on the targets of its attacks, thus again challenging the United Nations and the entire international community and showing its complete disregard for the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the principles of international law.

The item before us concerns a threat not only to facilities in Iraq but also to the established international system for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, as well as a threat to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab  
Republic)

peace and security. It represents a threat, also, to the right of States to choose the best methods and means for their economic, technological and social development plans.

The General Assembly is in fact now considering the question of how to safeguard the international order in regard to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, as well as the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Hence, the Assembly should seriously consider this complex item, which combines elements related to the past, the present and the future.

Israel has an expansionist policy and is addicted to terrorism and war. By its aggressive actions it has constantly demonstrated its determination to attack and destroy everything that it thinks can help the Arabs to achieve economic, technical and social progress. In attempting to justify these acts, Israel claims that they are acts of self-defence. Israel has destroyed installations and facilities in occupied Palestine. It has usurped that land with everything it contains and deviates the waters there whenever it wishes. Israel has annexed land and built settlements. It has caused the dispersion of thousands of persons. All this is done in the name of Israel's security and on the pretext of ensuring stability for the settlers it has imported from all parts of the world. Israel has waged war after war against the surrounding Arab countries, in the name of its security. Israel has destroyed more than a third of Lebanon, including its capital, Beirut; it has killed and wounded no fewer than 30,000 persons - all in the name of its security. Israel has committed massacres, in the name of its security. It has defied the international community and violated the principles of international law and all civilized values, also in the name of its security.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

The most recent act of aggression was that against Tunis, in which Israel violated the sovereignty of another Arab State, caused the death of innocent civilians and destroyed many installations - all in the name of its security.

Israel would not have been able to bomb, destroy and kill without the support and blessing of successive United States Administrations, which have extended and still extend all kinds of support, unlimited support, to Israel. The United States has stated that Israel's aggressive capacity should be increased quantitatively and qualitatively, and that it should be more than the combined Arab defensive capability.

As an example, I would recall that in 1981 the United States Administration hastened to justify the destruction of the peaceful Ossirag nuclear reactor. We read the following in the memoirs of the then Secretary of State, Mr. Haig:  
(spoke in English)

"I argued that, while some action must be taken to show American disapproval, our strategic interest would not be served by policies that humiliated and weakened Israel. The President's deep natural sympathy for Israel and his understanding that she depended on American friendship came into play also. In the end, the President decided to delay the shipment of four F-16 aircraft - the type used in the raid by Israel".

(continued in Arabic)

We all remember that the delivery of the planes was delayed for only two or three weeks.

But things did not stop at that. On 16 June 1981 "Israel Radio" reported the following:

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab  
Republic)

"President Reagan declared in Washington that Israel had reasons to feel concerned about the Iraqi nuclear reactor which it had sent its planes to destroy. He said that Israel must really have believed that its attack on the Iraqi reactor was an act of self-defence.

"The President added, during the first press conference held immediately after the attempt on his life last March" -  
that is to say, in 1981 -

"that 'We have to admit that Israel's concern was justified by Iraq's record'."

It is not surprising that the United States has attempted to justify the latest air attack, against Tunis, as having been carried out in defence of Israel's security. The White House spokesman, Larry Speakes, made a statement on 18 October 1985 that reminded us of previous United States reactions. Referring to the attack against Tunis, he said:

"This was retaliatory action against terrorist action. It was a legitimate response and an expression of self-defence".

Those attempts to justify Israel's actions demonstrate to the world, and the Arab peoples in particular, that there is no use in trying to convince the United States to adopt an independent or objective policy towards Arab issues. On the contrary, they have convinced us even more that the strategic alliance between Washington and Tel Aviv is directed against the Arab peoples, threatens the territorial integrity of the Arab States and violates their sovereignty.



(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

Israel may now claim that it will not attack or threaten to attack any nuclear facilities, but it is abundantly clear to all that Israel, which has not acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which refuses to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, is developing its aggressive military nuclear capability. Information has emerged about the secret Israeli efforts to obtain a nuclear capability, to enhance that capability already obtained in 1951, through theft, blackmail, assassination and bribery. Assassination operations have been directed against Arabs and foreigners. In fact, Israeli adventures in this field resemble the thriller films of Hollywood. I shall refer to the last three series to show the real reasons behind the refusal of Israel to accede to the NPT and to accept the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) with respect to all its nuclear facilities, together with its refusal to declare the Middle East region a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

All this took place after it collaborated with the racist régime in Pretoria, conducting a joint nuclear explosion in 1979.

First, according to an article published in the New York Times of 17 May 1985, between 1979 and 1983 Israel obtained KRYPTON equipment. That equipment is used to ensure precise timing control of nuclear explosions. Israel bought that equipment on the American market, in complete violation of American laws which prohibit the export of such equipment. The American mass media said that this matter raised a storm in the United States and remained a secret in Israel. The secrecy of this matter shows that that equipment was imported for ominous nuclear purposes.

The second act in this drama is the fact that Israel acquired 47 tons of uranium in a manner contrary to international guarantees. The uranium was bought from Luxembourg. The shipment of this quantity of uranium was discovered by the Atomic Energy Agency of the European Economic Community. The source of this information is the Washington Post of 12 July 1985.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab  
Republic)

The third and last act is the negotiations in the United States aimed at involving Israel in "star wars", or what is called the strategic defence initiative. This was revealed by the magazine New Outlook in its May/June 1985 issue. That invitation to participate came from Mr. Weinberger, the American Defence Secretary, and was a pleasant surprise to the Israeli military establishment. General Ephraim Pura, former military advisor to the Governments of Rabin and Begin, described that when he said:

"We are talking about tens and even hundreds of millions of dollars in research and development grants, not to mention the scientific and technological spin-offs."

All this took place while Israel was falsely claiming that its security was threatened and that its bombing of specific objectives in Iraq, Lebanon or Tunis was only a self-defence operation.

The General Assembly should adopt a resolution, requesting the Security Council to adopt measures under Chapter VII of the Charter, unless Israel desists from acts of aggression against vital installations in Palestine, in other occupied Arab territories and against Arab capitals as well as Arab installations all over the world. The "policy of the long arm" should be subjected to mandatory Security Council sanctions. A total boycott must be imposed on Israel in all fields by all Member States individually and collectively, because its "policy of the long arm" on security grounds constitutes a grave threat to international peace and security.

A major concern of the Security Council, the General Assembly and other organs should be to prevent Israel desists from dictating development conditions to Arab countries and non-Arab countries because, through its attempt to impose its hegemony, Israel is trying to keep the Arab people in an underdeveloped condition

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

by bombing or threatening to bomb whatever it considers to be a threat to its security. Therefore the Security Council and the General Assembly should adopt all necessary measures to compel Israel to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, that very Treaty which Israel is trying to undermine. If the NPT régime is undermined, nuclear weapons will proliferate everywhere in the world, and then Israel will be faced with the consequences of that horrendous development.

Mr. BASENDWAH (Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): The years that have elapsed since Israel carried out its attack against the Iraqi nuclear reactor are replete with further acts of aggression by Israel against other Arab countries. Within one year of that attack, Israel invaded Lebanon, occupied its territory and remains in occupation of part of Lebanese territory.

Last month we celebrated the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. At the beginning of that month Israel carried out an act of aggression when it attacked a peaceful area in Tunisia and killed many innocent Tunisians and Palestinians, among them the elderly, women and children, not to mention its daily acts of aggression against the peoples of Lebanon and Palestine.

(Mr. Basendwah, Yemen)

As a matter of fact this is not very surprising, because throughout its history Israel has relied on aggression; I do not need to show how Israel was established as a result of an international conspiracy, some of the elements of which are still with us today. If today we are called upon to adopt a draft resolution condemning Israel for its attack - an attack carried out five years ago - that is because to condemn that attack repeatedly is the least we can do.

Israel, as we all know, exploits the weaknesses of the United Nations. It does whatever it wishes and carries out various acts of aggression, crimes and so forth. Israel is encouraged - and this is very regrettable - by a super-Power which is supposed to be the protector of international peace and security, the protector and guarantor of respect for the Charter of the United Nations and of the implementation of its resolutions. The United Nations confines itself to adopting resolutions and decisions of condemnation and denunciation, therefore this is the least we can do. We should condemn the aggressor in order at least to ensure that there is an act of moral condemnation, for indeed the aggressor is not subjected to any material sanctions or punishment.

However, regardless of the passage of time, the crimes of Israel should not be forgotten by the international community. Israel tried to justify its attack against the Iraqi installations in a completely unconvincing manner. That attempted justification is even uglier than the crime itself, for Israel claimed that Iraq might use the reactor for the production of nuclear weapons, although the peaceful purposes of Iraq in regard to that installation were well known. Everyone knows that Israel possesses a number of nuclear reactors, which are not for peaceful purposes but for aggressive, military purposes. The proof of that is Israel's continued refusal to submit its nuclear reactors to supervision and investigation by international inspectors to make sure that they are not being used for the production of nuclear weapons, and to ensure the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Basendwah, Yemen)

Israel also refuses to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Israel continues to use the logic that what is permitted to Israel is not permitted to others, be it Iraq or any other country in the region. Those countries must not be allowed to even possess nuclear reactors, unless the country is safe from attack by Israel, unless Israel is incapable of attacking that country.

We are called upon to condemn and denounce all the crimes of Israel, as long as the United Nations cannot put an end to the acts of that State, a State which, regrettably, is a Member of the United Nations.

We should make sure that the passage of time does not nullify the crime. The international community should not forget such crimes or the ugliness of such acts, so that the criminal does not escape responsibility or rely on the principle that with every new act of aggression the international community will be led to forget the earlier acts. Israel carries out further acts of aggression in order to make us forget the previous acts, and in order to carry out one act of aggression after another. Indeed, the condemnation of the criminal is called for so that he will cease to rely on the short memory of the international community; otherwise he will continue to kill and destroy, relying on the weakness of the United Nations, the passage of time and the principle that further acts of aggression make us forget the earlier ones.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): The details of the attack that the Zionist base of terror occupying Palestine launched on Iraqi nuclear installations have been duly dealt with by previous speakers. I shall therefore avoid repeating the facts, and instead shall concentrate on other aspects of that criminal act.

The nuclear facilities of Iraq did not and do not belong to President Saddam Hussein personally. They were and are the property of the Moslem people of Iraq and, in a wider sense, belong to the Moslem Ummah as a whole. The

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

military attack by the Zionist base of terror occupying Palestine is from our point of view of exactly the same criminal status as the attacks against Lebanon, Tunisia or the Islamic Republic of Iran. We therefore strongly condemn the military attacks carried out by the Zionist base of terror against the nuclear facilities in Iraq.

The military attacks against our own nuclear facilities, however, deserve the same treatment, and we therefore condemn such acts and believe that they must never be repeated.

We particularly support the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution which states:

"Aware that all States developing nuclear energy for peaceful purposes

need assurances against armed attacks on nuclear facilities" (A/40/L.9/Rev.1)

We support that with the understanding that the Islamic Republic of Iran is included and that the paragraph applies to Iraq as well.

My delegation has followed the comments made by the representative of the Zionist base of terror regarding the Iraqi chemical warfare attacks on our civilians, and all the rest of it. I deeply regret that those remarks happen to be valid. I wish they were not. I deeply regret that certain conduct by our adversary has given the pretext to the Zionist enemy to make such remarks in order to divert the attention of this international body from the crime it has perpetrated by bombing the property of the Moslem people of Iraq.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

Whatever faults the Zionist enemy may find with the Iraqi régime do not concern us, nor do they turn us aside from our crystal-clear position regarding the Zionist military attack against Iraqi nuclear installations.

The Zionist non-entity is the cause - the main cause - of all our problems in the Middle East, and the war of aggression imposed on us will never divert our attention from the Zionist enemy. The Zionist enemy may rest assured that it will never remain unobserved. It should await the united Islamic front which soon will move to raise the flag of Palestine once again over all of the occupied territories.

On the basis of the sublime teachings of Islam, the Islamic Republic of Iran is obliged to stand beside our Iraqi Moslem brothers and sisters, whose property has been destroyed by the Zionist non-entity. We shall never allow the Zionist enemy to take advantage of certain aspects of the war being waged against us in order to divide the common united position of the Moslem Ummah against the Zionist base in our region. However, regarding the substance of the draft resolution before us, we believe that it seems slightly to condone the actual crime that the Zionist enemy perpetrated against our Iraqi brothers and sisters.

First of all, the Zionist enemy violated the Islamic air space of Iraq, and this deserves special attention. Secondly, it attacked and damaged the property of the Moslem Ummah and the Moslem people of Iraq - that crime, too, must be dealt with. In order to make up for these shortcomings, my delegation wishes to move the following oral amendment. I should like representatives to add the following paragraph as the new operative paragraph 1:

"Strongly condemns all military attacks on all nuclear installations dedicated to peaceful purposes, including the military attacks by Israel on the nuclear facilities of Iraq."

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

I understand, and I am sure that all representatives remember, that the real official name of this artificial entity in our political literature is the Zionist base of terror. But in this context, we follow the United Nations tradition of using the name of so-called Israel in our draft amendment. I would request representatives to renumber the subsequent paragraphs accordingly; thus, the original operative paragraph 1 becomes 2, 2 becomes 3, etc.

Mr. KITTANI (Iraq): We are in New York, not Vienna, and the item under consideration is Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations. I state those two simple facts because, first of all, the representative of Israel - with others slightly supporting him - went on at great length to explain that because of certain actions in Vienna, to which I shall return in a minute, the Assembly should drop everything, and secondly, because no matter what the item under consideration, we are accustomed to hearing the same worn-out record from the representative of Israel, dragging in all sorts of extraneous matters that should be discussed elsewhere and at another time, if at all.

There is a time and place for most of those, other than here and now. Incidentally, that is also true of some worn-out remarks made just now by the representative of Iran. I shall concentrate on the matter at hand. But there are two parts of the Israeli statement that I cannot let pass without comment. My brother representative of Kuwait answered that same point very well, but there are a few other points I wish to stress.

Ambassador Netanyahu said that Mr. Sharon does not speak for the Government of Israel. If I heard him accurately, he said that only the Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister or a designated spokesman can speak for the Government of Israel. All right. He forgot to tell the Assembly that under the existing coalition Government, the Likud is to take over in less than a year. Mr. Shamir is supposed to be the Prime Minister then. Mr. Sharon would like to be the Prime Minister.



(Mr. Kittani, Iraq)

Can he assure us that then, whatever the policy he is propagating here will remain in force? That is the first point.

Are we simply to forget about the aggression by Israel and accept that in 11 months the man who has just threatened to repeat that act of aggression will become either Prime Minister or Foreign Minister, or perhaps a designated spokesman and that this will be all right? Is that what he is asking the Assembly to do? I see he is not here, but I am sure he will hear about this.

The second point is that no matter what the subject under consideration, the representatives of Israel, and especially Mr. Natanyahu, love to talk about terrorism. As a matter of fact, the media in the West, and in this country especially - he is the darling of the media in this country - have billed him as an expert on terrorism.

(Mr. Kittani, Iraq)

Well, he is. We are not surprised that Netanyahu is an expert on terrorism. Most Israelis are - and why? Because they introduced terrorism to our area and to the world. Mr. Netanyahu would like us to forget who blew up the King David Hotel, who committed the massacres of Qibya and Deir Yassin. Let me remind him and the Assembly: it was the Irgun Zvai Leumi. Who was the leader? Mr. Begin. Who killed Count Bernadotte? The Stern Gang. Who was a prominent member of that? The present Foreign Minister, who, I suppose, speaks for Israel. That Mr. Netanyahu cannot deny, because he is the Foreign Minister, and he was a Prime Minister until recently, and he will probably be Prime Minister in 10 months' time. Those are the people who introduced terrorism into Palestine and into the Arab world and into the world. No wonder it became official Israeli policy and remains so.

What Israel commits and what the same people who were terrorists and heads of terrorist gangs adopted as the official policy of Israel is condoned and overlooked, and the victims of that terrorism and that aggression and that expansion are accused of being terrorists. We shall read about it again tomorrow, maybe in The New York Times, equating Palestinians with terrorism and Israel as a victim of terrorism. But that is standing history and logic on its head.

I come back to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). First of all, what happens in the IAEA is a very small part of what we are talking about here, which is Israeli aggression. It is true that, in addition to what has happened here in the Security Council and in the General Assembly, IAEA has taken certain actions. Here, I want to say the following. Israel sent a letter claiming that it had complied with a resolution adopted by the General Conference of the IAEA. We have pointed out in our statement, and so have numerous other speakers at this rostrum, that that is not so. If it were so, all that would be needed would be for the representative of Israel to come here now and make the following statement, one sentence: "Israel will not attack any nuclear facility fully under the IAEA

(Mr. Kittani, Iraq)

safeguards." Can Israel make that simple statement here - and I address myself especially to the representative of Luxembourg, who spoke about this, and to some from further north in Europe who have not yet spoken.

There is another aspect to what happened in Vienna. There was another resolution, in addition to the one referred to by Mr. Netanyahu, which was submitted by Iraq and certain other countries. That resolution received 41 votes in favour. The resolution that was quoted by Israel and Luxembourg - and on the basis of which they would like us to close the whole matter, not just in Vienna, but here as well - received 30 votes in favour. But, through a procedural gimmick, it was possible to say that the one that received 41 votes needed two thirds and the other one did not: so one passed, the other one did not pass. They are too smart to try such tricks here, Mr. President, knowing you are in the Chair, but they would like to use that to draw the wool over the eyes of the representatives in the General Assembly.

What is the crux of the matter? It will be recalled very well that in June 1981, when we suffered this grievous, expensive, flagrant act of aggression, we did not go to Vienna, we came to the Security Council. You, Sir, were a member of that Council at the time and Mexico was the President. We presented our case, and the same worn-out arguments of Mr. Netanyahu were presented. And what happened? A resolution was adopted unanimously, with the vote of the United States of America, which had the same Administration as now. It was a different ambassador, it was Mrs. Kirkpatrick, but it was the same Reagan Administration.

At that same series of meetings the IAEA, which has been drummed up here in defence of inaction, was represented by its then Director General, Mr. Eklund, who made a very moving statement. He said - as you, Mr. President and all who were there will recall - that that aggression was an attack not only on Iraq but on the

(Mr. Kattan, Iraq)

safeguards themselves. That is a direct quotation from Mr. Eklund. The Israeli action, he said, was an attack on the safeguards system of the IAEA, which is the backbone of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

Year after year the Security Council, the General Assembly and, the International Atomic Energy Agency have asked Israel to put its installations under the safeguards system, any internationally accepted safeguards system - but no. How can Israel be made to do that? It refuses. It also refuses to evacuate the occupied territories or to recognize the rights of the Palestinians. South Africa refuses to give up its illegal occupation of Namibia. South Africa refuses to recognize the rights of the majority black people in Africa. What is the Assembly to do? Is it because South Africa and Israel refuse to comply with the resolutions of this body that people get tired and say, "Oh, you are just bringing it up again. The Africans bring up apartheid every year," and so on.

We have just celebrated the fortieth anniversary of this Organization. I listened very carefully to most - I must admit not all - of the statements made both in the general debate and, more important during the commemorative part of our session. I recall one common denominator, one thing that ran through all that debate - that what is wrong with this Organization is precisely non-compliance with the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly - in the cases of Namibia and the aggression against our nuclear installations, resolutions adopted unanimously. People talk about the veto; there was no veto, there was a unanimous vote. But it is Israel and South Africa, and we are unable to persuade them, to coerce them. Each year there is tremendous, flagrant pressure on this country and that to change its vote. So the The New York Times, can say as it will tomorrow, "Iraq got fewer votes; people are getting tired; Israel is being picked on again"

(Mr. Kittani, Iraq)

and "South Africa is being pressured, and it is hurting the blacks". We know that many countries, unfortunately, either succumb to, submit to or are persuaded by some of the arguments in such cases. It is unfortunate, because we believe that each one of these cases is a nail in the coffin of international peace and security, of the Non-Proliferation Treaty system and the safeguards system and, perhaps more important, of the credibility, effectiveness and prestige of this Organization.

Since 1981 we have been asked - I shall not name names, but representatives all know which countries I mean - what we got from acceding to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. What did Iraq get? What guarantee did we have that our Tammuz facilities were fully under the safeguards system of the IAEA? In none of the reports of the IAEA inspection teams IAEA was there ever a question or a reservation about Iraq's compliance with the NPT system.

(Mr. Kittani, Iraq)

If the Organization does not make Israel at least make an unequivocal, clear-cut commitment not to repeat its act of aggression, and perhaps to submit its own facilities to international inspection, it is indeed driving very big and long nails into the coffin of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the safeguards system.

That is all I have to say, Mr. President. I move the closure of the debate under rule 75 of the rules of procedure and ask you now to put the draft resolution to a recorded vote.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting on draft resolution A/40/L.9/Rev.1.

I remind members that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): Ecuador reiterates its position of principle of rejection of the use or threat of use of force, of any concept of armed retaliation or aggression, even if it is presented in the unacceptable guise of preventive war.

Respect for the Charter implies refraining from recourse to the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. The settlement of international disputes by peaceful means is an imperative and tends to facilitate disarmament and release resources for the constructive purposes of development.

The international community should take steps to reconcile differences and seek to bring peoples closer together until they practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, to borrow the words of the Charter.

Thus, with respect to draft resolution A/40/L.9/Rev.1, which is now before us, on action for which Ecuador has repeatedly expressed its support, we believe it

(Mr. Albornoz, Ecuador)

should not remain silent in respect of such positive statements as the one contained in the report of the Secretary-General, which is not mentioned in the draft resolution. That report, which contains an official communication from the representative of Israel to the United Nations, reflects a positive aspect of this question.

Furthermore, as similar declarations have been received by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), where this question has been closed, it would not appear to be appropriate to adopt a draft resolution that would tend to reopen it in the IAEA.

For these reasons Ecuador will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/40/L.9/Rev.1. In so doing we express the belief that points of agreement rather than of disagreement among Member States should be sought if we are to move towards real observance of the provisions of the Charter, to whose guiding principles the Members of the Organization, whether or not founding Members, owe loyalty and respect, particularly, during this session at which we commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. SVOBODA (Canada): Canada's position in condemning Israel's 1981 military attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor is well known and has been stated many times in this forum and elsewhere.

Draft resolution A/40/L.9/Rev.1 as it stands, however, presents my delegation with serious difficulties. In our view it is inappropriate for a number of reasons.

First, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) annual conference in September of this year adopted its resolution 765, which fully responded to many of the points raised in the text before us, and in so doing, after four years, should have completed both the Agency's and this forum's consideration of the matter.

Secondly, the text before us does not appropriately take account of this, and indeed seeks to have the issue raised again in the IAEA.

(Mr. Svoboda, Canada)

Thirdly, Canada cannot support the request in paragraph 3, which implies the imposition of further restrictive measures against Israel; nor can we support the call in paragraph 7, which would have the effect of preventing organizations such as the International Atomic Energy Agency from co-operating with all their member States, including Israel.

Finally, there are aspects of the text which we do endorse, such as the call to Israel to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards, a position Canada supports with respect to all States in a similar situation. None the less, the balance of the content of this draft resolution leaves Canada no alternative but to vote against it.

Mr. OKUN (United States of America): The United States will vote against this draft resolution because we strongly believe that the issue it purports to address was decisively resolved by the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency in September, after four years of difficult and painstaking consideration.

As all member delegations are aware, the International Atomic Energy Agency Conference adopted a resolution which concluded that Israel had

"committed itself not to attack peaceful nuclear facilities in Iraq, elsewhere in the Middle East or anywhere else".

Israel explicitly confirmed its acceptance of this commitment at the Conference, including the 26 September statement made by the Director-General of the Israel Atomic Energy Commission at the direction of the Foreign Minister of Israel. That statement was circulated on 24 October as a General Assembly document.

The attempt to reopen this issue flouts the clear intention of the majority of the membership of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The United States considers this issue closed, and views the draft resolution before us as an unfortunate attempt to reopen it.



The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I have to inform the Assembly that the following countries have become sponsors of draft resolution A/40/L.9/Rev.1: Bangladesh, Cuba and Malaysia.

The Assembly will first take a decision on the oral amendment submitted by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. If adopted, it would become paragraph 1 and the following paragraphs would be renumbered accordingly. The amendment reads:

"Strongly condemns all military attacks on all nuclear installations dedicated to peaceful purposes, including the military attacks by Israel on the nuclear facilities of Iraq;".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, United States of America

**Abstaining:** Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mali, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire

**The amendment was adopted by 79 votes to 2, with 50 abstentions.\***

---

\* Subsequently the representative of Gambia advised the Secretariat that he had intended to vote in favour.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/40/L.9/Rev.1, as a whole, as amended. The amendment just adopted will become operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, and the other paragraphs will be renumbered accordingly.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Bolivia, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, France, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Malawi, Mexico, New Zealand, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Spain, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire

Draft resolution A/40/L.9/Rev.1, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 88 votes to 13, with 39 abstentions (resolution 40/6).\*

---

\* Subsequently the delegation of Gambia advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes. I would remind members that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. FERM (Sweden): Sweden's clear condemnation of the Israeli attack against the Iraqi nuclear installation in 1981 is on record. There can be no doubt about the seriousness with which the Swedish Government regards such attacks in Iraq or elsewhere in the world. We also give our whole-hearted support to the call upon Israel to place its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards.

Against this background, my delegation regrets that it was compelled to cast a negative vote on the draft resolution just adopted. The reason for our decision is the fact that the text contains several elements which are unacceptable to my delegation. I am referring in particular to the sixth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 2 and 4 - now paragraphs 3 and 5. The main thrust of these paragraphs is in clear contradiction of the relevant elements of resolution 443, sponsored by the Nordic countries and adopted by the General Conference of IAEA about a month ago. Furthermore, it is the Swedish view that the question of following up Security Council resolution 487 (1981) should lie within the Council itself. The Swedish Government pursues a clear and consistent policy as regards the importance it attaches to the IAEA safeguards system and the inviolability of nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful purposes. It was therefore with deep regret that we were left with no alternative but to vote against the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. FREUDENSCHUSS (Austria): Austria abstained on the draft resolution just adopted. This does not change the Austrian position in general, that is, strong condemnation of Israel's attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor in 1981.

(Mr. Freudenschuss, Austria)

Austria does not, however, consider the changes made in the draft resolution just adopted in comparison with resolution 39/14 to be conducive to its achieving its aims.

Mr. MARIN POSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Since 1981 Mexico has given its resolute support, both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly, to the draft resolutions which have been submitted on this disturbing issue. Furthermore, in June 1981 we had the honour, as President of the Security Council, to be in charge of the consultations which led to the unanimous adoption of Security Council resolution 487 (1981). Accordingly, a few moments ago we voted in favour of the amendment submitted by the delegation of Iran.

Nevertheless, we found ourselves obliged to abstain on draft resolution A/40/L.9/Rev.1 as a whole, as amended. There are various reasons for this, the chief one being that my delegation believes it would have been preferable for the draft resolution just adopted to embody in their entirety the results of the recently concluded General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The 29th Annual Conference of IAEA, which was held just over a month ago, adopted resolution 443, on this very subject on 27 September 1985. Unfortunately, the content of that resolution has not been properly reflected in the resolution that we have just adopted.

Mr. FARMER (Australia): Australia abstained on the draft resolution on this issue. This vote was based in part on our firm condemnation, expressed at the time, of the attack four years ago by Israel on the nuclear installation located in Iraq. Nothing has changed that would cause us to alter our view that that attack was carried out in contravention of the norms of international behaviour.

(Mr. Farmer, Australia)

Australia strongly supports the international non-proliferation régime and the vital role that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), in particular its safeguards system, plays in supporting that régime. Australia is therefore sensitive to and concerned about any action we perceive as threatening that régime. Elements of the draft resolution just adopted call on IAEA to become involved in matters which are outside its strict area of competence, and this could have effects on the continued smooth technical operation of the Agency.

(Mr. Farmer, Australia)

A point of particular concern for the Australian delegation relates to the terms of operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of the IAEA General Conference resolution of 26 September 1985. Those paragraphs accurately represent the position that has been taken by Israel in committing itself not to attack peaceful nuclear facilities in Iraq, elsewhere in the Middle East, or anywhere else. The Australian delegation views paragraphs 1 and 3 of the present resolution in that light. Indeed, we think that the IAEA General Conference resolution raises the question whether continued pursuit of this matter in this and other international forums is likely to produce constructive results.

The call in operative paragraph 4 for Israel to place all its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards control is one that Australia fully supports.

Moreover, in operative paragraph 8, the Conference on Disarmament is asked to continue negotiations with a view to immediate conclusion of the agreement on the prohibition of military attacks on nuclear facilities. Australia this year presided over the work of the relevant Ad Hoc Working Group in the Conference on Disarmament on this subject. Real progress was registered in that Ad Hoc Group because of the constructive spirit that prevailed there. We therefore welcome the inclusion of this paragraph. But, in doing so, we do not underrate the difficulties of immediately concluding an agreement on the issue, as called for in the paragraph. Such expectations would be unrealistic at this stage. Australia will none the less continue to contribute to the work of the Conference on Disarmament on this matter, with a view to the Conference's concluding an agreement as soon as possible.

Mr. MACIEL (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/40/L.9/Rev.1, despite the fact that it contains several serious shortcomings, and despite the fact that we were given only 24 hours to read,

(Mr. Maciel, Brazil)

analyse and vote on it. That is not a good procedure, especially when we are dealing with an important matter like this.

One of the most serious shortcomings of the document is that it fails to mention the report presented by the Secretary-General in document A/40/783. That report had been requested by the General Assembly itself. It has a direct connection with operative paragraph 1 of the resolution, and therefore it should have been taken into consideration.

The sixth paragraph of the preamble to the resolution mentions "the internationally recognized criteria for the definition of a peaceful nuclear facility". I doubt whether anyone could tell us what are "the internationally recognized criteria" to which this paragraph refers.

Operative paragraph 4 - the former operative paragraph 3 - seems to disregard the fact that the matter has been withdrawn from the agenda of the IAEA. It apparently tries to reopen, through the General Assembly, what was closed in Vienna. It contains, in our view, a conceptual imprecision of some importance.\*

Operative paragraph 8 deserved some examination in connection with decisions taken by the IAEA, but again that has not been done.

Operative paragraph 9 is drafted in very imprecise language, which should have been improved.

Had we had a little more time and not been pressed because of a 24-hour time-limit, it would have been possible to draft a more weighty resolution that would certainly have received more support than the present one has.

Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation believes it important to place on record the fact that its vote in favour of draft resolution A/40/L.9/Rev.1 was prompted by our position of principle - that is, our

---

\*Mr. Oyoue (Gabon), Vice-President, took the Chair.



(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

condemnation of all violations of international law as well as our condemnation of the use of force in flagrant contradiction with unequivocal commitments assumed by Member States under the United Nations Charter.

I should have preferred it, however, if the draft resolution that has just been adopted had referred in one of the paragraphs of the preamble to the report of the Secretary-General distributed in document A/40/783; that report contains a statement by the Director General of the Israeli Atomic Energy Commission.

Moreover, my delegation reserves its position with respect to certain technical concepts, contained in both the preamble and the operative part of the resolution, that are not in conformity with resolutions adopted in the framework of the IAEA.

Mrs. CARRASCO (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Bolivia has always condemned any violation of international law. In the present case, it has condemned the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi peaceful nuclear facilities. We now repeat this condemnation. We believe that the Security Council should ensure that its resolution 487(1981) is implemented.

We nevertheless abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/40/L.9/Rev.1 because it was submitted very late and contained certain technical flaws pertaining to the IAEA. Moreover, it fails to mention the report of the Secretary-General in document A/40/783.

Mr. BEAUGE (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Argentina has repeatedly expressed strong condemnation of Israel's aggression against the Iraqi nuclear facilities and the serious consequences that that aggression entailed for the internationally established system for the peaceful use of nuclear energy. In that connection, we voted in favour of the draft resolution that became General Assembly resolution 39/14.

(Mr. Beauge, Argentina)

This afternoon some amendments were submitted to draft resolution A/40/L.9. We regret that we were thus not given enough time to consider those amendments thoroughly.

On this occasion, for reasons of principle connected with the question of safeguards, which were not covered in the draft resolution to our satisfaction, we were compelled to abstain in the vote on it.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Assembly has completed its consideration of agenda item 29.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.