

MAR 14 1989

UN/SA COLLECTION



UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SIXTH YEAR

2280th MEETING: 12 JUNE 1981

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2280).....	1
Expression of welcome to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Tunisia	1
Adoption of the agenda.....	1
Complaint by Iraq: Letter dated 8 June 1981 from the Chargé d'affaires of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14509)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2280th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 12 June 1981, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. Porfirio MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2280)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Complaint by Iraq:

Letter dated 8 June 1981 from the Chargé d'affaires of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14509)

The meeting was called to order at 4.40 p.m.

Expression of welcome to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Tunisia

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like, at the outset of this meeting, to acknowledge the presence at the Council table of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Tunisia, Mr. Béji Caid Essebsi, to whom, on behalf of the Council, I extend a warm welcome.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Iraq:

Letter dated 8 June 1981 from the Chargé d'affaires of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14509)

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Algeria, Brazil, Cuba, India, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Pakistan, Romania, the Sudan, Turkey and Yugoslavia, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance

with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Hammadi (Iraq) and Mr. Blum (Israel) took places at the Council table and Mr. Bedjaoui (Algeria), Mr. Corrêa da Costa (Brazil), Mr. Roa Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Krishnan (India), Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan), Mr. Al-Sabah (Kuwait), Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon), Mr. Ahmad (Pakistan), Mr. Marinescu (Romania), Mr. Abdalla (the Sudan), Mr. Kirca (Turkey) and Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 11 June 1981 from the representative of Tunisia [S/14521], which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request the Security Council to invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the consideration of the item entitled 'Complaint by Iraq', in accordance with the Council's usual practice."

4. The proposal of the representative of Tunisia is not made pursuant to rule 37 or rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, but if approved by the Council the invitation to participate in the debate would confer on the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) the same rights of participation as those conferred on a Member State when invited to participate under rule 37.

5. Does any member of the Security Council wish to speak on this proposal?

6. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): The United States opposes extending to the PLO the same rights of participation in the proceedings of the Security Council as if that organization represented a State Member of the United Nations. We have consistently taken the position that, under the Council's provisional rules of procedure, the only legal basis on which the Council may grant a hearing to persons speaking on behalf of non-governmental entities is rule 39. For 35 years the United States has supported a generous invocation of rule 39 and would not object in this case. We are, however, opposed to special *ad hoc* departures from orderly procedures. In particular, the United States does not agree with the recent practice of the Council which appears selec-

tively to try to enhance the prestige of those who wish to speak in the Council through a departure from the rules of procedure. We consider this special practice to be without legal foundation and to constitute an abuse of the rules. For these reasons, the United States requests that you, Mr. President, put the terms of the proposed invitation to the vote. The United States will vote against it.

7. Mr. DORR (Ireland): Sir, since this is the first time that I have spoken since you assumed the office of President, I should like to extend my good wishes to you as President and to say that we are pleased that your country, and you in particular, will preside over our debate this month. I should also like to thank and pay tribute to the skill and good sense of our colleague, the representative of Japan, who presided over our debates in the month of May.

8. The Irish delegation will vote in favour of the proposal to invite the representative of the PLO to participate in the present debate. We are aware that the terms in which it is proposed that this invitation be issued have in the past been a matter of controversy. I should like therefore briefly to explain our vote.

9. The position of Ireland on the Middle East question was stated in the General Assembly on 30 September 1980 by my Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Lenihan.¹ He drew attention to two principles which Ireland considers essential elements in a peace settlement and which had already been stressed by the heads of State and Government and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the nine member States of the European Community in their declaration at Venice on 13 June 1980 [S/14009]. These principles are, first, the right to existence and security of all the States in the region, including Israel; and, secondly, the requirement of justice for all the peoples involved, which includes the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people within the framework of a peace settlement.

10. My Foreign Minister continued:

“It is only by reconciling these two principles through negotiation that a comprehensive, just and durable settlement can be found. Such negotiation must involve all the parties concerned, including the PLO”.

This continues to be the position of my country, and it is against this background that we have approached the present procedural proposal.

11. In considering how to vote on the proposal, we have also taken particular account of the following points: first, the PLO has had the status of observer at the United Nations for the past seven years; secondly, the Council has frequently in the past invited the PLO to participate in debates relating to Middle East issues; and, thirdly, the terms of the proposed invitation as just read out by you, Mr. President, are precisely

those used by the Council on every other occasion since 1975.

12. It has been argued that an invitation phrased in these terms is contrary to the provisional rules of procedure under which the Council has operated since 1946. It is true that the exact terms of the invitation, as stated by you, are not spelt out in the rules. But neither do we see anything in the terms of the invitation that is contrary either to the rules or to the Charter. We note that the particular formula used specifically states that rule 37, which is applicable to States Members of the United Nations, does not apply here—though, indeed, the extent of the participation granted to the PLO representative would be similar in practice to that envisaged in rule 37 in the case of States. We think this is quite legitimate. We believe it is within the authority of the Council, when it extends an invitation, to set such terms for participation as it considers appropriate to the particular case; and in the present case we believe that the Council is acting within its powers in issuing an invitation in the terms which you have just read out.

13. In brief, we see no procedural reason to object to a formula established in the Council for five years now, and we are prepared in practice to hear the views of the PLO representative on the present issue. Accordingly, after very careful consideration, Ireland will vote in favour of the present proposal.

14. Mr. NISIBORI (Japan): The Government of Japan has repeatedly expressed its considered view that it is essential for the solution of the Middle East question that the PLO, representing the Palestinians, participate in peace talks. In 1975 [1859th meeting] Japan, as a member of the Security Council, expressed the position that the PLO, as one of the major parties to the Middle East question, should be invited when the Council conducted its deliberations on the Middle East question, including the question of Palestine. I should like at this time to confirm that position.

15. In regard to the item before us today—namely, “Complaint by Iraq”—although it is a problem in the Middle East, in our view the direct and major parties are rather limited. Therefore, we believe that rule 39 of the Council’s provisional rules of procedure is applicable under the present agenda item and we would support the participation of the PLO in the debate of the Security Council if this were requested under rule 39.

16. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): As no other member of the Council wishes to speak, I take it that the Council is ready to vote on the proposal of Tunisia.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: China, German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: France, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The proposal was adopted by 11 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

17. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter, dated 11 June, from the representative of Tunisia [S/14524], which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request the Security Council to invite Mr. Chedli Klibi, Secretary-General of the League of Arab States, to participate in the consideration of the item entitled 'Complaint by Iraq', under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure."

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to the request.

It was so decided.

18. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Council is meeting today in response to the request contained in a letter dated 8 June from the Chargé d'affaires of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations, addressed to the President of the Security Council [S/14509]. I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the following other documents: S/14510, letter dated 8 June from the representative of Israel to the President of the Council; S/14511, letter dated 9 June from the representative of Spain to the President of the Council; S/14512, letter dated 9 June from the representative of Japan to the President of the Council; S/14513, letter dated 9 June from the representative of Egypt to the Secretary-General; S/14514, letter dated 10 June from the representative of Iraq to the President of the Council; S/14515, letter dated 10 June from the representative of Panama to the President of the Council; S/14516, letter dated 11 June from the representative of the German Democratic Republic to the President of the Council; S/14517, letter dated 11 June from the representative of Pakistan to the Secretary-General; S/14518, letter dated 11 June from the representative of the Philippines to the President of the Council; S/14520, letter dated 11 June from the representative of Tunisia to the President of the Council; S/14523, letter dated 12 June from the representative of India to the President of the Council; S/14525, letter dated 11 June from the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the Secretary-General; and S/14526, letter dated 12 June from the representative of Viet Nam to the Secretary-General.

19. The first speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, Mr. Saadoon Hammadi. I welcome him and invite him to make his statement.

20. Mr. HAMMADI (Iraq): Mr President, allow me first to express to you, and through you to the members of the Council, my gratitude for convening this meeting and for giving me the opportunity to address the Council on the question of the flagrant act of aggression committed by Israel against Iraq.

21. On Sunday, 7 June 1981, at 1837 hours, Baghdad local time, Israeli warplanes raided the nuclear installations situated near Baghdad, causing many civilian casualties and much material damage. The Zionist aggressors announced on the following day their responsibility for the attack, brazenly claiming the total destruction of the installations.

22. It is worth recalling that this was not the first attack of its kind carried out by the Zionist aggressor. We believe that Zionist warplanes carried out two raids aimed at the same installations on 27 September 1980.

23. In order to put the Israeli act of aggression in its proper perspective, it is necessary to deal with the motives and objectives of Zionist policies, and particularly those in the nuclear field.

24. It is no longer a secret that the founders of the Zionist entity had contemplated from the very beginning the possession of nuclear weapons as a means to guarantee the continued exile of the Palestinians, and continued expansion over Arab territories in order to realize the Zionist dream of "Greater Israel".

25. The Israeli nuclear programme goes back as far as 1949. The most important experiments conducted by the Weizmann Institute in the early 1950s concerned the development of techniques of uranium extraction from phosphates in the Negev desert, as well as those relating to the production of heavy water. In 1952 the Ben Gurion Government established the Atomic Energy Commission within the framework of the Defence Ministry, with a separate budget and special laboratories. The existence of that Commission was kept secret until 1954. In 1953 a nuclear co-operation agreement was concluded with France which marked a turning point in the Israeli nuclear programme. The fact remains, however, that the United States was the first country to provide Israel with a nuclear reactor under an agreement concluded in 1955—namely, the reactor at Nahal-Soreq, which had a five-megawatt capacity. The United States contributed \$350,000 towards the cost of that reactor and provided Israel with a vast library of books, studies and reports, as well as six kilograms of enriched uranium-235. Furthermore, 56 Israelis were trained in American nuclear establishments. Subsequently, Israel obtained another American reactor with an eight-megawatt capacity; it was installed at the

Technion Institute. In 1957 the decision was taken to construct the highly secret reactor at Dimona, and in 1958 a reactor at Rishon Lizion with a five-megawatt capacity was constructed in co-operation with the United States.

26. The decade of the 1950s also witnessed the provision to Israel of nuclear material and technology by the United States Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and the beginning of co-operation in the nuclear field with the Federal Republic of Germany. In 1964 the Dimona reactor became operational with a 24-megawatt capacity and a possible production of 5 to 7 kilograms of plutonium annually. That quantity is sufficient for the production of a nuclear bomb with 1.2 times the force of the Hiroshima type.

27. It is to be noted that the Dimona reactor was obtained from France, and the truth about it was not disclosed until the CIA revealed in 1960 that what the Americans were told was a textile factory was in fact a nuclear reactor. *The New York Times* stated on 20 December 1960 that the Dimona reactor was "particularly well suited for producing fissionable plutonium used in nuclear bombs". The same newspaper reported in its issue of 18 July 1970 that American experts who had visited the reactor had complained in 1969 that there was no guarantee that work relating to armament was not being undertaken in Dimona, in view of the restrictive procedures imposed by Israel on inspection.

28. It is well known that Israel has had a nuclear capability for a number of years. As far back as 1969, the *Buffalo Evening News* carried on its front page on 9 May a Reuters report published in the West German magazine *Der Spiegel* stating that Israel had become the world's sixth nuclear Power and had six Hiroshima-type bombs of 20 kilotons, produced at Dimona.

29. On 5 December 1974, *The New York Times* quoted Israeli President Ephraim Katzir as saying that Israel "possesses the potential to produce atomic weapons" and will do so "if we need it".

30. At the Conference on a Non-Nuclear Future, held at Salzburg in May 1977, Paul Leventhal, a former staff nuclear-weapons expert for the Senate Government Operation Committee of the United States, revealed that 200 tons of natural uranium, enough to build 42 nuclear weapons, which had been placed on a ship that had disappeared nine years before, had ended up in Israel. The uranium had been loaded onto a cargo ship named *The Scheersburg A* which had sailed out of Antwerp bound for Genoa, where it never arrived. The cargo of *The Scheersburg A* was reported to be capable of keeping a Dimona-type reactor operating and producing plutonium for 20 years. Shortly after the Salzburg revelation, Norway's former chief prosecutor stated that Israeli agent Dan Aerbel had admitted taking part in the operation to divert the uranium-laden ship. Aerbel had been

seized in 1974 by the Norwegians with four other members of Israel's Mossad, the Israeli secret service, for the killing of a Moroccan national who was mistaken for a Palestinian by the Israeli agents at a small town in Norway.

31. According to an article published in *The Times* of London on 14 August 1980, the CIA had mistakenly released the text of a five-page secret document in 1974 which stated categorically that Israel was engaged in a nuclear-weapons programme. Part of the uranium was described as having been obtained by "clandestine means" which, although this was not spelled out, was understood to refer to various raids in Europe by squads of underground Mossad agents. The report—all but two paragraphs of which would have remained classified, had a bureaucratic slip not led to its publication—stated in a key section:

"We believe that Israel already has produced nuclear weapons. Our judgement is based on Israeli acquisition of large quantities of uranium, partly by clandestine means, the ambiguous nature of Israeli efforts in the field of uranium enrichment, and Israel's large investment in a costly missile system destined to accommodate nuclear warheads."

32. *The Times* went on to say that recent foreign reports had suggested that South Africa was now Israel's main partner in a secret nuclear-weapons development programme. The article also referred to a mysterious blast detected off the coast of South Africa in September 1979 by an American spy satellite. It also referred to the manuscript of a book written by two Israeli journalists entitled *None Will Survive Us: The Story of the Israeli A-Bomb*, which contained information to the effect that the blast was the result of a joint nuclear test by Israel and South Africa. The blast of September 1979 was followed by another in December of the same year, and the second event was recorded by another United States satellite.

33. *The Middle East Magazine*, in its issue published in London in April 1981 which contained an investigative report on the Israel-South Africa nuclear link, states that:

"once again the White House said that the flash was 'probably not' a nuclear blast and suggested it was a 'micro-meteor hit', although scientists say this is likely to occur only once in 10 years. Even the CIA is not prepared to accept this a second time and has pointed out that, as in the previous incident, South African warships were positioned secretly at sea just below the flash point."

The magazine further quotes Marvin Cetron, the Pentagon's private weapons analyst, as saying:

"Were I in the White House, I would try and give as many different possible alternatives as could be technically feasible, hoping to take off the

high probability of its being a nuclear explosion. Obviously, it is a cover-up."

34. Nor was that the first attempted White House cover-up of its kind. In the mid-1960s the United States Government discovered that more than 200 pounds of highly enriched weapons-grade uranium, enough for at least four atomic bombs, was missing from the Nuclear Materials and Equipment Corporation (NUMEC) plant in Apollo, Pennsylvania. In his well-documented book *The Zionist Connection*, Alfred Lilienthal states that:

"The most serious nuclear safeguards case the U.S. ever faced broke into the open in late February 1978 when the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) released a 550-page report in response to a House committee inquiry over previous testimony given by NRC Executive Director Lee V. Gossick. In revealing that Gossick had 'testified incorrectly', the report confirmed that the CIA had evidence that Israel had the atomic bomb by 1968 and that bomb material in fact had been diverted from the Apollo plant. Equally important to the report was that CIA third-ranking official Carl Duckett had informed a closed meeting of the NRC in 1976 that President Johnson had been told eight years earlier that Israel had atomic weapons. The President had told CIA Director Richard Helms, 'Don't tell anyone else, not even Dean Rusk or Robert McNamara' (then the Secretaries of State and Defense respectively)."

The story was broken by *The Washington Post* in its issue of 2 March 1978.

35. The same Carl Duckett, who is currently a consultant to the United States Senate, repeated in an interview broadcast by ABC Television on the ABC News Close-up broadcast on 27 April 1981 that there was a clear consensus in the CIA that indeed NUMEC material had been diverted and had been used by the Israelis in fabricating weapons. He also confirmed that President Johnson had ordered Director Helms not to tell anybody else. Duckett further stated:

"The key impression to me was that indeed it was taken very seriously by the President, and obviously he was very concerned that we protect that information."

36. Iraq has embarked upon a vast and ambitious programme of development. In doing so, my Government recognized at an early stage the importance of science and technology, including the peaceful application of nuclear energy, for the achievement of social and economic development. Working towards that goal, we have made efforts to expand our nuclear-research facilities and to widen the scope of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. We have also recognized that the development of alternative sources of energy is becoming increasingly vital and that the peaceful use of atomic energy will be one of the most important alternatives for some time to come.

37. Despite the basic imbalances and discrimination which are to be found in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*], Iraq was one of its first adherents. We signed the Treaty on 1 July 1968 and ratified it on 29 October 1969. In 1972 my country concluded an agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for the application of safeguards to all our nuclear activities, as required by the Non-Proliferation Treaty. On numerous occasions my Government has expressed its conviction that full and faithful implementation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty would make a major contribution to its twin objectives—namely, horizontal and vertical non-proliferation and the promotion of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. We attach special importance to international co-operation in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Besides being a member of IAEA, Iraq has concluded bilateral co-operation agreements with a number of countries. With a view to strengthening and promoting co-operation in scientific and technical research, the Iraqi Atomic Energy Commission has, together with other organizations, sponsored several conferences and seminars, with the participation of scientists from other countries.

38. It can no longer be denied that it is the sovereign right of every country to seek knowledge and to pursue the application of science and technology, including nuclear technology for peaceful purposes, in the interests of economic and social development. We firmly believe that the widening gap between the developed and the developing countries cannot be narrowed without the full utilization of science and technology, including the peaceful application of nuclear energy.

39. Article IV of the Non-Proliferation Treaty provides as follows:

"1. Nothing in this Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all the Parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with articles I and II of this Treaty.

"2. All the Parties to the Treaty undertake to facilitate, and have the right to participate in, the fullest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Parties to the Treaty in a position to do so shall also co-operate in contributing alone or together with other States or international organizations to the further development of the applications of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, especially in the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States Party to the Treaty, with due consideration for the needs of the developing areas of the world."

40. Moreover, at the Havana Summit Conference in 1979, the non-aligned countries reaffirmed the inalien-

able right of every country to undisturbed and independent development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy.³ A similar position was adopted by the Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers at its special session held at Fez, Morocco, in September 1980 [see S/14207, annex]. In addition, repeated resolutions of the General Assembly have reaffirmed that right, subject to appropriate safeguards.

41. Israel prepared the ground for its act of aggression by a vast propaganda campaign alleging that Iraq was engaged in a programme of nuclear-weapons production. The countries which had concluded co-operation agreements with Iraq were denounced and vilified. The severity of the campaign prompted Mr. Jean François-Poncet, the then Foreign Minister of France, to question the reasons for such a campaign. He recalled that Iraq was, after all, the thirty-fifth country to buy a nuclear research reactor. There were 34 other countries which had imported 78 atomic reactors for such purposes, working with enriched uranium. Most of the reactors were of American construction. The countries included South Africa, South Korea, Thailand, the Philippines, Zaire, and so on. The French Government also issued a statement on 29 July 1980 which expressed astonishment at the fabricated accusations being levelled against it for its co-operation with Iraq. The statement pointed out Iraq's right, together with that of all other States, to utilize nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and found no basis upon which Iraq could be prevented from exercising that right. In conclusion, the statement reaffirmed that the co-operation of the French Government with Iraq was carried out with perfectly legitimate objectives and was covered by all the necessary safeguards.

42. The Zionist campaign did not stop at that. There were acts of terrorism, sabotage, international piracy and physical liquidation carried out by Zionist undercover agents in order to obstruct Iraq's peaceful nuclear programme.

43. The motives behind the Zionist campaign and aggression against Iraq are, first, the desire to cover up Israel's possession of nuclear weapons and secondly and more importantly, the determination not to allow the Arab nation to acquire the scientific or technical knowledge necessary for its development and progress. The Zionists believe that they can thus impose their diktat on the Arab nation. The more the Arabs advance in their scientific knowledge, the weaker the Zionist chances are of maintaining their occupation of Arab territories and their denial of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

44. It is evident that the Israeli nuclear programme has been geared to military purposes from its very inception and that all sorts of illegal means have been employed for its enhancement, in total violation of internationally accepted standards. Despite the repeated calls upon Israel to accede to the Non-Prolif-

eration Treaty, it has bluntly refused to do so. Iraq, in contrast, by accepting the terms of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, has fully subscribed to those standards in its nuclear programme. In that context, I should like to quote the following from the statement made by the Director General of IAEA at the opening meeting of that Agency's Board of Governors on 9 June:

"Iraq has been a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty since it came into force in 1970. In accordance with that Treaty, Iraq accepts Agency safeguards on all its nuclear activities. These safeguards have been satisfactorily applied to date, including during the recent period of armed conflict with Iran. The last safeguard inspection at the Iraqi nuclear centre took place in January of this year, and all nuclear material there was satisfactorily accounted for. This material included the fuel so far delivered for the Tamuz reactors."

45. Iraq, being mindful of the danger posed to international peace and security by the Israeli armament programmes, has taken the initiative since the convening of the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament in 1978, in bringing to the attention of the world the dangers of those Israeli programmes. The General Assembly, at its thirty-third session, adopted a resolution sponsored by 36 Member States entitled "Military and nuclear collaboration with Israel" [resolution 33/71 A]. In paragraph 2 of that resolution, the Assembly requested the Security Council, in particular, to call upon all States, under Chapter VII of the Charter and irrespective of any existing contracts:

"(a) To refrain from any supply of arms, ammunition, military equipment or vehicles, or spare parts therefor, to Israel, without any exception;

"(b) To ensure that such supplies do not reach Israel through other parties;

"(c) To end all transfer of nuclear equipment or fissionable material or technology to Israel".

The resolution further requested the Council to establish machinery for supervising the implementation of the measures referred to in the paragraph just quoted.

46. During the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, Iraq, supported by 25 other Member States, inscribed an item on the agenda entitled "Israeli nuclear armament". The Assembly adopted resolution 34/89, in which it called upon Israel to submit all its nuclear facilities to inspection by IAEA. The Assembly also strongly condemned any attempt by Israel to manufacture, acquire, store, test or introduce nuclear weapons into the Middle East. It further requested the Security Council to adopt appropriate measures to ensure the implementation of the relevant resolutions concerning Israeli nuclear armament.

47. Furthermore, Iraq has actively supported the initiatives taken in the General Assembly concerning the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, particularly in the Middle East and in the Indian Ocean.

48. The attack carried out by Israel against Iraq is clearly an act of aggression in accordance with the provisions of the Charter as expounded on in the *Definition of Aggression in General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX)*. The Israeli allegation that it acted in legitimate self-defence is totally unfounded, in fact and in law.

49. The Israeli act of aggression is a severe blow to the internationally accepted system for the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. The Director General of IAEA, in his statement to the Board of Governors, which I referred to earlier,⁴ said:

“This attack on the Iraqi nuclear centre is a serious development with far-reaching implications. The Agency’s safeguards system is a basic element of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. During my long time here, I do not think we have been faced with a more serious question than the implications of this development. The Agency has inspected the Iraqi reactors and has not found evidence of any activity not in accordance with the Non-Proliferation Treaty. A non-NPT country has evidently not felt assured by our findings and about our ability to continue to discharge our safeguarding responsibilities effectively. . . . From a point of principle, one can only conclude that it is the Agency’s safeguards régime which has also been attacked. Were will this lead us in the future? This is a matter of grave concern which should be pondered well.”

50. Iraq had already warned the Council in a letter dated 29 July 1980 [S/14073] that the Zionist campaign against Iraq was a prelude to an air strike against the Iraqi nuclear reactor, as Israel had in its possession American-manufactured aeroplanes with a range that enabled it to strike within Iraqi territory. This Zionist act of aggression against Iraq constitutes a qualitative change in the aggressor’s policy in the area. It is a clear indication of the determination of the Zionists, after the failure of Camp David, to escalate their provocations with acts of armed aggression prior to launching a full-scale war in order to subjugate the Arab countries and to impose full Zionist domination over the whole Middle East.

51. In conclusion, I should like once again to emphasize that the Israeli attack against my country is a clear-cut act of premeditated aggression. The whole world has recognized that fact. The elaborate preparations that preceded the commission of that act were fully described by the Prime Minister of Israel and other Israeli leaders in their press conference held at Tel Aviv on 10 June. What is worse is that Mr. Begin stated categorically at that press conference that, if

Iraq tried to rebuild the reactor, Israel would do all it could to destroy it again.

52. Faced with this grave situation, the Council cannot, in our opinion, limit itself to a mere condemnation of this act of Israeli aggression. The Council should reaffirm the right of all States to develop nuclear programmes for peaceful purposes. Mandatory sanctions in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter should be imposed upon Israel to remove the grave menace to international peace and security posed by its actions. Israeli lawlessness should be brought to an end. The Council must decide that all States—and especially the United States of America—shall, under Chapter VII of the Charter, refrain from providing Israel with any military material or technical co-operation or assistance which might encourage it to pursue its policy of expansion and aggression. Something more than condemnation should take place if we really want to have a world of law rather than a world of blind force. In addition, the Council should, in the interest of peace and stability in the Middle East, demand that all Israeli nuclear installations be opened to inspection, and subject to the safeguards system of IAEA.

53. There should be very little doubt, especially among the members of the Council, that Israel’s real target on Sunday, 7 June 1981, was not merely our peaceful nuclear installations. The Zionists and their friends were actually aiming at Iraq’s crucial role in rallying the Arab nations against the Camp David conspiracy, in making a real contribution towards strengthening the world of Islam and the non-aligned movement, and in being the vanguard of the fight against colonialism, racism including zionism, and all other forms of domination. They want to undermine the new Iraq and all that it stands for. That target is indestructible.

54. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of Israel. I invite him to make his statement.

55. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Mr. President, at the outset, let me take this opportunity of conveying to you our felicitations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of June. You, Sir, represent a country with which mine has the friendliest and most cordial of relations. Since Mexico’s election to the Council last year, you personally have exhibited great qualities of diplomacy and statesmanship. That was particularly the case when you acted as President of the Council in April of last year, a month in which a series of difficult debates took place. We have every confidence that, as President of the Council for a second time, you will handle its business with the same wisdom and expertise.

56. I should like to take this opportunity also to express my compliments to the representative of Japan, Mr. Nisibori, who conducted the Council’s

business last month in an exemplary fashion, with all his well-known skill and grace.

57. On Sunday, 7 June 1981, the Israel Air Force carried out an operation against the Iraqi atomic reactor called "Osirak". That reactor was in its final stages of construction near Baghdad. The pilots' mission was to destroy it. They executed their mission successfully.

58. In destroying Osirak, Israel performed an elementary act of self-preservation, both morally and legally. In so doing, Israel was exercising its inherent right of self-defence as understood in general international law and as preserved in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

59. A threat of nuclear obliteration was being developed against Israel by Iraq, one of Israel's most implacable enemies. Israel tried to have that threat halted by diplomatic means. Our efforts bore no fruit. Ultimately we were left with no choice. We were obliged to remove that mortal danger. We did it cleanly and effectively. The Middle East has become a safer place. We trust that the international community has also been given pause to make the world a safer place.

60. Those facts and the potentials for a safer world are widely recognized. Several States in the Middle East and beyond are sleeping more easily today in the knowledge that Saddam Hussein's nuclear-arms potential has been smashed.

61. But all this will not preclude a hypocritical parade here in the Council. Nothing will prevent numerous Members of the United Nations from the usual ganging-up on Israel for reasons of spite and expediency. Nothing will stop them from hurling abuse at us, even though they know in their heart of hearts that it is Israel that has relieved them of an awesome menace. Their cant and crocodile tears will do the Organization no credit. The sham and charade will not add to the stature of the Council, and pontification will not further the cause of peace.

62. Israel has long believed in a different, more constructive approach. We advocate the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, grounded in a multilateral treaty, reached through direct negotiations by all the States concerned. This is the moment for the Council to lend its support to Israel's proposal. I shall return to our proposal at greater length towards the end of my statement.

63. Ever since the establishment of the State of Israel over 33 years ago, Iraq has been conspiring to destroy it. Iraq joined several other Arab States which attacked Israel the day after it became independent in 1948. But while other Arab States—Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan and Syria—signed armistice agreements with

Israel in 1949, Iraq adamantly refused to do so. Instead, it fomented and supported the unrelenting Arab belligerency and terrorism against Israel. It also took part in the Arab wars against Israel in 1967 and 1973. And it has doggedly rejected any international measure or instrument which might imply even the most indirect recognition of Israel and its right to exist.

64. On 22 October 1973, when the Security Council called for a cease-fire in the Yom Kippur War [resolution 338 (1973)], the Baghdad Government announced: "Iraq does not consider itself a party to any resolution, procedure or measure in armistice or cease-fire agreements or negotiations of peace with Israel, now or in the near future".

65. In June 1977, the then President of Iraq, Ahmad Hasan Al-Bakr, asserted that "efforts . . . must be consolidated . . . to support the liquidation of the racist Zionist entity so as to build a democratic society".

66. More recently, the Iraqi ambassador at New Delhi had the following to say at a press conference reported by the Middle East News Agency on 24 October 1978: "Iraq does not accept the existence of a Zionist State in Palestine . . . the only solution is war". And only last year, in his statement at the 4th meeting of the seventh emergency special session of the General Assembly, the representative of Iraq found it necessary to restate his Government's opposition to the very existence of my country.

67. In sum, Iraq declares itself to have been in a state of war with Israel since 1948. Hence, it has rejected all United Nations efforts to seek a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute. It has publicly rejected Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

68. Iraq has missed no opportunity to make it clear that it will not abide by international law in respect to Israel and that it reserves its freedom of action with regard to Israel. This perverse doctrine found expression in the so-called "National Charter" of Iraq, proclaimed by its President, Saddam Hussein, in February of last year and circulated at the request of the representative of Iraq [S/13816, annex].

69. The principles allegedly underlying that Charter were said to include, *inter alia*, the non-use of force and the peaceful settlement of disputes. Yet, in paragraph 3, they were specifically excluded with regard to my country on the grounds that it is a "deformed entity [which] is not considered a State". That same Charter, in paragraph 4, committed Iraq in no uncertain terms to all-out warfare against Israel and enjoined other Arab States to participate in that war, using "all means and techniques".

70. In a letter to the Secretary-General of 11 March 1980 [S/13838], I drew attention to the fact that this undisguised denial by one Member State of the right of

another Member State to exist is in flagrant violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. I observed that it was a matter for surprise that a document so violently opposed to everything that the United Nations stands for should be circulated at all as a document of the Council, whose primary responsibility is the maintenance of international peace and security. The United Nations, and the Council in particular, were unmoved.

71. Not by accident has Iraq taken a lead among those Arab States which reject out of hand any solution of the Arab-Israeli dispute by peaceful means. To translate its words into deeds, Iraq has used its petro-dollars to develop a sophisticated technological and military infrastructure. It sees itself as the leader and linchpin of the so-called Eastern Front which the Arab rejectionist States established in Baghdad in 1978 against Israel. Despite its involvement in a war of aggression against Iran, Iraq has continued to indicate its willingness to send men and *matériel* to take part in any military hostilities that the rejectionist Arab States may initiate against Israel.

72. Over and beyond the development of its conventional forces, Iraq has in recent years entered the nuclear armaments field methodically and purposefully, while at the same time piously appending its signature to international instruments specifically prohibiting it from doing so.

73. As far back as 8 September 1975, Saddam Hussein was quoted in the Lebanese weekly *Al-Ushu Al-Arabi* as saying that the acquisition of nuclear technology by his country was the first Arab attempt towards nuclear armament. By way of comment on reports that Iraq would be the first Arab country to acquire an atomic bomb, the Iraqi oil minister at the time was reported on 30 November 1976 in the Kuwaiti paper *Al-Qabas* to have declared a week earlier that all Arab States should participate in a project to produce an atomic bomb. And according to the *International Herald Tribune* of 27 June 1980, Na'im Haddad, a senior member of Iraq's Revolutionary Command Council, stated at a meeting of the League of Arab States in 1977 that "the Arabs must get an atom bomb".

74. In brief, the Council is now confronted with an absurd situation. Iraq claims to be at war with Israel. Indeed, it prepares for atomic war. And yet it complains to the Security Council when Israel, in self-defence, acts to avert nuclear disaster.

75. I would like to remind the representative of Iraq that a State cannot invoke in its favour benefits deriving from certain provisions of international law without being prepared at the same time also to abide by the duties flowing from international law. Arab States, including Iraq, seek to impose on Israel duties stemming from the international law of peace while simultaneously claiming for themselves the privileges of the international law of war.

76. In recent years, Iraq has been the most active Arab State in the nuclear field. Its goal has been the acquisition of a military nuclear option. Permit me to elaborate.

77. In 1974, Iraq attempted to acquire a 500-megawatt nuclear power reactor of the graphite-gas type which had been developed in the 1950s primarily for the production of large quantities of plutonium for military use. Although that request was turned down, it was nevertheless agreed to supply Iraq with a 70-megawatt nuclear reactor of the Osiris type, which is considered one of the most advanced reactors of its kind in the world.

78. Iraq demanded that its supplier provide it with weapons-grade nuclear fuel—that is, uranium enriched to a level of 93 per cent. When it comes to research, this type of fuel is generally confined to use in nuclear facilities with an extremely low capacity—from 1 to 10 megawatts.

79. Iraq's supplier undertook to provide it with about 80 kilograms of this weapons-grade uranium. In 1979, the supplier tried to persuade Iraq to accept a far lower grade of uranium, but the Iraqis insisted on the previous deal. To fulfil it, the supplier had to draw from stockpiles in its own military nuclear arsenal.

80. During 1980 the supplier dispatched to Iraq the first shipment of the enriched uranium concerned, containing 12 kilograms. This shipment enabled Iraq to put into operation a smaller nuclear reactor provided by the same supplier. Israel learned from unimpeachable sources that following the delivery, expected soon, of two additional shipments of weapons-grade uranium weighing about 24 kilograms, Osirak would be completed, and put into operation within the next few weeks—and not later than the beginning of September 1981. Thirty-six kilograms of weapons-grade uranium in Iraq's possession would enable it to make a nuclear bomb.

81. This, of course, is by no means the end of the story. Iraq has also purchased complementary fuel-cycle technology: namely, four research laboratories for the study of the chemical processes of fuel preparation and its recycling, as well as the reprocessing of irradiated fuel. From the point of view of nuclear weapons, the most significant is a radio-chemistry laboratory, known as the "hot cell", used for the separation of irradiated fuel and the extraction of plutonium. This project is scheduled for completion in 1981.

82. Together with the construction of these facilities, Iraq has been energetically investigating the possibility of acquiring nuclear power reactors which operate on natural uranium and heavy water. Such reactors produce large quantities of plutonium which, as is well known, is used in the manufacture of nuclear weapons.

83. In order to build up the reserves of uranium needed to attain self-sufficiency, Iraq has operated in four parallel directions: (a) it has bought weapons-grade enriched uranium on the international black market; (b) it has acquired uranium through bilateral deals; (c) it has obtained enrichment facilities; and (d) it has begun an intensive search for uranium on its own territory.

84. Iraq already possesses aircraft capable of delivering nuclear warheads. In addition, it is involved in the development of a new surface-to-surface missile with an effective range of up to 3,000 kilometres, also capable of delivering a nuclear warhead. Unlike Israel, Iraq, for well-known reasons, has not embarked on its large-scale nuclear programme for reasons of pure research, despite its protestations to the contrary. And again unlike Israel, Iraq has certainly not embarked upon its nuclear programme because it faces an energy crisis. Iraq is blessed with abundant supplies of natural oil and, when not engaged in foreign adventures against one of its neighbours, it is normally one of the largest oil suppliers in the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries.

85. No amount of bluster can hide one simple, basic fact: Iraq's nuclear programme has, beyond a shadow of doubt, just one aim—to acquire nuclear weapons and delivery systems for them.

86. Academic and public figures who follow these matters have had no illusions about Iraq's nuclear objectives in the military field. For example, on 5 August 1980, the Paris newspaper *France-Soir* published an article on Iraq's nuclear programme containing a warning by the eminent French atomic scientist Francis Perrin, who had served as head of the French Nuclear Energy Commission from 1951 to 1971. Referring to Osirak, Perrin explained that it is fuelled by highly enriched uranium which can be used to produce an atomic weapon.

87. Similarly, on 27 March 1981, Senator Alan Cranston told the United States Senate that "This massive Iraqi nuclear development program is underway despite the fact that Iraq has no parallel program for developing commercial nuclear power." Senator Cranston went on to say that he had been informed authoritatively that Iraq was pursuing a nuclear-weapons capability option and that: "Iraq, though at the present time party to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, is embarked on a full-scale program that appears designed to develop the capability to extract plutonium suitable for weapons purposes."

88. Senator Cranston explained that Iraq had vigorously embarked on an approach of the Manhattan Project type, which could provide it with nuclear explosives of the Hiroshima size. Senator Cranston's concerns were heightened by the fact that Iraq is governed by what he termed "a radical, militarily aggressive régime which routinely employs terrorism to advance its aims".

89. The combination of an Osiris reactor, and about 80 kilograms of weapons-grade nuclear fuel, together with laboratories for the production of plutonium would have enabled Iraq to acquire a nuclear-weapons capability by the mid-1980s. To produce nuclear weapons, Iraq could have opted for one of two paths: (a) the production of three to four nuclear explosive devices on the enriched uranium path, by using the fuel supplied for operating Osirak, or, (b) the use of plutonium produced by Osirak and the reprocessing laboratory for the production of one plutonium bomb a year.

90. Further cause for anxiety was given by the delivery of weapons-grade nuclear material without proper provision for the return of the fuel rods after use.

91. Any lingering doubts about Iraq's intentions to acquire nuclear weapons to be used against Israel were removed just two days ago by the Iraqi Minister of Information. According to yesterday's edition of *The New York Times*, Latif Jassem wrote in the State-run newspaper *Al-Jumhuriya* on 10 June that the Israeli attack on Osirak last Sunday showed that Israel knew that its "real and decisive danger" came from Iraq.

92. In plain terms, Iraq was creating a mortal danger to the people and State of Israel. It had embarked on ramified programmes to acquire nuclear weapons. It has acquired the necessary facilities and fuel. Osirak was about to go critical, in a matter of weeks.

93. Over the last few years Israel has followed Iraq's nuclear development programme with growing concern. We have repeatedly expressed our demand both publicly and through diplomatic channels that nuclear assistance to Iraq should be terminated. On various occasions, Israeli representatives drew the attention of the United Nations General Assembly and of its First Committee to the frantic efforts being made by Iraq and its supporters to establish a nuclear axis aimed against Israel. The Government of Israel has repeatedly urged the European countries involved to stop assisting Iraq's systematic drive to attain a military nuclear capability, stressing the grave implications of such aid to Iraq for all concerned. We also urged other friendly Governments to use their influence in that direction. All these public and diplomatic efforts by Israel went unheeded while, at the same time, the pace of Iraq's nuclear development increased.

94. I should add that Israel was not alone in its apprehensions. Several neighbours of Iraq and other States in the Middle East also expressed their deep concern to Iraq's suppliers over Iraq's nuclear ambitions—but to no avail.

95. Precious time was lost, and Israel was left facing the stark prospect that within a very short period of time Osirak would become critical, or, in the jargon of nuclear scientists, was about to go "hot". Israel was

left with an agonizing dilemma. Once Osirak had become hot, any attack on it would have blanketed the city of Baghdad with massive radioactive fallout. The effect of that would have been lethal and tens of thousands, and possibly hundreds of thousands, would have been grievously harmed.

96. On the other hand, Israel could not possibly stand idly by while an irresponsible, ruthless and bellicose régime, such as that of Iraq, acquired nuclear weapons, thus creating a constant nightmare for Israel. Saddam Hussein's régime has amply demonstrated its total disregard for innocent human life both at home and in its war with Iran. Given the nature and record of that unscrupulous régime, the vast dangers for Israel inherent in the creation of an Iraqi military nuclear potential are self-evident.

97. The Government of Israel, like any other Government, has the elementary duty to protect the lives of its citizens. In destroying Osirak last Sunday, Israel was exercising its inherent and natural right to self-defence, as understood in general international law and well within the meaning of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

98. Commenting on the meaning of Article 51 of the Charter, Sir Humphrey Waldock, now President of the International Court of Justice, stated in a lecture delivered at The Hague Academy of International Law in 1952 that

"it would be a travesty of the purposes of the Charter to compel a defending State to allow its assailant to deliver the first and perhaps fatal blow. . . . To read Article 51 otherwise is to protect the aggressor's right to the first strike."

99. In a similar vein, Professor Morton Kaplan and Nicholas de B. Katzenbach wrote in their book, *The Political Foundations of International Law*:

"Must a state wait until it is too late before it may defend itself? Must it permit another the advantages of military build-up, surprise attack, and total offense, against which there may be no defense? It would be unreasonable to expect any State to permit this—particularly when given the possibility that a surprise nuclear blow might bring about total destruction, or at least total subjugation, unless the attack were forestalled."⁶

100. Professor Derek Bowett of Cambridge University, in his authoritative work on *Self-Defense in International Law*, observed:

"No state can be expected to await an initial attack which, in the present state of armaments, may well destroy the state's capacity for further resistance and so jeopardize its very existence."⁷

101. So much for the legalities of the case. Still, we have been accused of acting unlawfully. Presumably it

is lawful for a sovereign State to create an instrument capable of destroying several hundred thousand Israelis; it is unlawful to halt that fatal process before it reaches completion.

102. The decision taken by my Government in the exercise of its right of self-defence, after the usual international procedures and avenues had proved futile, was one of the most agonizing we have ever had to take. We sought to act in a manner which would minimize the danger to all concerned, including a large segment of Iraq's population. We waited until the eleventh hour after the diplomatic clock had run out, hoping against hope that Iraq's nuclear arms project would be brought to a halt. Our Air Force was only called in when, as I have said, we learned on the basis of completely reliable information that there was less than a month to go before Osirak might have become critical. Our Air Force's operation was consciously launched on a Sunday, and timed for late in the day, on the assumption that the workers on the site, including foreign experts employed at the reactor, would have left. That assumption proved correct, and the loss in human life, which we sincerely regret, was minimal.

103. I should add that those same considerations worked in the opposite direction as regards Iraq's other nuclear facilities and constrained Israel from taking action against the smaller Western-supplied research reactor, as well as a small Soviet research reactor. Both of those facilities are operational and, if attacked, could release substantial amounts of radiation.

104. In this connection, I wish to deny in the most categorical terms the false allegation made here by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq—who had the courtesy to leave the Chamber when I started my statement—that Iraq's nuclear installations were attacked by Israel on any date prior to 7 June.

105. With regard to the statement of the Foreign Minister of Baghdad as a whole, let me just observe that he added yet another tale to the *Tales of 1,001 Nights*, which, if I am not mistaken, were also written, like his statement, in Baghdad.

106. Iraq has unashamedly used the United Nations as an instrument to divert international attention from its nuclear weapons programme. By way of a smoke-screen, it launched an attack on Israel, which came to be known as the "Iraqi initiative"; at the tenth special session of the General Assembly in 1978 devoted to disarmament. Despite its manipulation of that special session and of the First Committee of the General Assembly ever since, in its unremitting campaign against Israel, nothing can or could camouflage its own nuclear weapons programme.

107. By contrast, Israel has long been committed to the concept that the most effective way to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to the Middle East would

be the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region, modelled on the Tlatelolco Treaty⁸, which is based on an initiative of the Latin American countries and on direct negotiations among them.

108. Israel has repeatedly given expression to this idea. Since 1974 Israel has proposed it annually in the General Assembly and in other international forums. At the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly in 1980, Israel submitted a draft resolution on this subject in document A/C.1/35/L.8, which spelt out in precise terms our proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. To our great regret, this proposal was rejected out of hand by a number of Arab States, first and foremost by Iraq, whose representative even challenged Israel's right to sit in the First Committee. The Iraqi position could only mean that Iraq rejects any possibility of creating a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

109. Israel's proposal stands. With full awareness of the many political differences among the States of the Middle East, and without prejudice to any political or legal claim, it behoves all the States of the region, for the sake of their common future, to take concrete steps towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

110. It is for that reason that, in a letter dated 9 June 1981 to the Secretary-General⁹ Israel further elaborated its proposal and formally and urgently requested all States of the Middle East and States adjacent to the region to consent in the course of the current year to the holding of a preparatory conference to discuss the modalities of such a conference of States of the Middle East with a view to negotiating a multilateral treaty establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

111. The Security Council now has a clear-cut choice before it. It can resign itself to the perpetuation of the well-established pattern of one-sided denunciations of my country which can only serve as a cover and encouragement for those who entertain destructive designs against it; alternatively, the Council can address itself seriously to the perils and challenges that confront us all.

112. It is in keeping with this latter approach that I invite the Council to consider carefully Israel's proposal regarding the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. We believe that the advancement of our proposal will constitute a significant contribution to the future well-being and security of all the States of the Middle East.

113. Beyond that, the time has come for serious stock-taking, for we are concerned here with a matter of grave import, crucial to the future of the Middle East and, I dare say, to the entire world. Certain lessons must be drawn.

114. Israel has always held the conviction that no international conflict can be solved by the use of force. By the same token it must also be clear that the selfish pursuit of narrow interests, economic and other, can only exacerbate international tensions.

115. For its part, Israel will not allow itself to be the victim of such a cynical approach. We are an ancient people. We are imbued with an indomitable will to live. That will has been forged in a crucible of 3,000 years of suffering. We have survived the most terrible of tests. We have re-established our national independence. We are firmly rooted in our own land. We have the means and the determination to defend ourselves and we are resolved to do so.

116. For 30 years and more the world has watched with equanimity the unrestrained and unending aggression of Iraq and others against my country. Iraq and its supporters, both in the Arab world and beyond, have been encouraged by the apathy and appeasement of the international community and by their own ability to manipulate the world Organization for their bellicose ends and lawless policies.

117. The time has surely come for the United Nations in general, and the Council in particular, to persuade Iraq and its supporters that international conflicts cannot be solved by plotting the demise of a sovereign State. The only way to solve any conflict is to negotiate its peaceful resolution, for peace and peace alone will ensure the rights of all the States involved and guarantee their well-being and security.

118. Mr. CAID ESSEBSI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Since the announcement of the atrocious act committed on Sunday, 7 June, against one of our Member States, Iraq, the eyes of the world have turned to the United Nations and to its supreme body entrusted with the task of maintaining international peace and security, as well as respect for the fundamental principles of the Charter.

119. Since that act of war was reported, the world has been awaiting the reaction of the Security Council. It considers that the Council should discharge its responsibilities to the full. The world awaits reassurance as to the capacity of the Organization to react to the event and to respond in an appropriate manner to the requests of its Member States when they are the victims of blatant aggression. It also awaits reassurance as to the nature of the reaction of the Organization to the aggressor, one of its Member States, which persists in considering itself a Member State while at the same time trampling underfoot the basic principles of the Charter and the most elementary rules of international law and morality.

120. Such, Mr. President, is the importance of the task entrusted to us today. It means that we must rely on your patience and your experience as well as on your dedication to the principles which govern our

work, so that we may be able to give the world the response it expects of us and the assurances it has a right to require of the Council. In congratulating you, Sir, on the occasion of your accession to the presidency of our important body, my delegation wishes to express to you its best wishes for success and to assure you at this particularly critical moment that you will have its full co-operation. It does so with great pleasure since you represent a great country, an advocate of so many noble and just causes with which Tunisia has friendly and close relations.

121. My delegation would be remiss were it not at the same time to convey to your predecessor, the representative of Japan, the very sincere tribute he deserves for the admirable and particularly effective manner—reports of which have reached even our capital cities—in which he led the work of the Council for the month of May.

122. Mr. President, in assuring you just now of Tunisia's full co-operation, my delegation was merely expressing its loyalty to a constant principle of its foreign policy that has existed since the dawn of its independence and that consists in attaching absolute primacy to international law, outside of which nothing is valid. It was right here in New York on 22 November 1956 that the President of the Tunisian Republic, President Bourguiba, declared that:

"We shall work to strengthen the United Nations so that it may be not only a moral force but a genuine supranational tribunal which lays down the law and has the ability to enforce it."¹⁰

123. In coming to New York today on behalf of Tunisia and on behalf of the Arab nation that has been the victim of blatant aggression, I am simply asking you, the members of the Council, which is much more than a moral force, to lay down the law and to draw from the Charter that governs your work the means to enforce it. That is precisely the substance of the request just made with eloquence and conviction by my colleague and friend the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, Mr. Saadoun Hammadi, whose statement has broadly and objectively enlightened us as to the significance we should attach to the Israeli act of aggression.

124. On 7 June, while the world was following with all due attention the diplomatic activities taking place in the Middle East region with a view to defusing the crises and tensions there, and while we noted, with some scepticism mixed with a feeling of mitigated satisfaction, that diplomacy was winning out over armed confrontation, the initiators of that so-called peace action publicly received a resounding slap in the face.

125. In fact, at that very moment the leaders of Israel were putting the final touches to preparations for a true war expedition. At that very moment, orders were

being given to a military staff possessing the most sophisticated weaponry and the most modern air force to fly over the territory of an independent and sovereign State, to violate the airspace of another independent and sovereign State and to bomb the vicinity of the capital of a third independent and sovereign State, thus causing, among other things, the loss of many human lives, among them that of a young French technician, who died while on a mission of peace and progress.

126. I leave it to the representative of Israel to perorate cynically about crocodile tears and about slimy cobras that show a smooth face, the better to strike their victims and spread poison, death and destruction. As for myself, I merely bow to those innocent victims, and I offer to their relatives and to their countries my most sincere sympathy, which is that of a man who loves peace and justice.

127. Once this outrage had been accomplished, the Israeli leaders unabashedly and publicly declared that they had committed that act of blatant aggression. Pushing brazen arrogance to its limits, Israel even went so far as to report on it in the most official manner and in the greatest detail to the Security Council itself, the body entrusted with dealing with breaches of the peace and acts of aggression and with taking the necessary collective measures.

128. Let us look for a moment at the letter dated 8 June from the representative of Tel Aviv [S/14510]; it is even more enlightening. What is the logic, what is the morality behind it? It is nothing but a heap of fallacious arguments, a pile of gratuitous and deceitful assertions, a justification based on unfounded hypotheses and accusations.

129. I need hardly recall here that, according to the Definition of Aggression contained in the annex to resolution 3314 (XXIX) adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1974, bombardment by the armed forces of a State against the territory of another State, regardless of a declaration of war, constitutes an act of aggression. I need hardly recall article 5 of the Definition of Aggression, which states:

"1. No consideration of whatever nature, whether political, economic, military or otherwise, may serve as a justification for aggression.

"2. A war of aggression is a crime against international peace. Aggression gives rise to international responsibility."

130. In our view that is the only appropriate response to Israel's quibbling. We refuse to give undue weight to considerations not founded on generally accepted international rules that are based on principle and law.

131. As to the other justifications given by Israel, I should like to quote the statement made on 9 June by

the Director General of IAEA, who, speaking in his most official and authoritative capacity, gave a most categorical denial of Israeli allegations concerning the character of the Iraqi nuclear installation. He stated:

“This attack on the Iraqi nuclear centre is a serious development with far-reaching implications. The Agency’s safeguards system is a basic element of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. During my long time here, I do not think we have been faced with a more serious question than the implications of this development. The Agency has inspected the Iraqi reactors and has not found evidence of any activity not in accordance with the Non-Proliferation Treaty. A non-NPT country has evidently not felt assured by our findings and about our ability to continue to discharge our safeguarding responsibilities effectively. In the interest of its national security, it has felt motivated to take military action. From a point of principle, one can only conclude that it is the Agency’s safeguards régime which has also been attacked. Where will this lead us in the future? This is a matter of grave concern which should be pondered well.”¹⁴

132. Need I recall further that attacks against any nuclear installations were formally prohibited by the additional Protocols of 1977 to the Geneva Conventions of 1949?¹¹

133. Furthermore, under what law, in what system of logic, can one claim the right to prevent sovereign States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty from developing their nuclear industry for peaceful purposes, under international controls, while oneself refusing to sign that very Non-Proliferation Treaty and while shamelessly arrogating to oneself the right to possess the atomic weapon?

134. What would happen if the arguments presented here today by Israel were to be turned against it, since it has been established now that this same régime has made a State policy of the practice of international terrorism? I repeat: today it has been established that this régime had made a State policy of international terrorism.

135. There remain to be noted, in that same Israeli letter, the threats and challenges to two European countries and to all other countries which refuse to heed Israel’s injunctions. It is up to those countries separately to shoulder their responsibilities and to make their response as they see fit. For its part, the Security Council must take note of that attitude of over-all defiance, which derives from the law of the jungle, and take the necessary steps.

136. Leaving aside the quibbles and *a posteriori* justifications, the Israeli attack of 7 June is in fact a continuation of the acts of aggression committed against the Arab people in Lebanon, Palestine and elsewhere. At the same time it is above all an act

whose objective is to prevent any scientific or technological progress the Arabs may make, so as to enable Israel to maintain its supremacy in the region. President Bourguiba was not mistaken when he stated, on 19 March 1973: “We believe that the struggle between Arabs and Zionists is above all a problem of scientific and technological disparity.”

137. Only Israel, which recognizes no boundaries for itself, imposes boundaries on science. Only Israel, whose expansionism knows no limits, wishes to impose limits on the expansion of progress. The cowardly act of aggression against the Iraqi nuclear research centre represents a new stage of escalation and a new proof, if proof were needed, of the Zionist spirit of arrogance and domination. So spoke a great man, who is no longer with us. This was an outrage with racist overtones, which men of science and of conscience cannot tolerate and must condemn. This act of terrorism, which is endangering world peace and has violated the basic principles of international law, also constitutes a dangerous precedent. In fact, it has introduced a new concept, which the civilized world cannot permit: it is Israel’s justification of its infringements on the independence, sovereignty and security of other States by invoking the needs of a single State to ensure its own national security. Today it is the turn of Iraq along with Lebanon and Palestine. Whose turn will it be tomorrow, on what could be an interminable list? What will become of relations among States if that concept is accepted and if the international community does not react as vigorously as possible to what would constitute a dangerous precedent, likely to endanger irreparably international peace and security?

138. Those who are not sparing of their friendship for Israel, providing it with aid, assistance and weapons, invoking the notion of security, should reflect carefully on the dangerous slope down which they are sliding.

139. The situation we are considering today has the merit of clarity—a rare merit, as will be recognized. The facts are grave and intolerable, the responsibility obvious and duly recognized. It is necessary in these circumstances for the Security Council to live up to its own responsibilities. It is necessary for the Council to respond to the expectations of the world, whose eyes are fixed today on every one of us. It is necessary for the Council to show unanimity when it comes to taking against those who jeopardize peace and international security the vigorous measures demanded by the seriousness of their actions and dictated by the provisions of the Charter.

140. It is necessary for the Council to be unanimous not only in the most vigorous possible condemnation of Israel for its acts of vandalism and its blatant aggression, but also, and above all, in drawing from the Charter appropriate measures liable to deprive the Government of Israel of the means of carrying out its

policy of provocation and defiance, as well as of the assurance of impunity it has enjoyed to date.

141. The United Nations, which has a special responsibility in the present situation in the Middle East—because the United Nations itself signed the State of Israel's birth certificate—can no longer tolerate the intolerable behaviour of the spoiled child which abuses the leniency shown it by some, in contempt of the principles of justice and law. It is time for international law, to which Tunisia and President Bourguiba remain unswervingly committed, to be respected. It is high time for United Nations law to be applied in full. For the question which concerns us today is in fact one episode in a more than ever explosive situation throughout the Middle East, because as long as a comprehensive, just and lasting solution is not found in the Middle East, as long as the fundamental question—that of Palestine—is not resolved in accordance with the principles of justice and law, as long as the Palestinian people under the leadership of its sole legitimate representative, the PLO, does not recover its right to self-determination, independence and a State, stability, security and peace will not be permanently established in the region.

142. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of Algeria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

143. Mr. BEDJAOUI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Algeria and Mexico combine their efforts so harmoniously and blend their voices so felicitously in the concert of nations which seeks to establish a more just world, that I feel a very special satisfaction, Mr. President, in seeing you preside over the fortunes of the Security Council for this month of June, a month I would have wished—for you, for the Organization, and for peace in the world—less agitated than it is. The profound relations of friendship which bind us add a special quality to the pleasure I feel at seeing you at the head of the Council.

144. I should like furthermore to express my Government's great appreciation for the manner in which your predecessor, Mr. Nisibori of Japan, fulfilled his lofty task.

145. A while ago we heard some very strange things and, if we leave aside the unseemly invective directed against the Arab countries, as well as the scorn for the international community and for the United Nations, what would remain from what we have heard is two arguments—in fact, I was going to say two pieces of sophistry.

146. The first is that the Zionist entity, in a state of war with the Arab countries as a whole, would, so it says, be perfectly justified in using all its military means against one of them: Iraq. But that is legal formalism with neither weight nor sincerity. First of

all, a state of war involves obligations—and precise obligations—codified in the four Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949,¹² and in all subsequent instruments, as well as by general international custom.

147. A peaceful research centre, whose activities are covered by the terms of a treaty and are under the control—considered to be perfectly satisfactory—of an international agency, should never have been a target of the Zionist forces precisely because of the state of war they invoke. But furthermore, this reasoning does not fail to surprise; for the Middle East conflict exists, and it will exist as long as the Palestinian people do not enjoy their legitimate national rights, and every Arab country, every Muslim country, every non-aligned country will consider itself to be at war as long as the Palestinian people have not achieved their legitimate national aspirations.

148. Would the Israeli entity then be justified in destroying those peoples, those countries which consider themselves at war because the Palestinian people have not succeeded in winning their rights from the Zionist entity?

149. But having said this, and since we are speaking of a state of war which has not been brought to an end by a peace treaty, does the fact that there is no peace treaty in due and proper form putting an end to a conflict justify the Zionists in attacking Baghdad today, Riyadh or Kuwait or oilfields in the Emirates tomorrow? And if one were to go further, I would say that, legally speaking, there is a state of war existing since 1939 between Germany and its opponents in the Second World War. There has been no peace treaty since 1939 between Germany and its enemies in that Second World War. Does the reasoning that we heard a while ago today justify an act of aggression by one of the protagonists in that world war against another? This would be truly absurd.

150. The second argument that we heard seems even stranger and more specious. We have heard proposed a conference for the denuclearization of the Middle East and of Palestine. We have heard proposals for direct negotiations between the States of the region. The manoeuvre is a skilful one, but quite transparent and the motives behind it are suspect. It is tantamount to a desire to deal with the consequences of the situation in the region without correcting the cause. They want us to believe that the whole problem of peace in the Middle East boils down to the efforts of each party to conquer and take possession of the nuclear threshold. Yet the basic problem which overshadows all the others is totally different: it is that of satisfying the national aspirations of the Palestinian people and of withdrawing from all occupied Arab territories. Instead of hoodwinking international public opinion by calling for a conference for the denuclearization of the Middle East, the Zionists would be better inspired to agree to a peace conference, a true one, with the PLO under the aegis of the United

Nations and in accordance with its pertinent resolutions.

151. But I have dwelt too long on a statement whose total inconsistency the Council will already have noted, so let us go on to more serious things.

152. We are meeting at a serious time. Once again the Zionist forces have struck and once again their victim is an Arab country. Once again, it has been a deliberate attack, coolly premeditated, programmed and executed with total disdain for the reaction of the international community, as well as for the consequences for the peace and security of the world. It represents, today as before, and perhaps today more than ever, a delirious craving for power, irresponsible adventurism and unjustified aggression, as if war had become for the Zionist régime a question of prestige in order to glorify technological supremacy, to cultivate a Dionysian exaltation of warlike virtues or to parade a scornful skill before an adversary it wishes always to humiliate. This has a name, the name Chancellor Kreisky gave it yesterday. It is the madness of Erostrates among leaders who would not hesitate to light the match that would blow up the entire planet.

153. The incredible aggression perpetrated by the Zionists against Iraq is, to be sure, not an isolated fact. The international community and the Palestinian and Arab peoples have for decades long known the true nature of the Zionist entity whose expansionism and desire for domination have always been served by aggression, a means to which it has always given pride of place. But today the threat of an outbreak of a new war carried gratuitously into the very heart of Iraq highlights the fact that the Zionist régime thrives on war and lives for war.

154. The aggression committed against Iraq is both a continuation of and a new stage in the execution of this constant policy of the Zionist régime.

155. It is a continuation in that it shows more clearly than ever the domineering, expansionist and adventurist thrusts of the Israeli régime throughout the region. It is a continuation, above all, in that it provides irrefutable proof today that all Arab countries are henceforth threatened by Israel's bellicose nature. This raid involves not only Iraq but, indeed, the whole Arab world because the Zionist forces are with impunity expanding the scope of action of their aggression to the entire Arab nation. Only yesterday Israeli military officials were inspecting the Egyptian-Libyan border, probably preparing some evil design there also.

156. But the Israeli aggression against Baghdad, which is only a continuation of Israel's constant policy, stands out nevertheless by the fact that it is a noteworthy intensification of the craving for power of the Zionist leaders and, above all, because it implies especially serious consequences for inter-

national peace and security. It should be made very clear, first of all, that the seriousness of the Israeli act does not, in our view, lie in the fact that it involved a nuclear reactor. Whether the target had been a factory, a rural village, a naval yard, a railroad crossing or an oilfield, the significance of the act, its international scope and its political consequences would be the same. In all those cases, it would be nothing more nor less than a very serious violation of the elementary rules governing international relations. It is nothing more nor less than scorn for the sacrosanct principles of national independence and sovereignty. It is nothing more nor less than a violation of the principles of the Charter and especially of the principle of the non-use of force or the threat of force against the territorial integrity of a State.

157. The Israeli action has the monstrous characteristic of introducing into international relations new frightening forms of action based on aggression, baptized "preventive" in order to make the unacceptable acceptable.

158. If this action brings us once again to the heart of Israel's constant expansionist and aggressive plans, it also gives us, by its exceptional seriousness, a very good idea of Zionist adventurism on all fronts, thereby opening the way for all kinds of perilous disorders in international relations, taking us back to the dark centuries when primitive mankind was exhausting itself in the practice of war for war's sake, and in resort to the law of the jungle, with no holds barred.

159. The new theory of "preventive" aggression is the very negation of law and of morality; it is diametrically opposed to peace and reason. Permeated by a suicidal subjectivism, it would in future authorize any State to attack another for whatever reason it considers valid—that is, in the final analysis, for no reason at all.

160. We can easily imagine the future of our world if every State were entitled to attack the territory of another by denouncing unilaterally, as posing a short-term danger to its own security, any activity carried out by its victim, even though it be universally acknowledged as normal.

161. Dilatory manoeuvres to draw the attention of the international community to the nature and objective of such activities and the development of a whole series of false arguments which we heard, focused on Iraqi nuclear activities, can in no way diminish or dilute the responsibilities of the Zionist aggressor, nor can they explain, let alone justify, its act of aggression.

162. Even the least imaginative mind can easily envisage the world-wide consequences, which we run the risk of legitimizing, if any justification whatsoever should by misfortune be given to the intolerable Israeli example which would then become a precedent. The least imaginative mind would then acknowledge the

frightening impossibility of living on a planet which had become a powder-keg, where every State would attack every other, for no reason other than the desire to attack it. The primitive instincts of human societies which we thought had been relegated to the dark ages would then surface, destroying the thin, fragile layer of human civilization.

163. Setting itself up as both judge and jury in assessing a situation which it presents as a danger to its security, the Zionist entity is hatching plans, preparing scenarios, making its own calculations and, in its power-hungry delirium, is committing irreparable acts, justifying its crimes in the name of supposed self-defence.

164. By creating a new battlefield in a part of the world already fraught with conflict, Israel's criminal initiative, which even some of its traditional allies are hesitating to sanction because of the seriousness of its implications, must not go unpunished, lest we run the risk of consecrating the primacy of might over right.

165. This long-premeditated attack against another State, an attack which furthermore violated the airspace of two others, could only be carried out thanks to weapons on which the aggressor can always count, and to the impunity it has become accustomed to enjoying in its evil doings. It is well known that Israel's challenge to the international community would not have been possible without the constant encouragement given it by the very ones who assure it of the protection of their weapons, while guaranteeing its impunity by the very fact of the destabilizing function which they have assigned to it in the region.

166. The implications of this act of aggression and the need for its vigorous condemnation, as well as for all measures likely to prevent its recurrence, are still the same, whatever the target of the aggressor. Moreover, today, the particular nature of the target, far from diminishing the seriousness of the act, in fact makes it more serious. In this connection, furthermore, a great many facts now available, coming from various authoritative sources, all agree in their radical rejection of any sort of danger therein. Only yesterday, IAEA, through its Director General, who has already been quoted this afternoon, declared that the Israeli act of aggression against Iraq constituted, in fact, an act of aggression against the Vienna Agency itself.⁴ Iraq, he specified, had fully subscribed to the Agency's safeguards system, was a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and had thus far scrupulously complied, to the Agency's complete satisfaction, with the obligations it had contracted in the matter of guarantees. In a resolution adopted yesterday [S/14532], the Vienna Agency condemned this act of aggression which violates not only the territorial integrity and political independence of a State but also:

"the inalienable right of all . . . States . . . to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, to

further their scientific, technological and economic development".

The same resolution emphasizes that this unspeakable act of aggression, which compromises regional peace and security, demonstrates:

"clear disregard for the Agency's safeguards régime and the Non-Proliferation Treaty and could do great harm to the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes".

167. But need we dwell any further on this aspect of the supposed nuclear danger on which Israeli propaganda wishes complacently to focus so much attention? Actually, that is not the problem, for it is impossible to understand how Israel, which—and this is a proven fact—possesses the atomic bomb, can fear Iraq, which—and this too is a proven fact—does not possess it. Israel, strengthened by its possession of nuclear weapons, while crowing about its technological superiority, paraded emulously in the course of its various aggressive raids, and refusing to be bound by any limitation or any treaty in its quest for the capacity for the mass destruction of the Arab countries, now falsely and abusively claims today that it fears a State which is engaged in laboratory research that is, in fact, peaceful in nature and, moreover, under the control of an international agency, besides coming under the terms of a treaty requiring scrupulous compliance.

168. The truth is totally different: once again, more dramatically than ever, it has been proved that peace and security in the Middle East—in Palestine and the world over—are irresponsibly threatened by the desire for power and the expansionism of the Zionist régime, which is waging a campaign of physical terror in the region and of moral blackmail of the entire international community.

169. Nothing, no one, has been opposing peace in the Middle East and in Palestine for more than three decades now except Israel, which denies the Palestinian people its legitimate national rights and continues its occupation of Arab territories.

170. It is precisely the crystal-clear nature of this act of aggression that has given rise to the severe criticism of it by the entire international community. There is today general condemnation of that act, coming even from personalities and leaders who are traditionally very open to Zionist theses, as well as from large segments of the people of Israel themselves. Such widespread repudiation results from the fact that this act can be called only one thing—aggression—and therefore causes the greatest anxiety about the dangerous habits it could introduce into international relations.

171. It is that severe criticism and universal condemnation that the Security Council is duty-bound to

echo, by determining "the existence of . . . [an] act of aggression" under Article 39 of the Charter. By the same token, it is up to the Security Council, pursuant to its major responsibility as the body entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security, and in conformity with the very terms of Article 39 of the Charter, to "decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42".

172. The seriousness and the gratuitous nature of the aggression forcefully require the international community—and particularly the States on which the Charter has conferred particular responsibility for the maintenance of peace—to prevent further danger and to take a decision now for salutary action, with all the necessary determination.

173. For the Zionist régime has already stated—in advance, before any condemnation by the Security Council, and even before any meeting of the Council—that it would repeat its act if it deemed that necessary. It is thus perfectly clear that any platonic condemnation would appear more than ridiculous in view of the serious stakes and Israel's renewed challenge. Only sanctions can adequately respond to this logic of renewed and renewable aggression and to this provocation which, in advance, shows so little regard for the Council's authority.

174. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of the Sudan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

175. Mr. ABDALLA (The Sudan): I should like to express at the outset my gratitude to you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Security Council for allowing my delegation to participate in the Council's deliberations. It is my pleasure also to join previous speakers in extending to you our congratulations upon your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. My delegation is confident that with your vast experience and diplomatic skills the current debate will, under your able guidance, come to a satisfactory conclusion. We also express our admiration to your predecessor for the able and commendable manner in which he presided over the work of the Council last month.

176. Today, once again, the Council is seized of a situation with far-reaching consequences for international peace and security, a situation caused by a grave and serious act of premeditated and unprecedented aggression committed last Sunday by Israel against the Republic of Iraq. As if the unheard-of atrocities inflicted upon the people of Lebanon and Palestine were not enough, Israel shocked the whole world by its reckless and irresponsible air raid against the Iraqi nuclear research installation. This Israeli naked act of aggression constitutes a breach of international law and a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations. The unanimous and instantane-

ous condemnation by the international community is clear testimony and a mandate for the Council to condemn and punish this unwarranted act of aggression.

177. It is indeed ironic that a State like Israel, having a developed nuclear-arms capability, not subject to bilateral, regional or international supervision and inspection, could attempt to justify its attack against Iraq, a signatory of and a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, on the grounds that possession of a nuclear research installation by Iraq constituted a threat to Israel's national security. It is worth noting that IAEA has confirmed this week that the safeguards of the Iraqi nuclear research installation have been satisfactorily applied to date, and that the latest inspection by the Agency took place as recently as only five months ago.

178. It goes without saying that under the existing international machinery, the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the IAEA safeguards remain the only instruments through which we could curb the ominous spread of nuclear weapons. My delegation is therefore not at all surprised that Israel has continued to refuse to sign the Treaty, and has continued to ignore the justified concern of the international community over its acquisition and development of nuclear weapons, concern expressed in General Assembly resolution 34/89.

179. One can draw the conclusion that the bizarre Israeli concept of "national security", on which the defence of the Sunday attack has been based, is limitless and so undefined that any legitimate activity in the region could be conceived and construed by Israel as a potential threat to its security. Moreover, one is bound to ask what law permits Israel to violate the airspace and national sovereignty of Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Iraq to strike deep into the outskirts of Baghdad.

180. The people and Government of the Sudan strongly condemn the Israeli aggression and premeditated violation of the national sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of Iraq, Jordan and Saudi Arabia. We further condemn in the strongest terms the Israeli raid on the Iraqi nuclear research centre at Osirak.

181. All of us should be very concerned with the serious developments of last Sunday and the grave consequences for peace and security in the region. Those developments are an ominous indication of the fact that we are on the verge of institutionalizing State terrorism. The criminal acts of Israel should no more be subjected to mere words of condemnation. It is high time for the Council to address itself to the dangerous reality of the situation in the Middle East and uphold the principles of the Charter. The Council should live up to its own primary responsibility as the guardian of a world inspired by the norms of international law and the ideals of the Charter.

182. Because of the continued Israeli acts of aggression and defiance of numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Council, the Security Council is called upon to act vigorously and decisively to apply mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

183. The Charter contains all the necessary and effective measures that are designed to deter and punish such wanton acts of aggression as those perpetrated by Israel. The adoption and application of those measures depend clearly on the will and sense of responsibility of all the members of the Council. Only by opting for such a firm course of action will the Council discharge its primary responsibility of restoring and maintaining justice, peace and security in the world. Furthermore, since a real and continuous threat is posed by the Israeli nuclear-arms capability, the Council is called upon to find ways and means of subjecting Israeli nuclear activities to regular international inspection and supervision.

184. Before concluding my statement, I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to reaffirm, on behalf of the people and Government of the Sudan, our full support and backing of our brothers in Iraq in their just cause against Zionist aggression and in their endeavours for economic and social development.

185. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of Jordan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

186. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): This being the first time that I have spoken in the Security Council for this month, I wish to extend to you, Mr. Porfirio Muñoz Ledo, my heartiest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. Your exemplary record in the councils of the United Nations has earned you the esteem, the friendship and the distinction which you so richly deserve as one of the most accomplished and versatile statesmen, in the best traditions of friendly Mexico's fearless fidelity to the Charter, to human freedom and dignity, and to amity amongst nations. May I wish you all success in your arduous task.

187. I should also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor Mr. Masahiro Nisibori of friendly Japan for the outstanding manner in which he handled the duties of this high office during the month of May.

188. The Security Council is in session today under a very dark, ominous and menacing cloud. Perhaps in years to come this meeting may well be evaluated as one of the Council's most momentous meetings for the profound consequences with which it is inescapably fraught, for future peace and stability not only in the Middle East but also far beyond. There are so many ramifications to the perfidious aggression against the Osirak nuclear research site in Baghdad as

to make it impelling for the Council to be seized of a fundamental stock-taking pertaining to the continued survival of an international order governed by international law or to its demise.

189. Is it to be supplanted by the criminal lawlessness and international terrorism which have been the hallmark of Israeli policy before and since its inception more than three decades ago? The expanded Israel of 1947-1948 was not baptized by the holy waters of the River Jordan but by the blood of innocent defenceless civilians in the mass massacres of men, women and children at Deir Yassin west of Jerusalem and in many other towns and villages throughout Palestine; the blowing up of defenceless homes, hotels and motels, such as the Semiramis and the King David Hotel, with victims buried under the debris, now all but forgotten and unnamed; the slaying of Lord Moyne, British Minister of State, in Cairo, in the midst of a global war; off-duty British soldiers hanged and dangling from the branches of trees; and the venerable Count Bernadotte, assassinated in cold blood on the hallowed streets of Jerusalem while serving as the United Nations Mediator in the pursuit of justice and peace.

190. The Palestinian and Lebanese peoples have seen their countries and their civilians devastated by ruthless and indiscriminate attacks by sea, air and on the ground in the name of Israeli security. It is to be hoped that those who claim to be concerned about international terrorism will read the thick compendium of Israeli systematic terrorism and realize who is the foremost terrorist in the world.

191. Only the other day a Palestinian diplomat who was accredited to the European Economic Community was assassinated in cold blood in Brussels—and nobody has said that that was an act of aggression against a diplomat. He had never carried a gun in his life and belonged to one of the good families in Jerusalem. He was doing a diplomatic job, but yet he was assassinated in cold blood on the streets of Brussels. Is that terrorism or is it not?

192. Those foul deeds which have initiated and nurtured terrorism as a deliberate instrument of policy are but the genesis of an unsatiated record of overt and covert acts of aggression unique in their consistency and diversity.

193. There is only one difference between yesterday and today. The sticks of gelignite and dynamite which tore to shreds innocent and unarmed civilians or brought about their dispersal up to this day have since been enhanced by the deadly appurtenances of modern technology.

194. Surprised by the sneak attack on Iraq and the violation of the airspace in depth of Jordan and Saudi Arabia? Not at all. For an aggressive and expansionist Israel, this falls within its axiomatic norms of conduct

and we are all too familiar with it. And besides, it was foretold by many an expert observer a long, long while ago.

195. Daunted that a small scientific research centre with a few pounds of uranium fuel, presumably to produce isotopes, manifestly for peaceful purposes, should have been largely or totally incapacitated? Not at all. For no power in the world can stop the inexorable progress of mankind in the sciences, in the humanities and in all other fields of knowledge. You can destroy iron and steel and other raw materials, but you can never destroy the human mind. In their hour of misguided exhilaration and euphoria, the Israelis should know, if they do not, that for countless centuries Iraq was a beacon-light of civilization and culture for the whole world. Iraq can never be wanting or thwarted in scientific and technological advancement.

196. The Israelis know perfectly well that the small scientific reactor, which was under international inspection and control—an inspection had taken place earlier this year—was never intended for other than peaceful purposes and scientific progress. The production of atomic bombs does not require the existence of a small and controlled nuclear reactor. A small quantity of plutonium could produce a bomb or bombs if a country so willed, as a student from Princeton demonstrated some three years ago.

197. As we all know, Iraq has signed and ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty in good faith and has subjected all its facilities to close international inspection and scrutiny. What, then, is the real casualty of Israel's audacious aggression? It is no less than the sanctity of the Non-Proliferation Treaty itself, and I wish to emphasize that.

198. The Council is all too familiar with the incessant pleas and urgings of the numerous non-nuclear States for practical and effective guarantees by the major Powers against nuclear threat and blackmail. The billions of human beings around the world will not forfeit their freedom and security or live in the shadow of nuclear destruction by international arch-terrorists, which is what Menachem Begin and his clique have been all along. And, believe me, these are not mere epithets; I am doing no more than simply narrating the truth. The Israelis are armed to the teeth with a huge arsenal of atomic weaponry and the sophisticated systems to deliver them. All the States of the Middle East have been brutally alerted to this awesome fact and will no doubt be exploring all available options, it is to be hoped, through the Council, but, if that should fail, by all other available means, whether through political alignments or self-reliance. This may very well some day somehow put the Middle East region on a collision course with a nuclear holocaust. That is the message of the 7 June aggression against Baghdad. It was a warlike act and it should be dealt with in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter.

199. Israel has over more than a decade tenaciously refused to subscribe to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and has kept its nuclear atom-bomb reactors incommunicado even to its greatest benefactors, without whose incalculable assistance it would not be in a position to trample upon the peace and security of the world as it is doing today. Even senior Senators like Howard Baker were refused access to the Dimona, or should I say demon, nuclear plant. I know that in the mid-1960s, at our request, the United States Government tried to investigate the Dimona nuclear plant, but it was denied access. But it did come up with facts and information which totally verified the information which we had supplied to it through people who were working in that plant and in other plants in another, European, country.

200. The explanation is anything but difficult, for the crux of the matter is that, as far back as 1950, the Israeli leadership determined to pursue the nuclear option—and this was a conscious and calculated decision of intent—in pursuit of a carefully laid down policy of territorial expansion, political blackmail and hegemony in its manifold manifestations.

201. An Atomic Energy Commission was established, accountable directly to the Prime Minister, with the avowed purpose of assiduously working towards the acquisition of nuclear power. In that same year I wrote an editorial in one of our leading newspapers in Jerusalem, *Al-Difaa'*, warning of the dangerous long-term consequences of Israel's pursuit of that goal. That was 31 years ago. Several warnings were given to various concerned Governments in the mid-1960s when incontrovertible evidence became available to my Government that Israel had reached a threshold capability. And yet Israel's determination to surge ahead was met with bellicose connivance and compromise as a result of the special United States-Israel relationship essentially anchored in domestic political imperatives.

202. You should have seen Senator Cranston the day following the unabashed act of aggression, and while the rest of the world was stunned and unanimous in condemning it, defending poor tiny Israel for its perfidious attack. He might have bought a little crib for his pampered child, already the sixth or seventh nuclear State. In a special dispatch for *The Christian Science Monitor* published on 4 June 1981, its correspondent in Jerusalem, Abraham Rabinovitch, had this to say:

“The possible need to go nuclear, rarely talked about publicly in Israel before, has been raised with increasing frequency in the past few months.

“The Center for Strategic Studies at Tel Aviv University, headed by former army intelligence chief Aharon Yariv, is presently completing a study on the subject. Former Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan told a closed political forum recently that

Israel might have to consider a nuclear option because of the impossibility of keeping up with the arms race.”

203. In 1968, United States Secretary of State Mr. Dean Rusk declared that:

“The spread of nuclear weapons would aggravate our difficulties in maintaining friendly relations with parties to a continuing dispute. If one party ‘went nuclear’ we might have to decide whether to help the other party, directly or through security assurances, whether to sever economic aid to the country acquiring atomic weapons, or whether to stand aside, even though the result might be a war which would be hard to contain.”

204. His analysis is as valid and rational today as it was when he made it 13 years ago. Condemnations will hardly assuage the genuine apprehension of the 150 million people of the region faced with mortal danger to their very survival. They have no reason to fight phantom enemies and no interest in doing so. But they have every reason to fight Phantom aircraft and F-15 and F-16 aeroplanes, which are showering death and destruction upon their lands.

205. It is time for the United States and others to take full cognizance of this fact and cut off all forms of assistance, as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter, in response to a blatant act of aggression which is before us for all to see. Failing that, the peoples of the Middle East will be left with no alternative but to regard the donors of enormous assistance to the dangerous gunman at large as accessories after the crime of aggression.

206. Mr. Begin has stated defiantly that he could not care less for American condemnation or Arab threats. One day he will discover that Arab security can never be compromised without the most serious consequences and at any rate that is our own problem, which we must and will resolve. As for his disdain for American condemnation, that should be an acid test of the freedom of the United States to decide what is in its best interests and its ability to act accordingly.

207. During the past several years the lines have been grotesquely blurred as to what is an American decision and what is an Israeli penchant, drawing upon the unbounded resources of a great Power.

208. Indeed, all of us at the United Nations are facing one of those turning points on issues which strike at the heart of the United Nations system. Can we tolerate an international order in which one State arrogates unto itself, in total disdain for the Charter, the right to commit a flagrant and confessed act of armed aggression against another State on the totally spurious, subjectively super-moral grounds—as Begin, the arch-terrorist describes them—of so-called legitimate self-defence? What kind of self-defence

imperative can there be, particularly coming from a country which intelligence experts estimate is already in possession of a huge arsenal of atomic and hydrogen bombs? Walter Cronkite, the anchorman at CBS, in his last report—and I stand to be corrected—quoted American intelligence sources as saying that Israel was already in possession of 200 atomic and hydrogen bombs. Is any country entitled to commit aggression in order to maintain a monopoly of the weapons of mass destruction and blackmail hundreds of millions of people into submission or annihilation?

209. There are already more than 30 States that have, in varying degrees, atomic energy programmes for peaceful purposes. Are they going to stop their scientific and economic progress because Menachem Begin does not like the faces or the policies of their governmental leaders, who refuse to condone aggression, expansion and occupation? And yet that is the loud message which the sneak raid on Baghdad and Begin’s almost daily utterances are sending to the whole world. He has declared audaciously that he would perpetrate similar operations not only against Iraq but elsewhere. Where elsewhere is, he did not specify; presumably it is the whole planet. In his duplicity, he would not mind attacking perhaps India or Pakistan for being staunchly supportive of Arab and Palestinian rights. And if what I have said seems too incredible to believe, this is how an official in Prime Minister Menachem Begin’s Administration, with a wry smile, put it succinctly, according to the reputable paper, *The New York Times*, on 11 June: “If Begin had been President of the United States instead of Truman in 1949, there would not be an arms race.” What he, of course, means is that Begin would have atom-bombed the 250 million citizens of the Soviet Union, to annihilate them. I do not think the American people would be terribly amused by this dangerous, criminal advice—not then and not today. That is a code for world destruction and not for legitimate self-defence.

210. Begin has so far spared the People’s Republic of China his wrath and his vision of legitimate self-defence and secure boundaries, notwithstanding that Republic’s unflinching support of Arab and Palestinian rights. Perhaps his atomic stockpile, big as it is, is not yet large enough to take on all those formidable adversaries at once. But it surely reveals what his concept of security and legitimate self-defence is.

211. The Israeli Prime Minister did not refrain on 11 June from lecturing America on minding its own business. He said: “We do not accept America or any other State’s advising us as to how we should use our weapons.” If that is the case, why does he crawl on his belly to accept American armaments and huge infusions of assistance, without which his vituperation would be cut down to size? Or does he think that America is a part of his domain? Or has he unilaterally abrogated the United States–Israel arms agreement of 1952,¹³ which specifically and categorically prohibits the use of American-supplied arms in aggression against neighbouring States?

212. The use of force and the threat of force, whose prohibition is the core of the Charter, have been openly advocated as an appropriate instrument of policy. The Non-Proliferation Treaty, with all its international safeguards, has been practically annulled as an instrument to regulate the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. I think we have been mortally wounded. The concept of secure boundaries has as a first step been extended more than 1,000 kilometres beyond the occupied territories. Begin is confronting the world with a total breakdown of the United Nations system.

213. If this fiendish plan is to be thwarted, the Council can do little less than take the following steps, in accordance with the Charter and the international order of mankind, based on international law. We cannot afford to do otherwise or behave otherwise.

214. First, the Council is urged to declare Israel an aggressor, in accordance with the Charter.

215. Secondly, having made that declaration, the Council has no alternative but to impose the sanctions provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter.

216. Thirdly, since Israel's concept of legitimate self-defence is predicated on the destruction of other peoples to make the world safe for Israel and on the destruction of countries regardless of boundaries, Israeli atomic installations should be opened to international inspection and control under the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which Israel adamantly refuses to sign.

217. The evasive Israeli contention, which surfaced only last year, that talks among the States of the region should be held as a substitute for the Non-Proliferation Treaty is a sham on two grounds.

218. First, ratification of the Non-Proliferation Treaty is a multinational arrangement and commitment which requires no negotiation. Jordan did not negotiate with anybody when we affixed our signature and seal to that Non-Proliferation Treaty. Besides, how can we negotiate with a country that is in occupation of our territory and declares publicly that it is not willing to relinquish it?

219. Secondly, a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East after Israel has acquired a huge arsenal is a contradiction in terms: it simply means a perpetuation of the Israeli monopoly of weapons of mass destruction.

220. The Council should decide that Israel must pay compensation for the substantial losses incurred by Iraq in consequence of Israeli aggression. What the Iraqi Government decides to do with that compensation is its own business; it might well decide to give it to some humanitarian agency. But Israel should pay compensation for the substantial losses which were imposed upon Iraq as a result of blatant aggression.

221. It is my earnest hope that the Council will act decisively and in a manner commensurate with the enormity of the challenge, if only to avert a drift to war and incalculable devastation, for the world can ill afford to drift into that kind of situation.

222. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Iraq, who has asked to be permitted to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

223. Mr. KITTANI (Iraq): The hour is late and, in any case, my delegation will have ample opportunity before this debate is over to give all the necessary replies and elucidations. However, the statement made by the representative of Israel should not go unanswered at this meeting. In order to show the bankruptcy of that statement and the total failure of the representative of Israel to justify the naked aggression committed by his entity against my country—which is, incidentally, the only subject before the Council this evening—I wish to take up only four of the points in his statement.

224. The professor referred to Article 51 of the Charter. The representative of Algeria has already answered him, I believe adequately. We can go back to this at a later stage, but, to show the shallowness both of his case and of his credibility, I shall simply read out Article 51 just to refresh the memories of the members of the Council. It reads:

“Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain . . .”

With the quotations he made and with his acrobatics, Professor Blum forgot also that it is not an isolated article; it comes after a series of other articles, all of them referring to actions by the Council or by Members of the United Nations individually and collectively in cases of the occurrence of armed aggression.

225. The second point I want to make has to do with the strange accusations levelled against my country. I quote the statement of the professor. He said that Iraq “has begun an intensive search for uranium on its own territory” [*para. 83 above*]. How low can he sink in his search for arguments to justify whatever he is trying to justify? What is being perpetrated here? Are they challenging even the right of a State to search for minerals within its own territory? Is he preparing the ground to come back to the Council someday to justify another act of aggression, perhaps against another Arab country which has not yet reached the level of having a nuclear reactor? Perhaps he will bombard Geiger counters.

226. The third point I want to make is concerned with the references to and quotations from Senator

Cranston made by Professor Blum. They are in themselves very indicative of the shallowness of his arguments; indeed, they are not merely shallow arguments: they have no depth at all. In a short one third of a triple-spaced page, he mentions Senator Cranston four times.

227. We preferred to quote Mr. Eklund. We preferred to quote the most authoritative agency within this Organization in the field in which Israel claims justification for attacking us, IAEA established in that field. We leave it to the Council to judge the objectivity of IAEA and that of Mr. Eklund, who has been the Director General of that Agency for 20 years, as against the credibility of Senator Cranston on the subject before the Council. Perhaps tomorrow Professor Blum will quote that other paragon of objectivity in the Arab-Israeli dispute, columnist William Safire of *The New York Times*.

228. Fourthly, and last, I shall quote again from Professor Blum's statement: "Israel has always held the conviction that no international conflict can be solved by the use of force" [*para. 114 above*]. Now if the members of the Council can believe that, they can believe anything. You do not have to go very far; all you have to do is spend five minutes scanning the annals of the Council, and you will find that the number of times that Israel has resorted to force—not to settle disputes, for most of the time there was no dispute, just naked aggression from beginning to end—exceeds all the instances brought before the

Council involving all other Members of the United Nations combined.

The meeting rose at 8.10 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 17th meeting, paras. 259 and 260.

² Alfred M. Lilienthal, *The Zionist Connection: What Price Peace?* (New York, Dodd, Mead and Company, 1978), p. 331.

³ A/34/542, Political Declaration, para. 228.

⁴ This statement was made at the 563rd meeting of the Board of Governors of IAEA, the official records of which are published in summary form.

⁵ United States of America, *Congressional Record*, Vol. 127, Part 4, (United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1981), pp. 4450-4451.

⁶ Morton A. Kaplan and Nicholas de B. Katzenbach, *The Political Foundations of International Law* (New York, John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1961), pp. 212 and 213.

⁷ D. W. Bowett, *Self-Defense in International Law* (New York, Frederick A. Praeger, 1958), pp. 191 and 192.

⁸ Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326).

⁹ A/36/315.

¹⁰ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Plenary Meetings*, 590th meeting, para. 192.

¹¹ International Committee of the Red Cross, *Protocols additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949*, Geneva, 1977, p. 3.

¹² United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, Nos. 970-973.

¹³ Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement of 23 July 1952. (*United States Treaties and Other International Agreements*, Vol. 3, Part 4, 1952, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1955), p. 4985.