

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SIXTH YEAR

2281st MEETING: 13 JUNE 1981

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2281).....	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.

2281s. MEETING

Held in New York on Saturday, 13 June 1981, at 10.30 a.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/2281)

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 11.25 a.m.

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)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with decisions taken at the Council's 2280th meeting, I invite the representatives of Iraq and Israel to take places at the Council table and I invite the representatives of Algeria, Brazil, Cuba, India, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Pakistan, Romania, the Sudan, Turkey and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

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 (Sudan), Mr. Kirca (Turkey) and Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to inform members of the Council that

I have received letters from the representatives of Bulgaria, Guyana, Somalia, Viet Nam and Zambia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity 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. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Sinclair (Guyana), Mr. Adan (Somalia), Mrs. Nguyen Ngoc Dung (Viet Nam) and Mr. Mutukwa (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the following documents: S/14522, letter dated 12 June 1981 from the representative of Zambia to the President of the Council; S/14527, letter dated 12 June from the representative of Hungary to the President of the Council; S/14528, letter dated 12 June from the representative of Romania to the President of the Council; and S/14529, letter dated 12 June from the representative of Yemen to the President of the Council.

4. The first speaker is the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait, Sheik Sabah Al-Ahmad Al-Jaber Al-Sabah, Chairman of the Council of the League of Arab States, on whose behalf he will speak. I warmly welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

5. Mr. AL-SABAH (Kuwait):* It gives me great pleasure, at the outset, to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of your duties as President of the Security Council for the month of June.

6. I was honoured by the Council of the League of Arab States during its emergency session held at Baghdad on 11 June 1981 with the chairmanship of the delegation entrusted with the task of participating in the emergency meetings of the Security Council called at the request of the Iraqi Government to consider the aggression committed by the Israeli Air Force against Iraq last Sunday.

* Mr. Al-Sabah spoke in Arabic. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

7. The Foreign Minister of Iraq has clearly explained that attack in detail [2280th meeting] and there is no need for me to elaborate any further on this aggression against a State Member of the United Nations. What I wish to affirm in my presentation before this august body is the fact that the raid launched by Israeli aircraft against Iraq was not, despite its very grave nature, something new; rather, it was one in a series of aggressive acts which Israel has committed against the Arab States over a long period of time. Israel's Prime Minister has even declared that the Zionist entity will launch such acts of aggression in the future against any Arab country whenever it finds it in its interest to do so.

8. This case is therefore not confined solely to Iraq but applies also to all the Arab countries, because they are all equally and explicitly threatened, as is evident in official Israeli proclamations. The source of the problem lies in the perceptions of the Zionist entity and its attitude towards the States of the region, as well as in its definition of its security requirements in terms of time and place.

9. In terms of location, Israel considers all Arab countries to be a target for its strikes, irrespective of the distance that separates it from them. As for the timing of its aggression, Israel has no fixed pattern of considerations but follows an illusory logic of fictitious probabilities which are void of any rationale or proof. This is evident from the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installation, despite the fact that the installation is an enterprise which serves peaceful purposes, as is certified by the French Government, which assists in its operation, and by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which is responsible for the supervision of the installation by virtue of the fact that Iraq is a signatory of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*]. Israel, it should be noted, has refused to sign that Treaty. The Council should be very well aware of the seriousness of this practice, which enables the Israeli Air Force to attack any part of the region, and of what that entails in terms of the Israeli determination to spread its influence over the entire region, thus indicating Israel's ambition to expand its borders from the Nile to the Euphrates, as has been declared by various Zionist leaders.

10. It is clear that Israel's definition of its security and borders constitutes a serious threat to the peace and security of the region, because such a definition necessitates the inevitable resort to uninterrupted aggression and violence to solve any problem which may arise. The so-called Israeli security policy is not defensive but an aggressive and expansionist policy which continuously threatens international peace.

11. In the light of this, Israel does not at all desire peace, unless the States of the region become subservient to its own definition of peace, which is based upon violence and domination and which utterly disregards the norms of international law.

12. Allow me to emphasize here the serious implications of the aforementioned Israeli concept of security. I have no hesitation in saying that it is an uncivilized concept which runs counter to all the values of civilization and which shows enmity and hostility towards the Arab States for no other reason than the fact that they are seeking to adopt projects of development and growth, which rest upon proper principles of science and technology, for the purpose of building up their economies and attaining prosperity for their societies.

13. That is the real aim behind the Israeli attack against the Iraqi nuclear installation, an attack which denies every Arab country the right to practise what other countries practise in the field of social, scientific and technological development and the serious endeavour of Arab countries to narrow the developmental gap between them and the developed countries.

14. Representatives are fully aware that the Israeli theory of security violates the moral values that our age believes in and that the United Nations tries diligently to promote. The reason for this lies in the fact that Israel considers its security to be dependent upon the continuation of the state of war which enables it to fulfil its aims, including its desire to destroy every project which helps the people of the region in overcoming the technological gap from which they suffer.

15. That is the true nature of Israeli objectives and goals, its method of violence and terrorism and its violation of freedom. One wonders if Israel would be able to pursue its practices without the unconditional political, economic, technological and military support that it receives from a number of States which are represented in the Council, especially the Government of the United States. Until this day the Council has been unable to impose any sanctions against Israel, despite its aggression against the Arab States and despite the fact that it has uprooted the Palestinian people and left it homeless and despairing of international justice.

16. There is no doubt that, had the Council imposed the necessary sanctions against Israel in the past, it would not have been able to persevere in its various forms of aggression against the sovereignty of Lebanon and its territorial integrity in an attempt to jeopardize the unity of its people; nor would Israel have been able to threaten Syria or resort to sabotaging the development efforts undertaken by Iraq within the context of international legitimacy over the past few years.

17. In the light of the foregoing, we can only conclude that Israel is an aggressive State—aggressive not accidentally, but through planning and continued preparation for aggression, because it considers its security to be based upon aggression.

18. In the face of those Israeli practices, the super-Powers and the great Powers have to shoulder their responsibility with firmness because it is their duty to utilize all means for the preservation of peace and security in all regions of the world.

19. There is no other way to deter Israel from the aggressive course it is pursuing but the adoption of the necessary measures that are bound to put a limit to its aggression. Israel is a Member of the United Nations and must therefore respect the Charter and abide by the rules of international law in accordance with which the Organization was created and to which it owes its existence.

20. Will the Council merely condemn Israel this time, knowing full well that Israel has always ridiculed all kinds of condemnation and has behaved towards the United Nations, which gave it its birth certificate, with arrogance and disdain?

21. If we really respect our great international Organization and care for its credibility, we must provide it with the necessary means that will enable it to discharge its responsibilities. In the case under discussion, it is in the interest of morality and international peace that the Council adopt a resolution calling for the imposition of sanctions against the aggressor. Without such a resolution, Israel will continue to violate international rules and principles and thus will rest assured that it will be neither deterred nor penalized.

22. The exercise of the right of veto against a draft resolution imposing sanctions on Israel will have a negative impact upon world public opinion, which has condemned in an unprecedented way the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installation. The leaders of various countries of the world have strongly condemned that aggression, and so has the press in different parts of the world. International public opinion will therefore be dismayed to see the aggressor free to pursue its aggressive policies against other nations, in this case the Arab States.

23. Should any State cast its veto to prevent the adoption of such a resolution, the Arab peoples will undoubtedly be greatly shocked because they still believe that the United Nations represents the conscience of the international community and is a refuge to which peace-loving nations turn. Will, then, the hopes of the Arab people be frustrated, and will the aggressor be given the green light to proceed with its acts of terrorism and piracy?

24. Any objection to the imposition of sanctions will in this case be explained by the Arab people and the peoples of the third world as an act of bias in favour of the aggressor for reasons which can neither be understood nor justified, especially since the Arab right is crystal clear in this case. Should any State exercise its veto power, which God forbid, the Council

will thus reinforce in the minds of weak peoples the conviction that the principles and rules embodied in international charters are different from those of the real world. There is no doubt that such a situation would jeopardize the chances for mutual respect and confidence among different peoples as well as the settlement of conflicts in various parts of the world.

25. We ask ourselves: how long will the United States continue to arm Israel with advanced weapons, expertise and technology? How long will the United States continue to overlook the serious excesses perpetrated by Israel? How long will the United States continue to overlook Israeli practices which aim at violating the principles of international law and the legitimate rights of the people of the area? We say all this because the United States is a permanent member of the Council and because it is a super-Power whose responsibility is the preservation of international peace, not the encouragement of aggression and destruction. We also say all this because the United States carries the banner of freedom and peace. We therefore ask ourselves: are the crimes committed by Israel in the region consistent with the values and principles espoused by the United States?

26. Our interest in maintaining positive co-operation with all the countries of the world and preserving non-alignment and independence leads us to hope that the Council's resolutions will be credible, in order not to prompt the belief that a violator of rights will find a sympathetic ear in matters where it cannot appeal to reason or to ethical principles, matters which promote the law of the jungle among members of the international community, a jungle in which the strong will do as they wish without fear of deterrence or penalty.

27. We appeal to the Council on the basis of our firm belief that justice must govern relations among all States great and small, distant and near, justice which believes in the equality of all States and holds that those States excel each other only to the degree that they respect international law and custom.

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

29. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): Allow me to express the gratitude of my delegation to you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Security Council for giving me an opportunity to address the Council during its current deliberations on the Israeli military attack on an Iraqi atomic reactor. The timely convening of the Council to consider the grave situation arising out of Israel's aggression against Iraq cannot but enhance our faith in the United Nations and encourage confidence in its determination to meet any threat to international peace and security. We are particularly happy that the Council has your leadership and guidance, Mr. President, at this critical moment. Your

personal qualities as well as the standing that Mexico enjoys in the international community will, we are confident, have a decisive influence on the decisions of the Council.

30. The Council has met on innumerable earlier occasions to consider the explosive situation in Western Asia created on account of the expansionist policies and aggressive actions of Israel. Israel has so far totally disregarded the calls and urgings as well as the condemnations and injunctions emanating from the Council and persisted in its intransigence towards its Arab neighbours, particularly the Palestinian people, who have been denied even their fundamental right to their own homeland. The latest Israeli act of aggression, this time in the nature of a premeditated attack on an Iraqi nuclear reactor in the outskirts of Baghdad, was committed at a time when the Arab countries in the region were engaged in a serious attempt to ward off war, even in the face of grave provocations. The continued occupation and annexation of Arab territories and the increasing threat to the very existence of Lebanon had already brought Western Asia to the brink of war. The naked and wanton aggression against Iraq now perpetrated by Israel has made the situation in Western Asia all the more precarious.

31. It was with grave concern and a sense of deep indignation that my Government learned of the attack on the Osirak atomic reactor in Iraq by Israeli war planes on 7 June. The Israeli action, which is nothing but stark adventurism and blatant intervention and aggression, deserves universal condemnation. It is a flagrant violation of all canons of international law and principles governing the conduct of relations between States. No justification, however ingenious, can alter this irrefutable fact. To call the very victim of Israeli aggression an aggressor is indeed a strange perversion. To invoke the right to self-defence to justify a long-premeditated act of aggression is a cynical attempt to confuse the issue. To cite Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations in support of this indefensible action is a travesty of the very provisions of the Charter. That Israel should have sought to present such arguments is an affront to the United Nations and the international community as a whole. It demonstrates yet again Israel's callous disregard of international law and its arrogant defiance of world opinion. The present action of Israel is not an isolated act of self-defence to deal with a special situation, as Israel has alleged. Rather, it must be seen as part of what Israel has been doing for the past many years in denying the rights of the people of Palestine and in continuing to occupy Arab lands, which has been the cause of continuing tensions and conflict in the region. Israel cannot ensure its own security by threatening the security of its Arab neighbours or by thwarting the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. Indeed, its own intransigence and aggressive actions are the cause of instability in the region and the consequent threat to peace and security.

32. India has consistently maintained solidarity with the Arab nations, which are constantly threatened by Israel's aggressive and expansionist policies. We have repeatedly called for the withdrawal of Israel from the Arab territories occupied since 1967, to facilitate the establishment of a Palestinian State and to guarantee the right of all States in the region to live in peace and harmony. Our hopes for the establishment of durable peace in the region have once again been shattered by Israel. Though acts of aggression by Israel have become too frequent to cause shock or surprise, the very nature of the attack on Iraq's nuclear reactor has shaken the entire world. The wanton destruction of a nuclear facility established with the objective of harnessing nuclear energy for peaceful purposes has made a mockery of accepted norms of international conduct and behaviour.

33. The argument that Israel has advanced to justify its actions is an allegation that Iraq was on the verge of producing atomic weapons. That allegation is baseless, because Iraq has repeatedly stated that its programme in the nuclear field is confined to the utilization of nuclear energy and technology for peaceful purposes. On the other hand, the world is aware that it is Israel which has been making systematic efforts in the pursuit of nuclear-weapons capability. There is growing evidence to show that Israel may already have acquired such capability and a stockpile of nuclear weapons. Against that background, surely the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes by Iraq cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be deemed to be a threat to Israel. The sovereign right of a developing country to acquire and develop nuclear technology for peaceful purposes cannot be denied or thwarted through discriminatory policies and practices and much less by such a dastardly act of naked aggression as the one committed by Israel.

34. The Council once again has ample proof that Israel alone is responsible for threatening peace and security in Western Asia. In fact, Israel has already committed breaches of the peace on several occasions, without any fear of punitive action by the United Nations. Entrusted as it is with the maintenance of peace and security in the world, the Council has the obligation to signal clearly to Israel that the international community will not tolerate its transgressions any more. We therefore join in the demand that the Council should not only condemn this act of Israeli aggression as a violation of the Charter and international law but also determine that it constitutes a grave threat to peace and security. The time is also now for the Council to consider, as urged by the Foreign Minister of Iraq, Mr. Hammadi, effective action under Chapter VII of the Charter to impose mandatory sanctions against Israel.

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

36. Mr. CORRÊA DA COSTA (Brazil): Mr. President, I should like at the outset to thank you and the other members of the Security Council for having given me the opportunity to address the Council and to make a statement on behalf of my Government expressing Brazil's views on the military attack against the Osirak nuclear reactor last Sunday.

37. Once again the Security Council is called upon to consider a breach of the principles on which the Organization is based. As a country which believes that those principles constitute the essential bulwark against chaos in relations among States, and as a Member of the United Nations which has consistently observed its obligations under the Charter, Brazil sees it as its duty to join other Member States in a clear condemnation of the aggression suffered by Iraq.

38. Brazil has always expressed its support of a comprehensive, just and durable peace in the Middle East, based on the principles of the Charter. By its act of aggression, Israel disregards its commitments under the Charter and gravely increases tension in the Middle East; in fact, its recent action renders the prospects for peace in the region much dimmer than they were before.

39. Brazil condemns an attack which is a flagrant breach of international law and which shows a dangerous preference for the use of force. The notion—for one cannot call it a doctrine—of “preventive aggression” is unacceptable under the legal system which binds all nations. Toleration of that notion would lead to the destruction of the Organization and to the foundering of any hope of coexistence among States.

40. A violation of the principles and purposes of the Charter is damaging to all the Members of the Organization, and not only to the immediate victims of such a violation. It certainly is damaging to the author of the violation, no matter how he may try to justify it.

41. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of Cuba, the President of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

42. Mr. ROA KOURÍ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I should like, first of all, to thank you and the other members of the Council for this opportunity to speak during the debate on the Israeli aggression against the Osirak nuclear reactor in Iraq.

43. It is also a great pleasure for me to greet you, Sir, as the worthy representative of Mexico, the country in which José Martí felt himself to be a “foreigner in privileges, but a Mexican in duties”; the country which has resisted the pressures from its powerful neighbour and has always maintained rela-

tions of friendship and respect with revolutionary Cuba; Mexico, the homeland of Juárez and Morelos, through whose race the spirit of our America speaks. I am convinced that, with your great qualities and recognized skill, you will be able to steer the present meetings of the Council to a successful conclusion.

44. The Council is meeting once again to consider an act of flagrant aggression which endangers international peace and security. The barbarous air attack by the Zionist régime against civilian Iraqi installations on 7 June last is nothing but a typical act of State terrorism, an action of international gangsterism, which has been firmly condemned by the majority of the Members of the Organization.

45. To the unspeakable deed is added the unheard-of brazenness with which the aggressor itself set about divulging the news and with which it attempted to justify the unjustifiable in this august forum. In the name of “security”, the Zionist régime is trampling the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and is illegally occupying Arab territories. In the name of “security”, it is massacring the population of southern Lebanon, destroying property and homes. In the name of “security” it is attacking the Arab nation and bombarding Iraqi nuclear research installations. Adolf Hitler launched his criminal hordes against the peoples of Europe in the name of *lebensraum*. Zionists and Nazis merge in their shabby arrogance, in their messianic aggressiveness, in their brutal contempt for the law of peoples and the international community.

46. The United Nations cannot allow one of its Members to attempt to stand above international law and the obligations imposed by the Charter of the Organization on all its Members. That is intolerable, even when the offender has among its few allies a permanent member of the Council.

47. Not content with the defiant statements of his Prime Minister, the representative of the Zionist régime yesterday [2280th meeting] displayed amazing cynicism, attempting to portray himself as the champion of denuclearization in the Middle East, and, in the process, falsifying the causes of the tension in that region of the world. It is not the existence of nuclear weapons—which, of course, are possessed in the area only by the Zionist régime—which has converted Asia Minor into a true powder-keg, but precisely the expansionist and aggressive policies of Israel and its persistent refusal to recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. Or can hypocrisy have scaled greater heights, and did the representative of the Zionist régime mean to suggest that a blitzkrieg, with sophisticated aircraft from the United States, is the correct formula for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East? That would be denuclearization *manu militari*, like the illegal occupation of Arab and Palestinian lands.

48. From the point of view of the norms governing the behaviour of States in the peaceful use of nuclear

energy, the argument of the aggressors does not stand up to the slightest scrutiny. The programmes for the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, as is well known, rule out, under rigorous supervision, the use of atomic science for purposes opposed to international peace and security. The word "safeguard" is permanently embodied in the language of the United Nations.

49. It is not by coincidence that the Board of Governors of IAEA in Vienna unequivocally condemned the Zionist act of aggression against Iraq and reiterated the right of all States to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes [see S/14532]. The Director General, Sigvard Eklund, himself confirmed that the Iraqi nuclear installations were covered by the safeguards and guarantees of that international Agency.

50. As if that were not enough, we have the presence of more than a hundred scientists and technicians from the country which provided the reactor, a responsible permanent member of the Security Council, with all that their presence implies in terms of additional guarantees.

51. We believe, as has already been stated by a great many Governments in expressing their condemnation of the Zionist act of aggression against Iraq, that this abominable act highlights the vital need to reach international agreements to prohibit attacks against nuclear power stations, whose destruction can result in massive loss of life and property.

52. My delegation, pending an emphatic reply from the Council, wonders whether the United Nations is willing to allow the Zionist régime of Israel to violate with impunity the cardinal principle of respect for the sovereignty of States, to heighten dangers and tension in the region and to threaten international peace and security.

53. In our view, only one reply can be expected from the organ whose primary responsibility is precisely to watch over peace and security around the world: unequivocal condemnation and the imposition of sanctions against this repeat offender. Any other artifice or sorcery, any other acts of legal juggling or attempts to justify the barbarous action would be unworthy and inadmissible, since they would be objectively endorsing the conduct of the aggressor.

54. In some circles we can already see clumsy stammerings, shameful disclaimers, courtroom conjuring and political attempts to absolve the offender. It would be hard for these so-called lawyers to prevent the imposition of sanctions against an aggressor which not only declares its guilt but threatens to commit new and worse offences. Following the zigzag path of Fascist logic, perhaps they will tell us, together with Israel: "After all, they are not so bad; if the reactor had been functioning, there would have been an

escape of radioactivity and the result would have been even worse."

55. This case cannot be considered in isolation. We have heard the complaint by Iraq [2280th meeting]—the incontrovertible evidence and arguments presented by its Minister for Foreign Affairs. But our main concern must be to make sure that we do not lose sight of the wood for the trees.

56. The barbarous attack on 7 June cannot be separated from the series of aggressive acts committed by Israel against its Arab neighbours; nor can it be dissociated from the overt support which it receives from the Government of the United States of America in pursuing its expansionist policy. Such hostile acts, already of long date, have escalated to new levels of intensity over recent weeks.

57. The Zionist régime of Israel, however much it may displease the false prophets of neo-McCarthyism, has formed a sinister binomial with the South African apartheid régime to raise State terrorism to the level of international policy. To restrict myself to only one of the factors in this binomial, the aerial attack against the Iraqi nuclear installations was, as we all know, preceded by threats against Syria and by constant terrorist activities conducted against Lebanon, as well as in the occupied Arab territories.

58. How and why is this chain of piratical Zionist activities possible? How and why is this sustained adventuristic policy by the Zionist State feasible? Who is its guarantor? Who is encouraging and inciting it? Who is the ventriloquist working the dummy?

59. None of this could have occurred just by itself. Economic, political and demographic limitations, as well as limited natural resources, would have erected a barrier around the offender.

60. Israel's gangster policy is a fact, and it continues to scoff at the conscience of the world, solely and exclusively as a result of the complicity, support, encouragement and inspiration which the Zionist régime receives from imperialist circles—in particular, from the United States Government.

61. Ultra-modern military supplies, sophisticated equipment—including the aircraft which sowed destruction upon the Iraqi Osirak nuclear research centre—which threaten the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other neighbours in the region and snuff out lives in Arab cities and towns, bear the well-known label "Made in the USA".

62. Barely a week ago, the non-aligned movement, meeting in extraordinary plenary session, wisely and perceptively stressed the singular coincidence of aggressive actions taking place in the Middle East and in southern Africa. In the communiqué issued at that time [S/14508, annex], the non-aligned countries

stressed that the common denominator in both cases—Israel and South Africa—was the modern and sophisticated American armaments which Washington was providing to its racist allies. A delegation from the movement, with a mandate from the plenary session, undertook to express that concern to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. On that same day, as if to heighten the drama of the situation, Zionist aircraft carried out their piratical act of aggression against Iraq.

63. It is the bounden duty of the international community, and of course of the Security Council in the first instance, to put an immediate end to the prevailing situation. The non-aligned movement has consistently and clearly expressed its unlimited solidarity with the Palestinian resistance and with the Arab peoples and countries of the region that are facing Zionist aggression. At this time of challenge, of uncertain dangers threatening peace and security around the entire world, we reaffirm that solidarity today and we call on the members of the Council speedily to adopt measures compelling the arrogant aggressor to yield, to halt its vandalous acts and thus contribute to the attainment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, which would presuppose Israel's complete withdrawal from occupied Palestinian and Arab territories and full exercise of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including its return to its own homeland, self-determination and the establishment of an independent Palestinian State in Palestine.

64. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of Pakistan, whom I now invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

65. Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan): Mr. President, on behalf of the Pakistan delegation, I wish to express our deep gratitude to you and to the other members of the Security Council for providing us the opportunity of participating in this important meeting. I should also like to express our warm felicitations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of June. We are happy to say that our two countries enjoy the most cordial relations of close friendship and co-operation. We are confident that under your wise guidance the Council will be able to take important decisions in carrying out its responsibility under the Charter with respect to international peace and security, which have been gravely jeopardized by the latest act of Israeli aggression.

66. The Israeli attack on the Iraqi atomic reactor on 7 June has shocked the international community and has further aggravated the already explosive situation in the Middle East. Commenting on this latest act of aggression by Israel, the Government of Pakistan issued a statement on 9 June describing the Israeli attack on the Iraqi atomic reactor as "an unprecedented act of international gangsterism" and a

flagrant violation "of the principles of civilized conduct" among nations [S/14517]. The statement called this Israeli act of terrorism against Iraq a continuation of the brazen aggression which Israel has unleashed against its Arab neighbours.

67. The Government of Pakistan condemned in the strongest terms the unprovoked Israeli aggression against Iraq and called upon the international community to take effective measures to prevent Israel from threatening the peace and stability of its neighbours with impunity. The Government and people of Pakistan declared their total solidarity with their Iraqi brethren in the face of the Israeli aggression.

68. The Council is once again faced with a grave violation of the Charter of the United Nations by Israel, which deserves the strongest condemnation and calls for an effective response from the Council.

69. The fallacy of the Israeli plea that the attack was undertaken in self-defence was fully exposed by the Iraqi Foreign Minister yesterday. The Israeli contention that the Iraqi nuclear reactor, which was part of Iraq's peaceful nuclear programme, posed a threat to Israel is no more than a clumsy pretext to provide an *ex post facto* justification of its act of aggression. The peaceful nature of the Iraqi nuclear programme is fully evident from the report of the Director General of IAEA and the resolution adopted by the Board of Governors of the Agency in the aftermath of the Israeli attack. Iraq fully subscribes to the Agency's safeguards system and has been fulfilling its obligations under that arrangement. It is clear that the Israeli attack on Iraqi nuclear facilities was part of the Israeli scheme to keep its Arab neighbours perpetually weak and technologically backward. In attempting to do so, however, Israel is only pitting itself against the irresistible advance of history.

70. Israeli representatives are trying to justify Israel's act of aggression against Iraq by invoking the principle of self-defence, specially Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. This cynical approach of Israel in arrogating to itself the right to act arbitrarily on the pretext of self-defence constitutes a highly dangerous precedent that must be condemned in the strongest terms. Such an interpretation of Article 51 of the Charter is no less than a negation of the United Nations itself, to which, ironically, Israel owes its very existence. No State should be allowed to take the law into its own hands. Even when Member States are facing a threat, it is imperative that they first resort to the United Nations.

71. The Israeli attack against the Iraqi nuclear installation has added a grave dimension to the conflict in the Middle East. It seems that Israel wishes to block every avenue leading to a durable peace in the Middle East and is not inclined to terminate its continuing aggression against the Arab and Palestinian people. Already, Israeli aggression has assumed

intolerable proportions. Israel has usurped and occupied the Arab and Palestinian lands, uprooting the Palestinian people from their ancient land and depriving them of their inalienable national rights. It has repeatedly committed acts of aggression against the Arab and Palestinian people and has contemptuously rejected the decisions and verdicts of the international community. Israel in its arrogance has now taken upon itself the launching of pre-emptive strikes against its Arab neighbours in order to perpetuate its hegemony in the Middle East. The relentless Israeli aggression, unless firmly checked, will inevitably lead to disastrous consequences for the peace of the entire region and, indeed, of the world.

72. The time has come for the Council to take effective decisions to force Israel to terminate its continuing aggression against the Arab and Palestinian people and to respect international law and to desist from taking the law into its own hands. Condemnation alone will not serve the purpose. The Council must act firmly and should proceed to impose mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. Only a decisive and resolute response to the latest act of premeditated Israeli aggression can compel Israel to see reason, abandon its arrogance and submit itself to the dictates of peace. Firm action on the part of the Council is also called for in order to reassert its effectiveness as the primary international body responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security.

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

74. Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from Russian*): I should first like to thank you, Mr. President, and all the other members of the Security Council for giving my country the opportunity to take part in the discussion of the item on the agenda. It is a particular pleasure for me to see you, an eminent representative of a country with which my own enjoys close, friendly relations, occupying the responsible post of President. We are convinced that under your skilful and wise leadership the work of the Council will be successful.

75. I should like to pay a sincere tribute also to your predecessor, Mr. Masahiro Nisibori, who conducted the Council's work last month.

76. World public opinion reacted with the utmost indignation to the news of the criminal, terrorist act of the ruling circles of Israel. It is by no means an exaggeration to state that there has been practically unanimous condemnation by the world of that act. This is demonstrated also by the present discussion in the Council.

77. Indeed, that act was in flagrant violation of international law. It has affected the very foundations

of the system of international relations, and has further exacerbated an already tense situation in the Middle East. The world community, which has been following with deep concern the actions of the Israeli militarists in Lebanon, has received further confirmation of Israel's aggressive designs. Israel has once again shown that in order to achieve its expansionist aims it is ready to undertake any crimes against international peace and security. This attack is one further step in a long series of steps taken by Israel which have elevated international terrorism to the status of State policy.

78. As is said in a statement distributed by the Bulgarian Telegraphic Agency, this is "a natural consequence of the Camp David conspiracy, which freed the hands of the extremist circles in Tel Aviv to undertake further aggressive actions against those Arab States that have rejected the policy of separate deals and are striving to bring about a comprehensive and lasting settlement of the Middle East problem". To the tactics whose essence is, by means of separate negotiations, to split the united front of the Arab States and peoples, in the interests of Israeli expansionism and in the service of the forces of reaction and imperialism, there has now been added the method of selective strikes against individual Arab States.

79. There are no arguments or points that could possibly justify this most arrant violation of the rules of civilized intercourse among States. The so-called security considerations that have been adduced are rather difficult to square with the doctrine of so-called spheres of vital interests. The philosophy of those two doctrines has now been joined by the concept of the so-called pre-emptive strike.

80. There are no guarantees that this piratical raid will not be repeated—and very soon at that. Indeed, the aggressor has declared with unconcealed cynicism that it is ready to repeat its criminal actions in the future. Thus, all the States that are in the geographical proximity of Israel and that lie within range of its aircraft are now subject to the threat of a similar attack against their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

81. Israel, its political and State leaders, and also the Zionist lobbies in the States that are patrons of Israel, have already adopted a stance which can be characterized as the arrogance of power. Along with that, ridiculous attempts have been made to divert the attention of world public opinion from the facts of this most flagrant, lawless, illegal, criminal act by adducing arguments connected with considerations of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons.

82. In their attempts to justify their criminal attack by the use of arguments about an alleged nuclear threat, the Israeli aggressors—for obvious reasons—have passed over in silence the fact that the country that was the victim of their attack is actually a State party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and has allowed

all its nuclear activities to be inspected by IAEA. Indeed, it is none other than the Israeli Government which has so stubbornly refused to associate itself with the existing system that is preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, and has preserved its freedom of action for the further development of nuclear weapons. Moreover, the mass media and official statements and documents published in certain countries have all made it clear for a long time that Israel possesses nuclear weapons and the potential for manufacturing them. It is a secret to no one that Israel and the racist Pretoria régime have established the closest possible co-operation in the nuclear field.

83. The hollowness and absurdity of the arguments adduced by the aggressor and its supporters are a further example of how Israel and its protectors attempt to mislead world public opinion. This is one further piece of evidence of how deeply entrenched in the minds of Israel's ruling circles is the profoundly fallacious idea that Israel's security can be ensured only by harming the security of others. That is a fallacious thesis; it is harmful and it is doomed, even from the standpoint of the genuine interests of the Israeli people itself.

84. The world community categorically repudiates all attempts on the part of Tel Aviv to justify its own aggressive actions by unfounded allegations against the victim of aggression and by attempts to represent it as guilty of committing an act of aggression. To agree with that kind of argumentation and approach would mean replacing contemporary international law by the law of the jungle and would be tantamount to connivance at aggression. The aggressor must bear full responsibility under the Charter of the United Nations for its acts of criminal aggression.

85. On the other hand, however, it would be wrong in principle if, in the circumstances, attention were not drawn also to the responsibility borne in the present circumstances by Israel's main protector. If Israel continues on its course of disregarding the will of the world community, if it continues its aggressive and expansionist policy and its acts of terror against its neighbours—and not only against them—then the ruling circles of the United States, too, must bear their share of responsibility. Everyone knows that Israel would hardly have dared to undertake such an irresponsible provocative action if it had not been sure that its principal arms supplier would in practice continue to support it. And nothing is changed by the fact that in words they have condemned Israel and have even threatened it with a postponement of the delivery of new offensive equipment. Everyone knows that in this case aircraft of United States manufacture were not used either for so-called self-defence or for so-called maintenance of internal order—on course, those two categories include actions carried out more than 1,000 kilometres from Israel's borders.

86. It is quite obvious that the United States, too, bears responsibility for the crime committed against

peace and security and for this act of State terrorism which is so dangerous for the stability of the international situation. On the other hand, Israel's actions are one more striking confirmation of the truth that United States policy, its strategy of separate settlement of the problems of the Middle East without taking account of the interests of all the interested parties, amounts in practice to encouraging the expansionist designs of Israel.

87. An understanding is growing around the world of the fact that the Middle East problem can be resolved only by means of a specially convened international conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all interested parties, including the Palestine Liberation Organization.

88. It is our view that, at this extremely crucial moment for the cause of peace and security, it is more than ever necessary for the Security Council, upon which the Charter has conferred special powers in questions affecting the maintenance of international peace and security, to come out firmly in favour of adopting practical, effective measures which could prevent a repetition of such aggressive actions in the future.

89. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is Mr. Chedli Klubi, the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

90. Mr. KLIBI (*interpretation from French*): Allow me first of all to join the heads of delegations who have already paid a tribute to the authority which you, Mr. President, have and continue to show in conducting the work of the Security Council. Allow me also to say how much the qualities of your predecessor, the representative of Japan, have been appreciated, since the echoes of the esteem in which he was held have reached us.

91. I am keenly aware of the honour that you, Mr. President, have shown me by allowing the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States to speak here in the Council for the first time. I should like to express my deep appreciation for that.

92. The question before the Council is one of exceptional gravity. Peace is in danger in a region which today is the most sensitive in the world. An Iraqi scientific research facility—indeed, a nuclear reactor—has been destroyed and human lives have been lost. That, we are told, was done "cleanly and effectively" [2280th meeting, para. 59].

93. In spite of all the pretexts which have been put forward, despite the initial and the latest justifications, Israel is guilty beyond a shadow of doubt.

94. We have heard talk of self-defence; but when one looks into that argument one realizes that it is an

unfounded imputation of intent. Between building a nuclear reactor, on the one hand, and, on the other, using it to produce nuclear weapons and use them against Israel, being prepared in so doing to massacre, along with Israelis, those Arabs who live in Israel, in the occupied territories and even in the neighbouring countries of the region, which would inevitably be contaminated by the radiation, owing to the smallness of Israeli territory—between those two actions there is a distance which only men hard put to it for arguments did not hesitate to cross.

95. Therefore this is a fallacious argument and the argument of self-defence cannot be supported. Rabbi Balfour Brickner knew that when, according to *The New York Times* of 12 June 1981, he said: "No nation can arbitrarily thumb its nose at the world, destroying what it perceives as a threat to its security."

96. The flight of supersonic aircraft, which violated the airspace of two countries before bombing the territory of a third; the massacre of a large number of workers and technicians; the destruction of a technologically sophisticated installation—this cold-blooded crime, which was committed "deliberately", as has been recognized, was not, let there be no mistake, conceived solely in terms of electoral interests. The explanation is to be found in the French newspaper *Le Monde* of 10 June. An article by Charles Saint-Prot states:

"... one may wonder why the State of Israel took such a risk, carrying out an action that has earned it the condemnation of the entire international community.

"Indeed, Israel has developed a nuclear bomb in the Negev and has refused to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It wished to halt the technological development of its main adversary in the Middle East."

The article goes on to state:

"Israel could dominate the region only with the assistance of Western technology, in particular that of the United States, and it has a vested interest in seeing the Arabs remain underdeveloped."

The article continues:

"The Iraqi research centre must comprise more than 500 Arab engineers and technicians. Therein lies what Israel wanted to prevent—as though it were possible to prevent the scientific take-off of an entire people!"

97. The Council may be sure that Israel was in no way concerned with defence objectives or the preservation of security. The notion of security, Israel's old war-horse, can be expanded in terms of space, and not merely in terms of airspace. Its geographical limits

have never been made clear; nor have its frontiers, which Israel still refuses to define and which it would prefer to extend from the Nile to the Euphrates, and Baghdad is on the Euphrates.

98. For the Zionist State, defence is attack. So-called preventive attacks are only a subterfuge to impose domination and hegemony. In that area the Israeli arguments are presented as being the only valid ones, the only ones that are credible, whereas those of its adversary—even if justified, evident, tangible and indeed staring you in the face—are always null and void.

99. The head of the Israeli Government, drunk with joy after the attack on Baghdad and the destruction of the Iraqi research centre, has attempted to teach "moral lessons", to use his own term, to the States of Western Europe, including France, the France of President Mitterand, whose election he welcomed and acclaimed. Invective, sarcasm, insults—everybody comes in for his share: the German Chancellor, Italian politicians, the United States Secretary of Defense, and so on.

100. Israel's arrogance and irresponsibility are such today that no country in the area can feel secure or, in other words, safe from an Israeli attack, concerned as Israel is with preventing the Arab nation from advancing along the road of technology and progress.

101. Some, in Europe and elsewhere, in 1977 and recently, had in good faith thought that the Camp David accords, by markedly reducing the weight of Israel's adversaries, would reassure Israel and lead it to a more balanced view of the Arabs. They have had to think again. Contrary to their expectation, Israel has become emboldened. It thinks it can do anything. In Lebanon it is sowing division, destabilizing, machine-gunning and bombing. And when attempts are made through appropriate deterrents to prevent it from continuing to violate Lebanese airspace, it threatens to declare war on Syria.

102. Israel claims—we heard this yesterday—that since the destruction of Osirak the region has become less dangerous and the situation is less threatening. But less threatening to whom? Certainly not to the Arabs, who are threatened with the bombing of their towns and the destruction of their technological potential. And these are not empty threats. Not only does Israel possess warplanes that can commit aggression against any Arab city, aggression that has already been clearly and publicly announced by the head of the Israeli Government; it also possesses nuclear weapons—everything points to this.

103. Israel's nuclear reactors, which it has possessed since the 1950s, are not open to international inspection, because Israel has not yet acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. But what cannot fail to disturb us considerably is that, while a few American experts

were able to visit that reactor in the 1960s, those visits have not been permitted for the last 10 years.

104. Is Israel ready to authorize a visit of inspection from IAEA? If it refuses, it should justify its decision before the international community. Let it say what it is hiding in that centre and why it is hiding it.

105. And why should we not ask that country, which justifies its aggression and denies the right of others to manufacture nuclear bombs, whether it possesses nuclear weapons and how long it has possessed them? Would it be ready to answer that double question?

106. In actual fact, there is quite a contrast between Israel's conduct and that of Iraq. Israel has long entertained thoughts about the nuclear option. In 1976, before the Osirak plan, Moshe Dayan, who is no stranger to this, stated that Israel must have the nuclear option to counterbalance the numerical superiority of the Arabs.

107. That is the situation. It is Israel which 30 years ago began the nuclear competition in the area. In 1974, the then head of the Israeli Government claimed that Israel possessed a nuclear potential—that is, the capacity to manufacture the bomb. Those are the facts.

108. We are told that Israel claims the right to survival. But what has Israel done to ensure the possibility of survival for the Palestinian people, which has been condemned to exile, doomed to life in the refugee camps, stripped of its country and its identity, deprived of its most elementary rights?

109. As is evident, the Israeli danger is not just a mere slogan. It is a reality that is reasserted more strongly with every passing day. At the present time, no country in the region is free from the threat, and tomorrow no Arab country, from the Gulf to the Atlantic, no Muslim country maybe, and no African country will feel exempt from attacks by Israel, unless the international community does something to remedy the situation.

110. That State, which is still back in the days of colonialism in its thinking, its racial segregation and religious intolerance, but which happens to possess the most sophisticated weapons, which it is using in the service of the mentality of an earlier age—that State is dangerous, and we must be on our guard against it.

111. More than once United Nations bodies, including the Security Council, have condemned acts of aggression by Israel and have bidden it to comply with international law, which it is always obviously determined to flout. But all those decisions and resolutions have remained a dead letter.

112. Sanctions have been called for in the Council. Measures have been proposed. The Council cannot shirk its duty: world peace is at stake. All the hot points which seem to threaten that world peace have cooled down, with one exception: the Middle East. The objective elements of a confrontation which could lead to armed conflict are liable, over the short term, to be found there in combination.

113. In the face of this situation, the Council of the League of Arab States, meeting in extraordinary session at Baghdad on 11 June, vigorously condemned the Israeli aggression. It also affirmed the absolute right of the Arab States to establish programmes of technological and nuclear development. The Council none the less decided to work through the United Nations and to trust in it, because of its devotion to the Charter [S/14529, annex].

114. The unanimous determination of 21 Arab States, expressed by the League of Arab States, is that political options should be exhausted. It is those options which the Arab States would prefer, anxious as they are to ensure peace in the region.

115. If the Arab States have had recourse to the Security Council, it is out of necessity as well as of conviction. It is also because they want to conduct themselves responsibly *vis-à-vis* the rest of the world. That sense of responsibility is something they have proved and they expect that others will follow suit.

116. The act of aggression by Israel is a flagrant one and it is indefensible. Self-defence cannot be used as a legitimate explanation. While claiming to be preventing the Arabs from possessing nuclear weapons, Israel has not denied itself possession, thinking thus to counterbalance the numerical superiority of the Arabs.

117. For the Arabs, the use of nuclear weapons comes up against major difficulties and presents inordinate risks, because within a radius of 100 kilometres the damage and loss of human life would be catastrophic.

118. The idea of Israel is therefore to weaken the Arabs because it is convinced—and here I am quoting Golda Meir—that the security of Israel resides in the weakness of the Arabs.

119. Israel wants to delay the technological progress of the Arabs, which is the guarantee of their independence and of their invulnerability.

120. Its aggression is therefore undeniable. It calls for the measures which have been proposed to the members of the Security Council.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة
يسكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استلم منها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经销处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o dirjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
