



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 20: Admission of new Members to the United Nations (<i>concluded</i>)	923
Agenda item 130: Armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security (<i>continued</i>)	929

President: Mr. Ismat T. KITTANI (Iraq).

AGENDA ITEM 20

Admission of new Members to the United Nations
(*concluded*)

1. The PRESIDENT: This afternoon I invite the Assembly to consider the positive recommendation by the Security Council for the admission of Antigua and Barbuda to membership of the United Nations. In this connection a draft resolution has been submitted in document A/36/L.13.

2. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts the draft resolution by acclamation?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 36/26).

3. The PRESIDENT: I therefore declare Antigua and Barbuda admitted to membership in the United Nations.

4. I request the Chief of Protocol to escort the delegation of Antigua and Barbuda to its place in the General Assembly Hall.

The delegation of Antigua and Barbuda was escorted to its place in the General Assembly Hall.

5. The PRESIDENT: It is a great honour for me once again to welcome a new Member of the United Nations—this time the State of Antigua and Barbuda, which is represented here today by Mr. Lester Bird, Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister, who is accompanied by Mr. Vere C. Bird, Jr., Deputy Speaker and Adviser to the Prime Minister, and Mr. Hugh Marshall, Minister of State in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Economic Development, Tourism, Energy and Supply.

6. The admission of Antigua and Barbuda as the one hundred and fifty-seventh Member of the United Nations is a joyous occasion for us all because it brings us closer to the goal of universal membership. It is all the more gratifying because it marks yet another advance towards the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, a process in which the Assembly has played the leading

role. It gives me special pleasure to have presided over the General Assembly during this session when three new Member States have been admitted.

7. In welcoming the delegation of Antigua and Barbuda to our midst, I am confident that its presence among us will enrich the Organization and that it will make a valuable contribution to the work of the United Nations towards the achievement of the objectives set forth in the Charter.

8. Several delegations have expressed a desire to speak at this juncture. I call first on the representative of the United Kingdom.

9. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): Yesterday my delegation voted in favour of resolution 492 (1981) adopted unanimously in the Security Council, recommending that Antigua and Barbuda should be admitted to membership of the United Nations and it gives us equal pleasure to acclaim in the General Assembly, only 24 hours later, the resolution admitting the new State to full membership of the Organization.

10. This is the third time in the course of the thirty-sixth session that the General Assembly has welcomed a former dependent Territory of the United Kingdom. The ceremonies of admission for the delegations of Vanuatu and Belize earlier on in the session were happy occasions for all of us and it is now with particular pleasure that we welcome Antigua and Barbuda as the forty-third independent member of the Commonwealth to join us. Before independence on 1 November, it had been a self-governing State in association with the United Kingdom and fully responsible for its own internal affairs since 1967. Antigua and Barbuda now follows the same path as Dominica, Grenada, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines in its transition from associated statehood to full independence and United Nations membership.

11. I should like to say a few words about the status of association enjoyed by Antigua in the period before independence. This was a completely voluntary arrangement under which Antigua was fully self-governing, but the United Kingdom retained ultimate responsibility for foreign affairs and defence. In practice, a wide measure of executive authority in the field of external affairs was delegated to Antigua over the years and the remaining responsibilities of the British Government were discharged in close consultation with the Government of Antigua and with regard to its interests at all times. The British Government made clear at the outset that the status of association could be terminated at any time and by either party. In accordance with successive British Governments' decolonization policies, my Government undertook to grant independence whenever this was the will of the majority of the people so long as the proposed independence constitution made proper provision for the preservation of fundamental rights and the rule of law. So when the present Government was elected in April last year on a platform of early independence, consultations were quickly

started and a Constitutional Conference was held in London from 4 to 16 December. That Conference was attended by delegations representing the United Kingdom, the Antiguan Government, the Antiguan Opposition and Barbuda, and the basis of their discussions was a draft independence constitution prepared by the Government of Antigua. This document was revised in the light of the Constitutional Conference's deliberations, and certain constitutional safeguards were introduced to protect the interests of the people of Barbuda. The Independence Constitution was then approved by the Antigua Parliament in April and May, and the British Parliament approved an Order in Council in July this year to prepare the way for full independence on 1 November.

12. Many distinguished visitors from all over the world attended the festivities at the beginning of this month. They witnessed the proud and joyful beginnings of a new Caribbean nation, and I am confident that Antigua and Barbuda will play its full part in international affairs. The links between the United Kingdom and Antigua and Barbuda will of course go from strength to strength. A web of commercial, cultural and economic links has been built up over the 300 years of our association. Even more important, the ties of friendship and real affection will endure, only to be enhanced by the new status of Antigua and Barbuda in the international community. The aid and technical co-operation programmes which have been administered in co-operation with the Government of Antigua over the years will continue; and in the Commonwealth and the international community we shall find new areas for co-operation and partnership.

13. It is a particular pleasure for me to see in this Hall Mr. Lester Bird, the Foreign Minister of Antigua and Barbuda, and Senator Lloyd Jacobs, who, I understand, will be the first Permanent Representative of Antigua and Barbuda to the United Nations. They will find many friends here, both amongst their Caribbean colleagues, who play such a vital role in the work of the Organization, and in the membership at large. Antigua and Barbuda has a strong parliamentary tradition and its democratic institutions are lively and firmly entrenched. We look forward to the role its representatives will undoubtedly play in New York and wish them, their Government and their people all good fortune in the years ahead.

14. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Benin, who will speak on behalf of the group of African States.

15. Mr. SOGLO (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): I am honoured and privileged, as chairman of the African group, to express from this rostrum the joy felt throughout Africa at this solemn moment when the Organization is welcoming to its fold its one hundred and fifty-seventh Member State, the new State of Antigua and Barbuda, which yesterday was still on the list of dependent Territories falling under the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in resolution 1514 (XV).

16. Africa, eternal Africa, which has the honour of having been linked for generations with this young State by close ties based on cultural traditions and common ways of life; Africa, militant Africa, which has just emerged from the long colonial night and which continues even today to fight to rid its continent once and for all of those who follow the retrograde policies of colonialism, neo-colonialism and *apartheid*; Africa cannot but rejoice above all others at the accession to independence and full

sovereignty of a Territory which, thanks to the farsightedness and vigilance of its sons and the courage and sacrifices of its people, has been able to throw off the colonial yoke.

17. That is why it is a particularly pleasant duty for me to address to this young State our warmest congratulations and sincerest good wishes for a future marked by peace and prosperity. I ask the leader of the delegation of this new State, Mr. Lester Bird, and the members of his delegation to be kind enough to pass on these good wishes and congratulations to the people and the Government of Antigua and Barbuda. Their State's admission, by bringing the Organization closer to its goal of universality, can only strengthen the determination and revive the hopes of all the colonized and oppressed peoples throughout the world which have resolved to do everything they can to rid themselves of the colonial yoke.

18. Henceforth, as a fully fledged member of the international community, this young State, drawing on the creative genius of its people and the values derived from its native soil, will, I am sure, make a positive contribution to the work for peace and development which is the *raison d'être* of the Organization.

19. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Pakistan, who will speak on behalf of the group of Asian States.

20. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan): It is a matter of special pleasure and an honour for the delegation of Pakistan to extend on behalf of the States members of the Asian group a warm welcome and sincere felicitations to Antigua and Barbuda on its admission as a Member of the United Nations.

21. Antigua and Barbuda attained independence on 1 November 1981, thus advancing the irreversible process of the complete and total elimination of colonialism and giving new hope to nations and peoples still under colonial domination. The Government of the newly independent country has pledged its adherence to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and solemnly declared its willingness to carry out its obligations as a Member of the Organization. We are confident that Antigua and Barbuda, by its presence in the United Nations as an equal partner, will make a positive contribution to the cause of international peace and the economic and social progress of mankind.

22. The admission of Antigua and Barbuda has brought the United Nations still closer to attaining complete universality in its membership. The presence of Antigua and Barbuda will also not only enrich the group of Latin American States but strengthen the Group of 77 and other third-world activities within the United Nations forum.

23. On behalf of the group of Asian States, we express our full solidarity with the Government and people of Antigua and Barbuda, wish them success in all their endeavours for national progress and prosperity and look forward to developing relations of close friendship and co-operation with the delegation of Antigua and Barbuda, which is today led by its distinguished Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister.

24. The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representative of Poland, who will speak on behalf of the group of Eastern European States.

25. Mr. WYZNER (Poland): It gives me great pleasure as chairman of the group of Eastern European States to extend a warm welcome into the family of the United Nations of its new Member, Antigua and Barbuda.

26. Ever since the establishment of the Organization, the socialist States of our group have been earnestly striving for the final abolition of colonialism and neo-colonialism in all its forms. That is why it gives us particular satisfaction to witness a steady development in the process of decolonization and of the liquidation of the last remnants of the old colonial rule in the world. At the same time, we consider it as corresponding with the truly universal character of the United Nations that the States gaining their independence join us here in our efforts to secure peaceful coexistence and co-operation among all nations.

27. The socialist States of our group welcome Antigua and Barbuda to the United Nations in the hope that the new Member of the United Nations will contribute by its peaceful policy to the achievement of those goals.

28. May I also convey to the people and Government of Antigua and Barbuda our warmest wishes for every success in the development of their statehood and the well-being of their nation.

29. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Mexico, who will speak on behalf of the group of Latin American States.

30. Mr. MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is a high honour for me to welcome a new Member State, Antigua and Barbuda, to the United Nations on behalf of the countries of Latin America, the region to which it historically and geographically belongs.

31. It is on our continent that the process of decolonization began and where it has been the longest, most painful and most conflict-ridden. Latin America has lived through nearly two centuries since the first efforts undertaken to attain political independence, and even now it is endeavouring to eliminate unacceptable vestiges of colonial domination and disgraceful forms of neo-colonial exploitation.

32. In Latin America, we have had to fight against old and new empires simultaneously. When some colonial Powers begin to decline, others, with new designs for domination, emerge. This is particularly true in the Caribbean area, where even today the right to independence is being denied, a right which is, in essence, the ability of a people to determine its own political régime and its own path to development.

33. The international community is richer today in its mixture of cultures, races, political systems and philosophies, the things that give the Organization its physiognomy and its universal nature. Latin America, for its part, is increasing its membership and responsibility. Every State that emerges in our region represents a further challenge to the mechanisms of co-operation that we have established. At the same time, however, it also represents a hope that our will to independence will be strengthened, as will our determination as Latin Americans to reject any and all overt or covert forms of hegemonism.

34. Almost half of the Latin American States are Caribbean countries, and approximately 10 are geographically

a part of the Caribbean basin. This means that a clear majority of the countries of Latin America are directly involved in the problems of a geographical area that is particularly subject to upheavals and that deserves the full attention of the international community and the great respect of the major Powers.

35. The first colonial settlements on this continent were in the Caribbean. It was there that the elimination or absorption of the indigenous races began. It was there where the transplantation of inhabitants from Africa and Asia began. The Caribbean has been the melting pot of civilizations, a model of colonial exploitation and a prey to ambitions of all kinds. That is why the peoples of the Caribbean have, historically, fully deserved their full freedom, their complete decolonization and a life of dignity based on international co-operation. It is the responsibility of the United Nations to assist them in that endeavour.

36. On behalf of all their brothers in Latin America, therefore, I welcome the people and the Government of Antigua and Barbuda. Upon their entry into the Organization, they acquire the best guarantee of their independence, and they offer to us a new, fresh voice in the struggle for peace and world security, as well as for the establishment of the new international economic order.

37. On behalf of all the countries of our region, I wish to express the fervent hope that the State which is today raising the membership to 157 may, in the application of the principles of the Charter and in active international co-operation, find good reasons to believe in the United Nations.

38. The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representative of Finland, who will speak on behalf of the group of Western European and other States.

39. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): As Chairman of the group of Western European and other States, I wish to extend a most cordial welcome to Antigua and Barbuda as the one hundred and fifty-seventh Member of the United Nations. In the annals of the United Nations, the admission of a new Member is always a solemn occasion for the State itself, as well as for the United Nations. It is not only a final recognition by the international community of the birth of a new nation; it also puts a formal seal on a covenant of mutual commitment between the new Member and the Organization, based on the Charter of the United Nations. The members of the group of Western European and other States attach special importance to occasions like this. They are further steps towards universality, towards a United Nations representing the international community as a whole. This aim can only be achieved if all nations on the earth belong to it.

40. We further welcome the membership of Antigua and Barbuda as another demonstration of the success of the efforts of the Organization in the peaceful dismantling of former colonial empires. The former administrative Power, the United Kingdom, is to be commended for the manner in which it has acted in accordance with its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations in bringing the inhabitants of Antigua and Barbuda to self-government and now to independence.

41. The group of Western European and other States warmly congratulates the Government and people of Antigua and Barbuda on the attainment of their independence and on their admission to the United Nations.

42. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Qatar, who will speak on behalf of the group of Arab States.

43. Mr. AL-DOSERI (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): On behalf of the group of Arab States and of the delegation of Qatar, it is my great pleasure to convey sincere congratulations to Antigua and Barbuda now that it has become a Member of the United Nations. We are certain that this new State will play an important part in achieving the goals of the Charter of the United Nations.

44. On this occasion, now that a new Member is being admitted to the United Nations family, I should like to say that this admission is one more step in the process of decolonization and strengthens the faith of those peoples who are still victims of colonialism. At the same time it strengthens the concept of universality of the United Nations. This underlines the desire of the majority of the Members of the Organization that people should enjoy their sacred right to self-determination and national independence.

45. In welcoming the new Member and congratulating it on its independence, we should not overlook the fact that decolonization is not yet ended, because there are still peoples who continue to fight heroically to enjoy their sacred right to self-determination and national independence, particularly in Africa and the Middle East. We are referring especially to Namibia and Palestine.

46. Once again I should like, on behalf of the group of Arab States and of Qatar, to congratulate the people of Antigua and Barbuda on their admission to membership of the United Nations, and I wish them every success in their struggle to promote their independence and to build prosperity. We hope that the delegation of Antigua and Barbuda will succeed in its new responsibilities here within the United Nations family, and we assure them of every co-operation on the part of the group of Arab States.

47. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Trinidad and Tobago to speak on behalf of the member States of the Caribbean Community [CARICOM].

48. Mr. ABDULAH (Trinidad and Tobago): It is with very great pleasure that, on behalf of the Commonwealth Caribbean, I today welcome the delegation of Antigua and Barbuda to the United Nations and offer congratulations to the Government and people of this sister Caribbean State upon its membership of this world body.

49. It says much for the continuing relevance and influence of the United Nations that, while newly independent States face the challenges posed by such factors as small size, underdeveloped economies and infrastructures and limited natural and manpower resources, their Governments attach great importance to membership of the United Nations. There can be no greater indication of faith in the Organization and in its continuing ability to act as a catalyst and moral force for the attainment of a more balanced, equitable and peaceful world order. We trust that as each new Member State brings the United Nations closer to achieving universality, progress towards this goal will be increasingly discernible.

50. We, the independent States in the Caribbean grouping of CARICOM, have achieved independence peacefully but not without the dedication, hard work and sacrifice of several generations. We have sought to create

societies founded on the values and aspirations of our peoples and, in spite of the disadvantages of small territorial size and populations and traditionally agricultural and very limited economies, we have made discernible progress in expanding our economies, developing our industrial bases and improving our infrastructures. There remains much to be done and we recognize that the development for which we strive can best be achieved in an era of peace, stability and mutual respect among all nations. From this recognition stems our commitment to the principles of the United Nations.

51. The islands of the Caribbean are strategically located at the crossroads between North and South. These islands have seen the passage of peoples between the two regions since the days of Columbus, and possibly earlier, although records do not remain. As a result, their populations have been enriched by the diversity of their racial and cultural heritage. Living in harmony, they have a breadth of outlook which is not likely to be found in the inhabitants of a more isolated group of islands and thus they are uniquely placed to serve as a bridge of understanding between North and South, between East and West.

52. As a part of this environment, Antigua and Barbuda is well placed to make an excellent contribution to the efforts of the United Nations towards fostering greater understanding and co-operation in every sphere between Member States. As a sovereign partner in the Caribbean Community, this newly independent State, we are sure, will contribute significantly to the development of the entire region, thereby enhancing the thrust of the region as a whole in relations at the international level.

53. The countries of the Commonwealth Caribbean welcome Antigua and Barbuda as the one hundred and fifty-seventh Member of the United Nations. We look forward to the valuable contribution which we are convinced its delegation will make to our deliberations and pledge ourselves to work together in furthering the goals of the Organization.

54. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the host country, the United States.

55. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): On 1 November 1981, a new Caribbean nation achieved its independence. The United States, this hemisphere's oldest democracy, is pleased and proud to welcome Antigua and Barbuda, the newest, as the one hundred and fifty-seventh Member of the United Nations. As the host country, as friends and neighbours, the Government and people of the United States extend congratulations to the Government and people of Antigua and Barbuda as they join in the cause of peace, freedom, justice and respect for human rights, in this hemisphere and in the world.

56. When the Security Council considered the application of Antigua and Barbuda for membership in the United Nations, the United States' expressed its confidence that this newly independent nation would uphold the basic principles of the Charter. We feel sure that those principles will guide Antigua and Barbuda as it assumes its role in world affairs, both within the Caribbean region and in the United Nations.

57. My country enjoys an especially warm relationship with Antigua and Barbuda—one that dates all the way back to our own early colonial period, when one of our greatest statesmen, Benjamin Franklin, made the gift of a

printing-press to Antigua. And through the years, that history of friendship and mutual assistance has grown. Americans have gone to Antigua to enjoy its beauty, its bounty, its serene life; they have invested in its trade and commerce, and in business opportunities there. In 1967, a United States Peace Corps contingent was established in the island and, in May 1980, we opened our consulate-general.

58. Along with our private and diplomatic presence in Antigua and Barbuda, we also note with pride a long-standing, mutually beneficial security relationship and, since 1967, an important partnership in space exploration. In that year, a United States Air Force space-vehicle tracking and communications station was constructed; that station contributed substantially to the success of the Apollo moon missions and it continues to provide support for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA] space projects.

59. In all of those ways—the ways of peace and security—our two nations have worked together to our mutual benefit, towards mutual goals. We look forward to the continuation of that partnership of friends and neighbours.

60. Antigua and Barbuda will, we are certain, fulfil all of the duties and obligations of United Nations membership—even as it is dedicated to all of the fundamental principles of freedom, justice, and self-determination. Those are the principles it reaffirms today through its membership in this forum of nations and its adherence to the Charter.

61. It is always a special pleasure for my country when the ranks of the democracies increase, in our own hemisphere and around the world. The Government and people of the United States extend warm congratulations to the Government and people of an independent Antigua and Barbuda—and the warm embrace of our fellowship in freedom. We extend also a warm and personal welcome to the distinguished representatives of that new nation who have joined us today in this chamber.

62. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now hear a statement by the Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Antigua and Barbuda, Mr. Lester B. Bird.

63. Mr. BIRD (Antigua and Barbuda): Mr. President, I wish first to extend to you and the people of Iraq congratulations on your election as President of the Assembly. As representatives of a small third-world country, my delegation cannot but be delighted that as we join the Organization it is you who serve as President. Your career is an inspiration to my country, for it has proved that a humble beginning is no impediment to success provided it is attended by hard work and determination. As you have grown from modest beginnings to become an accomplished diplomat, so too my small country hopes to demonstrate its capacity to cope successfully with the enormous challenges of the international environment. I pledge to you my delegation's wholehearted support as you discharge the high responsibilities of your office during this thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

64. I also wish to record my country's deep gratitude to the countries which have sponsored our admission to the Organization and to those which have expressed such warm good wishes.

65. I represent a people living in the reality of under-development. I stand before you as a representative of the wretchedness that is the residue of colonialism, a wretchedness which includes unemployment and under-employment, inadequate housing and insufficient medical facilities.

66. And yet, despite our condition, my people are part of mankind's universal relationship; by our very existence we are intertwined in the destiny of all humanity. In that sense, regardless of the wealth of some men, mankind will never be rich while we remain disinherited, dislocated and disenfranchised.

67. My country, Antigua and Barbuda, is a small State. We have no military muscle and would want none; we have no quarrels with neighbours or nations further afield and we would wish to keep it so. Our most earnest desire is a world secure in peace and stability; a world where man fulfils his obligation to the survival of his fellow man above the narrow concerns of ideology, above racial prejudice and above religious bigotry.

68. I am pleased that although our desire may appear to be idealistic, although it may sound lofty and ethereal, we are not alone in that desire. The Charter of the United Nations itself affirms the faith of all our peoples in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small. In that Charter the peoples of the world have a sacred bond. We place the greatest value and highest importance on that bond, for had we not, we would have chosen to remain outside of this body.

69. It is regrettable that the bond is jeopardized by lack of commitment to the spirit of the Charter by some States which behave as if the rule of law in international affairs is prescribed only for those too naive to recognize the realities of power. Large groups of people the world over are becoming cynical about much of the work of the Assembly. The rhetoric is in danger of becoming hollow and the pledges empty, for the measure of commitment to a world where economic and social justice prevails is no longer the statements of statesmen but the actions of their Governments.

70. Yet, for small nations such as my own the Organization represents mankind's single most important forum for dialogue and discussion. Indeed, if there were no United Nations, there would be no place in which the concerns of small nations could be expressed to large and powerful countries. There would be no dialogue, but dictation; no discussion, but direction; no negotiation, but instruction. Such a situation would bring the world to grave conflict. For if rationality is sacrificed for autocracy, reason will be replaced by resistance. Two worlds would then exist, one with the resources to sustain mankind's livelihood and another with the resources to destroy mankind in pursuit of those resources. No nation, I am sure, would wish to see the world thus divided. No Government would wish to face the disastrous consequences of such action. As you, Mr. President, observed upon your election at this thirty-sixth session,

"The General Assembly is not in need of new resolutions but rather a commitment to the resolutions it has already adopted and to the implementation of those resolutions by translating them into concrete actuality, thereby contributing to the principles and purposes of the United Nations." [1st meeting, para. 60.]

71. I should be remiss if on the first occasion that my country had the honour to address the Assembly I did not pledge my nation to upholding and advancing the principles of the Charter. I should be equally remiss if I did not on behalf of the world's newest nation call upon all others, rich and poor, powerful and weak, to recommit themselves to the spirit of the Charter in the name of all mankind.

72. My country devotes great efforts to strengthening economic integration in the Caribbean. Equally we place much emphasis on deepening areas of co-operation with sister States in the Caribbean Community. In so doing we are not attempting to create a power bloc against the rest of the world. Rather, we are building a bridge that will permit discussion with larger States on a more equitable footing.

73. As we have embraced our Caribbean neighbours in the past, we hope to embrace our sisters and brothers in Latin America in the future. We are of the same region, though artificial barriers created by history's competing colonial Powers have hitherto separated us. It is our hope that through co-operation with our Latin American family yet another bridge to dialogue with larger States will be built.

74. Such dialogue is now of critical importance within the General Assembly itself, for although groups of nations can advance the framework for international discussion, they can neither negotiate nor decide for others. It is the universal participation in the international decision-making process within the United Nations that makes this body so fundamental to mankind's future.

75. No industrialized country, whether or not it sits as a permanent member of the Security Council with a right to veto, can make fundamental decisions for the rest of the world. Some of us are developing States, but we too are part of the rich tapestry of human endeavour. We too have a right to be heard. And in the final analysis we represent the majority of the world's people, who are the markets for the production of the rich. If we cease to be markets, the rich would cease to be rich. For their economies would recede so quickly that stability would be rocked beyond recovery, and the gap that would be created could not be filled by direct trading among themselves.

76. I am aware that, conversely, it will be argued that the poor would also suffer. But we should bear in mind that it is far easier for the man who knows suffering to endure it than for the man who knows no suffering at all. In that context, last month's summit meeting in Cancún, represented a beacon of hope to developing States adrift in the stormy sea of economic difficulties. It should also be seen as an opportunity for economic stability by the industrialized States. It is a matter of renewed hope and great relief that the summit appears to have cleared the way for global negotiations within this body on the world's economic issues. At last there appears to be wider consensus on the need for such negotiations, which were urged by the non-aligned movement, the Group of 77, the Brandt Commission and the Commonwealth heads of Government.

77. My delegation warmly applauds the breakthrough which has led to preparations for a round of global negotiations, for we are victims of the international economic environment, which as it currently exists offers little hope of the accelerated development we urgently require.

78. The World Bank's development report for 1981 eloquently describes the condition of countries such as mine. With compelling frankness the report states that developing countries face the 1980s with no sign of change in either their trade or their aid prospects; that the world will be divided more sharply between the haves and the have-nots; that burdensome interest rates place borrowing beyond the reach of poor States; and that in 18 years' time the world population, which stood at 4 billion in 1975, will reach 6 billion.

79. The scenario is disturbing, for it portends an unstable world in which nations may once again be set at each other's throats in pursuit of national self-interest. As the World Bank report concludes, this scenario painfully exposes any residual belief that industrialized countries can somehow immunize themselves from the problems of the poor.

80. The interdependence between North and South stares us inescapably in the face. Anyone who now refuses to acknowledge the interdependent nature of the international environment is simply courting a grave disturbance of global peace and security. The economic condition of the world demands an urgent response, particularly from those with the economic and political power to effect change.

81. Antigua and Barbuda is but a speck in the ocean, a dot on the world map. But if the contribution of a small section of mankind makes any difference to the prospects for all of mankind, then my country may be counted on fully to participate in the creation of a world built on social justice and economic co-operation from which all can benefit.

82. I am loath to sound a distasteful and discordant note in the pleasantness and warmth extended to my country by the Assembly, but the subject to which I now turn, itself sounds a distasteful and discordant note in the harmony of mankind's search for justice and equality. The subject is South Africa.

83. In discussing the condition of the world, my delegation cannot but express our abhorrence of the system of *apartheid* practised in South Africa. For the Government of that country has challenged the basic precepts on which the Organization is founded by attempting to make its vice of racism a virtue. Not content with the oppression of the majority of people within its own borders, the South African Government has threatened and violated the territorial integrity of States in southern Africa.

84. The celebration of my country's independence is soured by the oppression of the majority of people in that country, for how can mankind claim to be free when so many men remain captive? Indeed, all human achievement is cheapened by the conditions which persist in that country. My delegation condemns the South African régime and pledges to join with all who would seek to dismantle its system of *apartheid*.

85. As the newest country to achieve independence, after three centuries of colonialism, my delegation also shares the hope of the Assembly that Namibia will proceed to self-determination and independence without further delay. We fully endorse Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and would wish to see its implementation without modification or dilution as early as possible.

86. We are very conscious of the smallness of our country. We are under no illusions that, on our own, we have the power to affect world trends and developments. However, we will not sit on the sidelines of international debate. We intend forcefully to stand up for principles in which we firmly believe. In being bold enough to dare participate in the challenges of the international community, we are inspired by the words of the late American President John F. Kennedy, who said, "Some ask why, I ask why not". We have asked "why not?" and we have resolved to participate fully in the work of the Organization and, by so doing, to contribute to our own development and to the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples. That is the resolve to which we are firmly committed; that is the resolve which will guide our conduct.

AGENDA ITEM 130

Armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security (continued)

87. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community.

88. The subject of this debate is a matter of deep and legitimate concern to the international community. This is not only because it involves the consequences of a military attack by one Member State upon another, very serious though these are. But it is also because it has serious implications for international relations in nuclear matters which affect the development and future security of all States.

89. The concern of the 10 members of the Community in this particular incident has been given an extra dimension. Two of our member States were engaged in peaceful nuclear co-operation with Iraq at the time of the attack and a national of one of them was killed by the bombing.

90. After the attack, the 10 members of the Community made a joint public declaration of their attitude at the highest level. The European Council announced on 1 July, after the meeting of heads of Government in Luxembourg, their endorsement of resolution 487 (1981), which had been adopted unanimously by the Security Council. Four member States of the European Community took part in the Security Council debate which preceded the adoption of this resolution and placed their views on record. Subsequently, the Community took part in the debate at the twenty-fifth session of the General Conference of IAEA in Vienna in September, where it made a common explanation of vote on resolution GC/(XXV)/RES/381 that was adopted there.

91. The attitude of the 10 members of the Community to the attack is plain. They believe that it was a clear violation of the principles of the Charter and the rules of international law. They have therefore condemned it strongly and do so again today.

92. From the beginning, Israel has accepted, indeed claimed, responsibility for the attack which its aircraft carried out on Iraq's nuclear installations on 7 June. It has also made no attempt to deny the very serious damage and loss of life which resulted from the attack. It has

sought instead to justify its action as one of self-defence. It has based this justification on its interpretation of Article 51 of the Charter, which it asserts must now, in an age of nuclear weapons, be interpreted far more widely to allow a pre-emptive strike by one State against what it alleges to be the nuclear-weapon development programme of another, potentially hostile, State. The Community does not accept this interpretation. Indeed, the dangers of doing so must, on reflection, be obvious to all of us—including, we would have thought, Israel, whose future security is also at stake.

93. By attacking the nuclear facility as it did Israel has added a new and dangerous dimension to the cycle of violence and reprisals, endangering efforts to achieve a just and comprehensive solution to the Middle East conflict. The 10 members of the Community are convinced that the resort to force in the Middle East is self-defeating because it postpones the day of peace. This applies as much to Israel's security as to that of the other States and peoples of the region. The 10 members have always affirmed, and we reaffirm today, our attachment to Israel's right to live in peace and security. But this will only be secured, for this and future generations, by a just and negotiated settlement of the Middle East conflict. Violence must be halted. With this in mind, the Community solemnly appeals to Israel to respect its obligations under the Charter and refrain in the future from any further acts of this kind and from the threat of such acts. The Community also considers that Iraq is entitled to appropriate redress for the destruction and loss of life, responsibility for which has been acknowledged by Israel.

Ms. Gonthier (Seychelles), Vice-President, took the Chair.

94. I turn now to the implications of the Israeli attack for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

95. In the view of the Community, co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy should be carried out within the framework of the international non-proliferation régime. The 10 members support and uphold the principles of this régime, in which the safeguards system of IAEA has a central role.

96. The Community recognizes the right of all States to establish nuclear programmes aimed at developing their economies and their industry for peaceful purposes, in accordance with the present and future needs of States and consistent with the internationally accepted objective of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Individual members of the Community have given practical expression to this view through their peaceful nuclear co-operation with other States, including especially a number of developing countries.

97. The Director General of IAEA concluded in his statement of 19 June 1981 at the 2288th meeting of the Security Council that the Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations amounted to an attack on the Agency's safeguards system itself. The Community notes that Iraq has been a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [resolution 2373 (XXII) annex] since it came into force in 1970, and that it has accepted Agency safeguards on all its nuclear activities. The Director General of IAEA has stated that all the facilities and fuel at Tamuz were covered by Agency safeguards in accordance with the safeguards agreement between Iraq and the Agency; that those safeguards had been satisfactorily ap-

plied to date; and that, during the last safeguards inspection in January of this year, all nuclear material was satisfactorily accounted for. In these circumstances, the Community felt bound to share Mr. Eklund's concern at this attack on the IAEA safeguards régime. At the same time, they reiterate their support for the Agency's safeguards system and their confidence in its efficacy as a reliable means of verifying the peaceful use of a nuclear facility.

98. It has been widely noted that, while Iraq adheres to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and accepts the application of IAEA safeguards to all its nuclear activities, Israel does neither. The members of the Community are concerned at the awesome threat which the development of nuclear weapons by the countries of the Middle East could pose to peace in the region and elsewhere, particularly at a time when no comprehensive and lasting peace settlement has been achieved. They earnestly entreat all the countries of the region, including Israel, to refrain from any action which might serve to increase this danger. They express the hope that those countries in the region that have not already done so will accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and submit all their nuclear facilities to IAEA safeguards, as the best way of encouraging the development of mutual trust and confidence.

99. Many of these matters have already been discussed at the General Conference of IAEA in Vienna in September. The Community felt bound for reasons which it explained at the time to abstain on the resolution which was adopted at that Conference. They had wished instead to see a solemn warning to Israel that any repetition of similar action on its part would have serious consequences for its position in the Agency, coupled with a call to Israel to refrain from any further action inconsistent with the objectives of the Agency. They also agreed that the Board of Governors of IAEA should be requested not to consider the provision of any further technical assistance to Israel for the time being, and at the same time should be requested to examine urgently ways of increasing the provision of technical assistance to Iraq.

100. I trust that what I have said has made clear the deep concern and careful deliberation with which the Community has approached the issue of the Israeli attack. I have also made clear the very serious consequences which the Community believes to have resulted from a premeditated use of force of this kind. We believe that it is of vital importance that there should be no repetition of such action by Israel or any other country.

101. The international community must show in its statements and in its votes that it strongly condemns such action. It should do so by endorsing in full the views and recommendations contained in Security Council resolution 487 (1981). Indeed, the Community believes that this resolution, which was unanimously adopted by the Council, provides the principles for any General Assembly resolution on this item. The General Assembly should take this opportunity to restate the vital importance for all countries of refraining from any act of violence which might escalate tensions in the region. Let us also redouble our efforts to promote the cause of moderation and to work towards the just and comprehensive peace settlement which is so urgently required in the Middle East.

102. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): The question we are discussing today is so momentous in its ramifications, so fraught with incalculable consequences, so brazen an aggression, not only against Iraq but against the very foun-

ditions of the United Nations, that no language or formulation can adequately portray its implications for the future peace and security of the world.

103. The Israeli sneak attack of 7 June 1981 against the Osirak nuclear research site in Baghdad has shocked the entire world and a sense of outrage and apprehension has reverberated in every corner of the globe. The Security Council, fully conscious of its profound impact upon the ability to survive an international order governed by international law, solemn conventions and the Charter of the United Nations, condemned that mendacious and unprecedented Israeli aggression and warned against its repetition.

104. In retrospect, in my humble opinion the Security Council was duty-bound under the Charter to respond more forcefully to that warlike act by imposing the sanctions provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter. That it failed to do so, under the compulsion of a veto by one or more of the great Powers, has profoundly undermined the sense of security not only in the Middle East but in the world at large. It has set a dangerous precedent which will not be lost on all nations throughout the world.

105. Aggressive and expansionist Israel, whose concept of self-defence is predicated on the wilful destruction of peoples and countries regardless of distances and boundaries and without even a semblance of a concrete and tangible pretext, lost no time in responding to Security Council resolution 487 (1981) with a blatant and undisguised challenge. Not only did it declare its self-anointed right to have destroyed, on 7 June 1981, the Osirak nuclear research centre in Baghdad, devoted solely to peaceful purposes and under the continuous supervision and inspection of IAEA, but it added a new dimension to its policy of aggrandizement and hegemony by publicly arrogating unto itself the right to destroy any rebuilt peaceful nuclear research facilities, not only in Iraq but throughout the region and beyond.

106. Unlike Iraq, which has signed and ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty in good faith and has subjected its facilities to close international inspection and scrutiny, Israel, which has adamantly and persistently refused to adhere to the Treaty, has dealt it a fatal blow, the extent of which only time will reveal.

107. It has placed the bulk of humanity in a totally unacceptable, untenable and unparalleled predicament and danger. What the Israeli doctrine is—a doctrine no doubt shared in theory and in practice by racist South Africa—we hear loud and clear: the message to their potential victims is, "Stop your progress in the sciences, in the humanities, even in economic development, chemistry, biology and all other fields of knowledge—or else". And what is that Israeli "or else"? Those hate-mongers and emotionally infantile Israeli aggressors will have no compunction whatsoever about annihilating other peoples, using their atomic arsenals, which are sustained and augmented substantially, technologically, financially and in *matériel*, by sectors in the United States working clandestinely on behalf of interests at variance with the official policy and the national interests of the country to which they belong. The visits of the formidable scientists of that great Power have over the past decades become so routine in their itineraries that in most instances they have hardly qualified as news fit to print.

108. Hardly ever has the question been asked, at what price? Permissiveness and favouritism are a prerogative of

those who practise them—after all, beauty is in the eye of the beholder—except when they pose a present and imminent danger to whole nations, which is what the case we are discussing today is all about.

109. The principal casualty of Israel's act of aggression against Osirak is the sanctity of the Non-Proliferation Treaty itself. The Treaty specifically recognizes the incontrovertible and undisputed right of every State to pursue and develop its programmes in the application of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, as a concomitant of its agreement to forgo the option of converting its capabilities into lethal weaponry.

110. The questions which the General Assembly should address and resolve are the following. First, should, or can, obsessed and lawless countries like Israel and South Africa hold the great bulk of humanity hostage and link their deranged concept of security with the cessation of humankind's inexorable progress in the sciences and in other fields of knowledge? Secondly, what should be done to restore the credibility of the Non-Proliferation Treaty when its very foundations have been weakened and torpedoed at the whim of a recalcitrant Israel? Thirdly, the numerous non-atomic States—and, indeed, the overwhelming majority of mankind—have made incessant urgent pleas for practical and effective guarantees from the major Powers against nuclear threats and blackmail. Yet the vast majority of Member States that have signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty find themselves, in the aftermath of Israel's aggression, threatened and blackmailed, which places their progress and even their survival in the greatest jeopardy. Can any nation tolerate such imminent and present danger without resorting to some other option or options? The late General Dayan told a closed political forum last summer that Israel might consider the nuclear option. Why? Because of the arms race. Indeed, he did consider it in the 1973 war when Israel was suffering military reverses on the battlefields in occupied Arab lands. Fourthly, the General Assembly might, in its wisdom, give serious consideration to what a distinguished former United States Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, declared in 1968. I quote what he said because of its relevance and its considerable importance: "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." That is a very wise assessment by a statesman who recognized the inherent dangers of nuclear adventurism by a State which has consciously, since the 1950s, when it formed its Atomic Energy Commission, worked assiduously to acquire, by fair means or foul, including theft, substantial quantities of enriched nuclear ingredients, technological know-how which is presumed to be highly classified, and also some of the most advanced systems of delivery, such as the Pershing missile launchers, for use as an instrument of a policy of expansion and aggression.

111. We are all agreed that nuclear weaponry is suicidal madness, and yet we in our region have been living in the shadow of this awesome insanity without any deterrence to its unfolding. Condemnations can hardly assuage the legitimate apprehensions of the non-atomic majority of mankind. It is the responsibility of all nations, big and small alike, to make a reappraisal of the totally new and menacing situation created by Israel's aggression against

Osirak, against the Non-Proliferation Treaty and, above all, against world peace, security and orderly progress, and to come up with appropriate remedies.

112. I might mention in passing that I was very, very amused, as, I am sure, virtually the representatives of all Member States were also amused, by the Israeli Ambassador's statement this morning, in which he alleged that the Middle East has become a safer place to live in since the Israeli attack on Baghdad. But, while amused, I present to the Member States his statement as further evidence, if any were needed, of Israel's self-centered, egoistic and exclusivist vision of the world. What Israel is telling all of us is that Israel and Israel alone matters in this world. It follows that it alone should have a monopoly of atomic weapons of destruction and armed deterrence, unlike other universal doctrines of mutual deterrence—or whatever else it may be called, such as "equivalent deterrence"—and, simultaneously, continue to pursue its reprehensible policies of expansion, aggression and colonization and its adamant refusal to countenance any plan for a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East—and, when I say a "just, comprehensive and lasting peace"—I mean a meaningful peace and not the peace of the grave; one can bury a country, but that is not peace—which would restore the usurped inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

113. The Israelis openly declare and boast to our suffering population under occupation that, with their acquisition of nuclear power, they can continue to defy and ignore all imperatives of international law, justice and international resolutions. This is not only stated and discussed in institutes for strategic studies; it is the kind of thing that mayors say to each other and that common people talk about; it is an open secret.

114. I can only describe this deranged perspective as myopic and dangerous. No power on earth can predicate its policies on locking up the God-given minds of humankind and thwarting its progress for any but the briefest time. The Israelis are evidently and callously playing with fire, which will engulf the region and beyond and, surely enough, their own people as well. Perhaps they should pay some heed to this banal and trifling fact.

115. The Israeli Ambassador's claim that Israel has always supported non-proliferation is not only a blatant distortion—and I have been attending meetings of the First Committee for years—but, equally importantly, a contradiction in terms. How can a country which has embraced the doctrine of the nuclear option consciously and openly allow itself to talk about non-proliferation, unless it means by that, as it does, a monopoly of this world-threatening weapon of destruction, without any deterrence and to the exclusion of other nations? The Israeli representative's sham talk about a nuclear-free zone is equally contradictory and deceptive. How can any region have or claim to have a nuclear-weapon-free zone when one country in its midst is already nuclear and has continually refused and continues to refuse to adhere to the only multinational Treaty in existence to prevent proliferation, namely, the Non-Proliferation Treaty?

116. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic is taking part in the debate on this important item of the agenda in order to reaffirm that Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear reactor—a reactor which was devoted exclusively to peaceful purposes and recognized as such by IAEA and all States, except Israel and

the United States—is quite obviously part of the global plan of aggression, the details and practical application of which have become well known ever since it occurred earlier this year. That plan, which is aimed at achieving the dark designs of American imperialism and those of Zionism in the Arab region, calls for the direct domination of Arab countries.

117. The United States is implementing that plan as an attempt to realize what it terms “strategic compatibility”, on the one hand, and its strategic alliance with Israel, on the other. That attempt has been condemned by the peoples of our region as well as by non-aligned peoples and all countries which, on the basis of their historical experience, are aware of the dimensions of that conspiracy being waged against our peoples, their natural resources and their strategic positions and of what that conspiracy represents as a threat to international peace and security.

118. Suffice it to recall here the various acts of aggression committed by Israel against Lebanon and Palestinian refugee camps and the various threats against the Syrian Arab Republic, all of which are accomplished and executed within the framework of the dark designs to which I have referred.

119. Furthermore, military aggression against the Iraqi reactor is part of the American-Israeli unbridled efforts aimed at preventing the Arab peoples from exercising their natural and positive rights to achieve economic and social progress on the basis of their human, material and cultural resources which enable them to emerge from the underdevelopment imposed upon them by classical colonialism and American imperialism and to follow the path of progress so that their countries may strengthen their national independence through their economic, technical and cultural potential.

120. This item appears on the agenda because of the Security Council's failure to condemn Israeli aggression under Chapter VII of the Charter. That failure was the result of pressure by the United States, which enabled Israel to escape even a modicum of sanctions, which would have had to be imposed on the Zionist entity to deter it from repeating such acts of aggression against peaceful Arab nuclear enterprises. In furtherance of its dreams of colonialism, Israel will continue to act against the potential of our peoples.

121. Israel justifies such an act of aggression on the basis of an argument that is logically, politically and legally false—that of self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter. We deplore the fact that the United States recognized that aggressive theory by Israel, which found expression in the pre-emptive blows, or the pre-emptive “self-defence”, when the United States lifted the ban on the shipment of military aircraft to Israel only a few days after the Security Council had acted to condemn the Israeli action—but not the aggression, as it had been requested to do. The United States of America bears full responsibility for all the acts of terrorism and aggression by Israel, including this attack on the reactor, because of the alliance of the United States with the Zionist entity and because of the identity between American interests and the expansionist interests of the Zionist entity, which occupies Palestine and other Arab territories and exercises a settler colonialism that is no less aggressive so far as the rights of the indigenous inhabitants are concerned than is the settler colonialism exercised in South Africa and Namibia.

122. The delivery to Israel of sophisticated weapons, the limitless flow of funds and technology into Israel, the fact that the United States at the same time strengthens Israel's policy of aggression against Arab countries—all this is proof that Washington has decided to be Tel Aviv's partner against our Arab nation. That development imposes on the American people the fact of their being the enemy of the Arab people. It seems to us that the United States Administration has forgotten the lessons learned by the American people after the aggression against Viet Nam, because now that Administration is doing everything possible to lead its people into a new Viet Nam.

123. The General Assembly is called upon to fill the gap in Security Council resolution 487 (1981) about Israeli military acts which led to the destruction of the reactor. We request the General Assembly to adopt a resolution condemning Israeli aggression and repeated acts against the peoples of the region, and placing the attack on the reactor within the framework of official acts of terrorism committed by Israel against Arab peoples. The attack on the reactor is nothing more than an exacerbation of Israeli terrorism. We also ask the General Assembly to condemn the United States, which, despite all the dangerous developments, continues to provide the Zionist entity with instruments of destruction as part of its strategic alliance. This threatens international peace and security. We also call upon Member States to sever all relations with Israel as a means of halting Israeli aggression, which continues against our region and our peoples. The General Assembly should ask the Security Council to impose mandatory sanctions on Israel under Chapter VII of the Charter.

124. The resolution which will emerge from the Assembly should call upon Israel to place all its nuclear installations and laboratories under international control and supervision. Israel should immediately adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, without reservations and unconditionally, and all Member States should refrain from providing Israel with technology and fuel until it adheres to the Treaty. In that context, the resolution should openly condemn nuclear co-operation between South Africa and Israel.

125. In conclusion, we should like to warn the United States about its continuing to be the ally of our enemy, Israel. We think that the Arab peoples cannot recognize that Washington has legitimate interests, so long as the United States has not recognized our national rights and, first and foremost, the need for a complete and unconditional Israeli withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories, the return of the Palestinian people to their home, from which they were expelled by force and terrorism in 1948, and the establishment of an independent Palestinian State without foreign interference, under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO].

126. The implementation of the General Assembly resolution, in addition to the implementation of all other relevant resolutions, whether adopted by the United Nations or by specialized agencies, will be proof of the political will of States to deter Israel from committing similar acts against any other country, bearing in mind that it has declared officially, and with arrogance, its determination to destroy any establishment which may constitute a danger to its colonial and expansionist interests.

127. My country's delegation does not believe that any responsible State—I emphasize “responsible”—could remain silent in the face of this flagrant act of aggression.

That is why we expect the General Assembly and the Security Council to act at the same time to deter Israel, to halt such acts, so that that country may not lead the world to catastrophe.

128. Mr. LIANG Yufan (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Last June the Israeli authorities launched an air raid on Iraqi nuclear installations. Israel's blatant armed aggression against a sovereign country constitutes an act which seriously violates the Charter of the United Nations, tramples on the norms of international law and aggravates tension in the Middle East. The Chinese Government and people oppose and strongly condemn this criminal act of aggression by Israel.

129. At this meeting the representatives of Iraq and several other countries made eloquent statements in accusation and condemnation of Israel's act of aggression. They also put forward the reasonable demand that necessary actions be taken against the aggressor. This demand has our firm support.

130. Israel's attack on Iraq's nuclear installations is in no way an isolated event. It is a well-known fact that in the 30-odd years since the Second World War Israel has launched four successive wars of aggression against the Arab countries, seriously threatening their security, displacing the Arab and Palestinian people and causing heavy loss to them in human life and property. With the support and encouragement of a super-Power, the Israeli authorities have obstinately held the Arab and Palestinian people in hostility, going farther and farther on the road of aggression and expansion. To this day Israel still occupies the Palestinians' homeland and continuously wages armed invasions against neighbouring countries. The attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations was one of its most recent aggressive moves. Such a move also provided the opportunity and created the condition for further intervention in this region by the super-Powers.

131. In order to cover up its crime of aggression, Israel resorted to fabricating various pretexts. Israel alleged that Iraq was hostile to it, insisting that the Iraqi nuclear installations served the purpose of manufacturing nuclear weapons which "threatened" the "security" of Israel, thus interpreting its own aggressive acts as legitimate self-defence. This is nothing but the aggressor's logic which for years has dictated Israel's conduct. With "outside threat" as an excuse, Israel has wilfully launched preemptive attacks on neighbouring countries, undermining their security and peace in the Middle East and violating the Charter and the norms of international relations. Israel's act has once again demonstrated that it was none other than Israel itself which undermined peace and security in the Middle East.

132. In reaction to this grave incident in June, the Security Council adopted resolution 487 (1981), strongly condemning Israel's violation of the Charter and international law and calling upon Israel to redress the damage it had done to the victim of its aggression, Iraq. But Israel responded to world public opinion with defiance and more unwarranted pretexts arbitrarily to justify its refusal to implement the Security Council resolution. Iraq, as a sovereign State and the victim of aggression, has every right and reason to appeal to the international community for justice and for opposition to such aggression in order to force the aggressor to submit to international rulings and sanctions. This is an appeal that deserves international support. The Chinese delegation firmly supports the request made by Iraq and other States to consider the

item "Armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installation and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security" at this session of the General Assembly.

133. The Chinese Government and people resolutely oppose the criminal act of aggression perpetrated by Israeli expansionists. We firmly support the just struggle of Iraq and other Arab States in defence of their national rights. We firmly support the struggle of the Palestinian people to restore their national rights, including the right to establish their own State. We have consistently held that it is the inalienable right of all countries and people to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. This naturally applies to the Iraqi Government and people.

134. We are, however, firmly against the clandestine development of nuclear weapons by Israel, which is a constant menace to neighbouring States and a serious threat to peace and security in the Middle East and the world. The Chinese delegation lends firm support to the relevant draft resolution submitted by Iraq and other States [A/36/L.14], and we hope to see it adopted by the General Assembly.

135. Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): Instead of engaging together in a quest for peace and co-operation, we in the General Assembly have recently been forced to consider the ever more frequent use of force, aggression, interference, intervention in the internal affairs of other States and various other forms of illegal behaviour. Regrettably, this is the characteristic of the present situation, and the policy and conduct of Israel lend a specific dimension to this state of affairs.

136. This time, we are considering an act of aggression by Israel and its grave consequences for the established international system concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and international peace and security. There can be no justification whatsoever for the raid on the Iraqi nuclear facilities. It caused losses of human life and great material destruction. That attack is a flagrant manifestation of the use of military power and force.

137. Iraq—and any other country—has a sovereign right to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. That right is an inalienable one, and this ought to be confirmed at the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, to be held in 1983 and for which preparations are under way.

138. The nuclear installations in Baghdad were constructed to serve the development and prosperity of Iraq and its people and did not pose a threat to anyone's security. They were the result of the endeavours of the people of Iraq to move forward faster along the road of development and to break the bonds of economic and technological colonialism.

139. Iraq has ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty and has consistently adhered to its provisions. This has been clearly and unambiguously confirmed by IAEA. The construction of the nuclear facilities was carried out in full accordance with the international system of nuclear safeguards. Iraq has met all the requirements of this system.

140. Israel, on the other hand, has not signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty and does not adhere to the international nuclear safeguards system. Its nuclear installations are built outside any international control and there remains no doubt that it is capable of producing nuclear weapons. In a report submitted under item 56 the Group of Experts to Prepare a Study on Israeli Nuclear Armament stated that Israel has enough material and know-how to produce, if it has not already done so, nuclear weapons in a very short period of time [see A/36/431, para. 82].

141. Israel takes it upon itself to be the paramount judge and enforcer of how and to what limits a neighbouring or some other State should peacefully develop. Such behaviour by any member of the international community should be condemned and checked, otherwise mankind may soon find itself on the threshold of its own destruction.

142. Israel has attempted to justify its onslaught on Iraq by the right to self-defence under the provisions of the Charter. This is unacceptable and dangerous logic. It is dangerous for all countries including Israel itself. The international community cannot accept such logic, since if it did so it would become the accomplice of aggression and would legalize lawlessness and anarchy. The Charter is precise and clear: the right to self-defence can be exercised only "if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations". The interpretation of the Charter cannot depend on momentary needs and interests. Article 51 of the Charter does not leave room for arbitrary interpretations that would justify the use of force and make "might makes right" the supreme law.

143. It is evident that Israel was not attacked, nor was it threatened by the Iraqi nuclear installations. The attack on Iraq was part and parcel of its policy of *fait accompli*, occupation and domination of its Arab neighbours.

144. Proceeding from the principles and policy of non-alignment, Yugoslavia has never and will never accept or approve of aggression, intervention, interference or any other form of use of force in international relations, for any reason or under any pretext whatsoever. Once again, we cannot but express our concern over and condemnation of the Israeli attack on Iraq. Immediately after the attack on the Iraqi nuclear facilities the Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia issued a statement in which, *inter alia*, it stressed that this was an "act of State terrorism and most flagrant violation of the principle of sovereignty in international relations". Further, it pointed out that "Israel again resorted to brutal use of force with a view to spreading the flames of war in the Middle East and exacerbating the crisis in that region. With its latest armed aggression it has extended the area of its intervention and onslaught on the freedom of the peoples and countries in that region".

145. The Security Council and the international community condemned the attack and, as on other occasions, Israel was called upon to respect international law and to refrain from acts of aggression. The aggressive behaviour of Israel cannot be condoned by anyone any longer. The danger of such behaviour is becoming evident even to its friends. However, it continues to turn a deaf ear to all decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. The General Assembly, as well as the Security Council, should consider comprehensively the crisis in the Middle East and recommend measures leading to its just and lasting solution. This means the solution of the Palestinian problem through the exercise by the Palestinian

people of its inalienable right to self-determination, including the right to its own State, the withdrawal of Israel from the territories occupied in the war of 1967, and the provision of guarantees of equal security for all countries and peoples in the region. Only on the basis of such a solution can peace in the Middle East be achieved.

146. It is necessary to adopt measures with a view to providing compensation for the damage caused by the attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations. Also, it is high time, in our opinion, to put an end to the supply of arms to Israel, which is enabling it permanently to jeopardize the sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence and freedom of countries in the Middle East.

147. No State can secure its own safety without respecting the safety of others, in the first place that of its neighbours. Security cannot for ever be founded on power and might. Any policy of reliance on force and aggression is short-sighted. Although it may provide temporary benefits it always turns against its proponents in the end. History clearly shows that nothing of lasting value can be, or was ever achieved by force.

148. The Arab States, and the PLO have given, and are giving, examples of a constructive approach to the solution of the Middle East crisis. The time has come for Israel to respond to these approaches, to accept reality and to search, together with the neighbouring countries and the PLO, for solutions which will create the foundations for stability, security and peace in the Middle East.

149. Mr. KIRCA (Turkey): Turkey has already, on different occasions, expressed its position and views on the question of Israel's military attack last June on the Iraqi nuclear installations. We have asked to speak once again because we believe that the issue is of vital importance, not only in terms of its impact and consequences for peace and stability in the region, but also in terms of its implications for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy by sovereign States.

150. During the consideration of that question in the Security Council, the Turkish delegation² made clear our unconditional disapproval of Israel's premeditated and unjustified aggression against the Iraqi nuclear centre. At that time we also delineated the reasons behind our condemnation of Israel. We felt that the action of Israel constituted a serious violation of international law and gravely endangered peace in the turbulent and fragile region. We indicated that the self-justification proposed by Israel, namely, that Israel acted in self-defence under the terms of Article 51 of the Charter, was unacceptable. We emphasized that no nation, including Israel, had the right to interfere with the right of other States to engage, under appropriate international safeguards and in conformity with the principles of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, in activities for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. We called on Israel to make prompt and adequate reparation, especially to Iraq. And we concluded our observations in the Security Council by expressing the hope that the Council would adopt a resolution commensurate with the gravity of the situation.

151. The resolution which the Security Council did finally adopt on 19 June 1981 was significant in several ways. The support it received from members of the Council was unanimous. Moreover, it was Iraq, the very victim of the aggression, that was primarily instrumental in the evolution of the consensus that was eventually formalized by the Council. All that made resolution 487 (1981) a

product of the shared concern of the international community, putting in proper perspective the various issues involved in Israel's military attack on Iraqi nuclear installations. Hence, Security Council resolution 487 (1981) appropriately embodies some of the main concerns of Turkey. In particular, Turkey, a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, adheres at the same time to the view that the right of Iraq and all other States to engage in efforts aimed at the peaceful uses of nuclear energy is a sovereign right and that the only acceptable limitation of that right would be, with respect to its exercise, a limitation in the form of safeguards as provided by IAEA. We believe that Israel should also place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. Israel's adamant refusal to do so does not speak well of its intentions. We are deeply concerned about the dangers of nuclear proliferation. We are of the view that the cause of peace would be helped if all nations adhered to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

152. Since the Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear centre, the Middle East has witnessed other dramatic developments. The situation now is more critical and sensitive than ever, requiring the utmost patience and perseverance from all parties. In that region, which is highly volatile and where the road to peace is difficult and arduous, the temptation to resort to the threat or use of force must in any case be resisted. Israel appears, however, to have transformed the temptation to use force into a self-sustaining habit whereby the leaders of Israel, whenever they deem it necessary in the name of "self-defence" and in utter disregard of the rights of its neighbours, feel free to resort to force. If Israel feels justified to destroy the nuclear installations of a country like Iraq, which is a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and a member of IAEA and whose nuclear programme has been subject to the Agency's safeguards, what next? Not even Israel is entitled to introduce such a unique concept of self-defence into the arena of international relations; such novel concepts are totally inconsistent and incompatible with notions and principles relating to legitimate self-defence laid down in the Charter and established in international treaties.

153. Israel has failed to comply with resolution 487 (1981). But, as Turkey has always unequivocally stated, if the Middle East problem, the core of which is the Palestinian question, is to be resolved on a just and lasting basis, the solution must provide for the security of all States in the region. We shall explain our position in depth on the question of Palestine and the Middle East later under the appropriate agenda items. But suffice it to say now that a lasting solution will not be achieved unless and until Israel demonstrates its commitment to peace with its actions and refrains from attacks, among others, on the nuclear installations of other States in the region.

154. Mr. NGUYEN THUONG (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): The item now before the General Assembly is, in the eyes of my delegation, one of major importance, not only because it deals with aggression—indeed it could not be described otherwise, despite the denials of its perpetrators—but also because that act typifies a mentality and morality which some are trying to inject into relations between States and which our international community is in duty bound to oppose strongly and firmly.

155. Israel's act, directed against a peaceful nuclear research centre, is a challenge to the established international system on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The feeble contentions of the Tel Aviv authorities are a further

insult to IAEA—a challenge and an insult which in themselves would deserve to be dealt with severely. However, something which is even more serious is that this act of gratuitous aggression is a flagrant violation of the sacred principles of respect for the independence and sovereignty of States, and is even more reprehensible since that aggression was coldly calculated and ruthlessly carried out, and cynically justified with total disregard for the possible reaction of the international community, thus demonstrating an intolerable arrogance of power and political adventurism devoid of any sense of responsibility for peace and security in the region and in the rest of the world. Still worse, the world has been outraged to hear the perpetrators justify the act on the basis of the concept of so-called prevention and by slanderously accusing the Republic of Iraq of intending their destruction, thus attempting to revive medieval and colonialist theories that have been rejected once and for all by the international community of our time.

156. It was therefore with good reason that in its resolution 487 (1981), adopted unanimously on 19 June 1981, the Security Council strongly condemned "the military attack by Israel in clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international conduct". It is generally held that this armed aggression by Israel calls not only for severe condemnation but also for sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. If the Security Council proved unable to adopt a resolution along those lines, it was because of the United States threat of the veto, which once again ensured Israel's impunity and prevented the Council from adopting a resolution that could and indeed should have been considerably better.

157. The military, economic and political support of the United States has encouraged Israel to step up with increased ruthlessness its hostile activities against its Arab neighbours. Far from acknowledging any responsibility for his criminal act, the Prime Minister of Israel went as far as openly to threaten Iraq by claiming that he had the right to repeat the act of armed aggression against nuclear installations in that country when and if Israel saw fit. Thus, in defiance of the Security Council resolution to which I have referred, the Israeli authorities persist in their false allegations and their arrogant claims, as shown by the statement of the Israeli representative this morning.

158. The Zionists would never have dared thus to escalate their aggressive acts against the Arab countries and adopt this intolerable attitude towards the international community if they had not been certain of the unconditional and unflinching support of the new American Administration for their attempts at destabilization, intervention and aggression in that part of the world.

159. The Israeli air force's premeditated bombing of the nuclear site in Iraq is not an isolated incident; it is, indeed, one of a series of acts of flagrant aggression by Israel against Arab States, in particular the repeated attacks against Lebanon, which constitute in fact an undeclared war against a sovereign Arab country and Palestinian resistance.

160. The deliberate and gratuitous attack against the peaceful nuclear installation in Iraq, the killing of scientists working for Iraq and the indiscriminate and unprovoked bombing of the Lebanese civilian population and Palestine refugee camps are all part of a systematic attempt to spread and perpetuate physical and moral terror among millions of innocent women, children and old people in order to practice disgraceful blackmail against the

proud and dauntless people of Palestine and against the entire Arab nation in the insane and vain hope of bringing them to their knees. These practices, which have been promoted to a State policy that can only be described as a policy of terrorism, are absolutely inadmissible. There may be attempts to justify such practices by calling them preventive or punitive—both equally anachronistic concepts—but they are entirely contrary to the ethics and the law of our time. The world public must indeed be vigilant, because these practices and policies are not directed simply against Iraq, Lebanon or Palestine, nor are they the monopoly of Zionists.

161. These Israeli practices and policies are possible only because of the strategic alliance between Zionism and imperialism, Israel's reliance upon the United States in its attempts to realize its expansionist dream and the imperialists' use of Zionism as a local policeman in order to entrench and maintain their policy of hegemony and domination in the Near and Middle East and throughout the entire region, in defiance not only of the right of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination but also the sovereignty and the immense natural wealth of the Arab States of the region.

162. Indeed it is no accident that in parallel with this recrudescence of Israeli aggressiveness the United States is increasing its military presence and intensifying its warlike activities in that part of the world, which is of such vital strategic importance for international peace and security. The activities of the United States marines in the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean, the presence of rapid deployment forces, the reinstatement of former military bases and the establishment of new ones by the United States—all this creates an atmosphere of great tension, adding to the pressure and the threats levelled against the independence and sovereignty of Arab States and peace and stability in the region.

163. The people and Government of Viet Nam vigorously condemn the acts of criminal aggression perpetrated by Israel, aided and abetted by the United States, against Iraq and the other Arab countries and Palestinian resistance. We reaffirm the solidarity of the people and Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam with and their firm support for the just cause of the Republic of Iraq and the struggle of the Arab people against the expansionist ambitions of Israel in order to safeguard the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Arab States and to ensure peace and security in that region.

164. In particular we should like to reaffirm our support for the entirely justified claims of the Iraqi delegation at this session—*inter alia*, the request for forthright and effective action by the Security Council to prevent any recurrence of Israel's threats to peace and security in the region and for just and adequate compensation for all the damage and loss of human life that has resulted from Israeli aggression.

165. Finally, we give our full and unreserved support to the draft resolution that is now before the General Assembly on this agenda item. It is our sincere hope that it will win the full approval of the General Assembly.

166. Mr. AL-DOSERI (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): In its statements and its acts Israel does not conceal its intention to dominate in the Middle East. It wishes its borders to contain the entire region. Israel has recently

been guaranteeing that domination through its technology and military superiority and its aggressive policy, which knows no law, no rules. However, Arab technological potential has increased, and the Arabs have decided to confront Zionist domination. Israel has seen that its expansionist and aggressive policy will be countered by Arab potential, and that is why Israel decided to commit this criminal act against Arab technological progress and attacked Iraqi nuclear installations, which are, moreover, under international control. IAEA had already confirmed more than once—most recently on 12 June and just before the Israeli attack—that those installations were used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

167. The Zionist aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations constituted a serious threat to the Middle East. Its consequences will be evil not only for the Middle East but for the world as a whole, because that act of aggression was a challenge to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to the system of international safeguards. It was a threat to all peace-loving countries which use nuclear energy for peaceful and scientific purposes. Many of those countries realize this truth—in particular, Japan, whose representative stressed the great concern felt by Japan regarding the danger of military aggression against nuclear installations which serve peaceful purposes, especially since Japan has 13 atomic reactors.

168. In the resolution it adopted on 26 September IAEA also expressed its apprehension and concern with regard to Israeli aggression. It requested Israel to place its nuclear installations under IAEA control and called on all countries to refrain from providing nuclear material to Israel.

169. The Israeli Zionist entity refuses to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to place its nuclear installations under international safeguards. It also refuses to abide by the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. It threatens any country installing a nuclear reactor because of its desire to monopolize all nuclear activity in the region and to acquire nuclear weapons so as to pose a threat to the countries of the Middle East and perhaps to countries all over the world.

170. Resolutions which condemn and denounce are not enough. Such resolutions can have no results, for Israel believes that it is all-powerful since it has the support of other Powers which share its racist and aggressive policy. The international community must adopt whatever measures are necessary to punish, to impose sanctions, to deter Israel and its allies from repeating such acts. The international community will not remain idle in the face of such aggression.

171. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan): The Israeli air attack against the nuclear reactor near Baghdad on 7 June this year is yet another flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and has added a grave new dimension to the Middle East conflict. Furthermore, it has serious and far-reaching implications for international security, disarmament, the nuclear non-proliferation régime and international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

172. In its resolution 487 (1981) the Security Council condemned this Israeli act of aggression in strong terms but, regrettably, it failed to take any punitive measures against the aggressor, nor did it demand redress for the damage suffered by Iraq. In view of the gravity of the matter it is appropriate that the General Assembly should examine the question thoroughly, and it was for this pur-

pose that Pakistan was one of the many Member States which asked for the inclusion of the item in the agenda of this session.

173. The General Conference of IAEA and the Committee on Disarmament have deliberated on the various aspects of the Israeli attack on Osirak. Two of these aspects have aroused particular concern in the international community. First, the attack undermines the international safeguards system for peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Secondly, it has given rise to a new danger of attacks on peaceful nuclear facilities which, though carried out by conventional arms, have a qualitatively different effect, similar to that of the use of nuclear weapons. Such an attack could result in widespread radioactive contamination in the victim State and its vicinity.

174. The Director General of IAEA, both in his statement to the Security Council last June and in the General Assembly debate yesterday, expressed the concern of the Agency in unequivocal terms. He rightly described the Israeli attack as a blow to the Agency's safeguards régime, which must be protected. In its resolution of 26 September the General Conference of the Agency also took a firm view of the development and recommended suspension of Israel from the exercise of privileges and rights of membership of the Agency in the event of non-compliance with the provisions of Security Council resolution 487 (1981). The Agency also called upon its members to ban the transfer to Israel of fissionable material and technology which could be used for nuclear arms. Equally important was the reaffirmation by the Council of its confidence in the effectiveness of the Agency's safeguards system.

175. The Israeli attack has important repercussions as regards the goal of nuclear non-proliferation. The attack presents the spectacle of a country which, having developed a nuclear-weapon capability itself, as fully revealed by the findings in the report of the Group of Experts in document A/36/431, is arrogating to itself the right to prevent another State from developing a peaceful nuclear energy programme. The Israeli action also demonstrated that even adherence by a State to the Non-Proliferation Treaty was not sufficient to prevent the aggressor from making a subjective and unilateral judgement and launching an attack on the Iraqi nuclear facility.

176. Since the attack the reaction of some of the developed countries which are vociferous advocates of nuclear non-proliferation has been intriguing. Instead of addressing themselves to the central issue of the attack on Osirak and urging measures for the prevention of the repetition of such an occurrence, they are merely advocating strengthening the already adequate and internationally recognized safeguards system. A more ominous trend is reflected in some irresponsible reporting of the event, which appears to hold it up for emulation.

177. The Committee on Disarmament discussed intensively another important aspect of the questions raised by the Israeli attack on Osirak. The report of the Committee states:

“There was unanimous recognition of the necessity to ensure against the repetition of such an attack on nuclear facilities by Israel or any other State. The call for the prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities was widely supported.” [See A/36/27, para. 137.]

There was a widespread sentiment in the Committee on Disarmament that the question of further strengthening the existing international provisions regarding protection of civilian nuclear facilities against military attacks should be solved through the adoption of appropriate international instruments. For this purpose the Swedish proposal made in the context of the draft convention on radiological weapons is most pertinent.

178. We have also noted with interest the suggestion made by the Director General of IAEA for the strengthening of the existing international law prohibiting attacks against nuclear power plants by enlarging the scope of the Additional Protocol of 1977 to the Geneva Convention of 1949.

179. In considering the Israeli attack on Osirak the General Assembly must strongly condemn Israel for its premeditated and unprecedented act of aggression, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international conduct, which constitutes a new and dangerous escalation and a threat to international peace and security.

180. It must also issue a solemn warning to Israel to cease its threats and the commission of such armed attacks against nuclear facilities. The General Assembly should also request the Security Council to enforce effective measures so as to prevent Israel from further endangering international peace and security through its continued aggression and policies of expansion, occupation and annexation in the Middle East. Finally, the Assembly also has a responsibility to demand redress for the material damage and loss of life suffered by Iraq on account of Israel's act of aggression. In adopting such a decision the General Assembly would indeed be reflecting the overwhelming sentiment of the international community:

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.

NOTES

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, 2309th meeting.*

² *Ibid.*, 2286th meeting.