

people in Lebanon, Palestine and elsewhere, and as a denial of the rights of the Palestinian people. Its objective was to prevent Arab scientific and technological progress so as to enable Israel to maintain its supremacy in the region. Mexico described the attack as the climax of escalating violations of international law, including territorial annexation by conquest, persistence in illegal occupation, denial of Palestinian rights, and aggression and harassment against neighbouring States.

Bulgaria and the Syrian Arab Republic considered the act a consequence of the Camp David accords between Egypt and Israel, which had freed the hands of extremist circles in Israel for further aggression. Israel's act, the USSR said, was a logical consequence of the Middle East policy of the United States, aimed at dividing the Arab world. Egypt maintained that the accords did not justify or permit acts of aggression; the Israeli aggression could only lead to Israel's isolation.

Several speakers cited reports that Israel had developed nuclear weapons. Guyana remarked that Israel would shrink from no aggression or terrorist act to maintain a nuclear monopoly in the Middle East.

References were made to an appeal by the General Assembly in 1979,⁽⁴⁸⁾ reaffirmed in 1980,⁽⁴⁹⁾ that States end co-operation with Israel which might help it to acquire nuclear weapons. The German Democratic Republic said the danger of a further aggravation of the situation in the region, for which Israel was responsible, made it imperative to cease all nuclear and military collaboration with the aggressor. Somalia hoped that the recent decision of the United States to suspend its planned delivery of four fighter-bombers to Israel was the beginning of a reassessment of the dangers of its supply of arms.

Several countries, including Egypt, France, the German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Kingdom and Yemen, regarded the Israeli attack as a challenge to the nuclear safeguards system. If Israel suspected that Iraq intended to produce atomic bombs, said Japan, it should have sought to settle the matter by peaceful means, such as submitting it to IAEA. Perhaps it had not done so, the Philippines observed, because it was not a party to the non-proliferation Treaty. Many States, including Jordan and the Sudan, called on the Council to find ways of subjecting Israeli nuclear activities to regular international inspection and supervision.

A number of speakers, among others Egypt, Ireland, Japan and the United States, held that further efforts should be made to prevent the

proliferation of nuclear weapons and that States which were not party to the non-proliferation Treaty, including Israel, should accede to it as soon as possible. Lebanon called for compulsory means of subjecting Israel's nuclear superiority to the imperatives of international compacts.

A number of States-including Cuba (on behalf of the non-aligned countries), Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, the USSR and Yemen-called for mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. China thought the Council should take effective measures resolutely to put an end to Israeli aggression and to punish Israel in accordance with the Charter. Kuwait said any objection to the imposition of sanctions would be explained by the Arab people and peoples of the third world as an act of bias in favour of the aggressor.

Ireland questioned the wisdom of imposing sanctions in the face of the complex situation of conflict in the Middle East. The United States, while condemning the Israeli action as damaging to the regional confidence necessary for peace, said it would approve no decision that harmed Israel's basic interests, was unfairly punitive or created new obstacles to a just and lasting peace.

Many speakers, including France, Guyana, Italy, Jordan, Morocco, the Niger, Sri Lanka and Turkey, were of the view that Israel should compensate Iraq for the losses resulting from its aggression. A call for compensation was also included in a resolution by the Islamic Group of Member States at the United Nations, adopted on 16 June and read to the Council by Iraq.

Israel, maintaining that the non-proliferation Treaty was no effective guarantee against the proliferation of nuclear weapons, expressed the view that the most constructive step towards the security of all States in the area would be to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Czechoslovakia, which supported the establishment of such a zone, said this idea should not be utilized to camouflage Israel's aggressive policies towards neighbouring Arab countries. Egypt stated that Israel's unwarranted air raid had cast serious doubts about its support for a nuclear-weapon-free zone; Egypt reiterated its call on all States, pending the establishment of such a zone, to declare that they would reciprocally refrain from producing, acquiring or in any way possessing nuclear weapons and nuclear explosive devices, and to deposit their declarations with the Security Council.

The Secretary-General of the League of Arab States stated that, by its act of aggression, Israel