

wanted to delay the technological progress of the Arabs, which was the guarantee of their independence and of their invulnerability. The League's Permanent Observer to the United Nations added that, when the world community sought punitive sanctions and measures, it did so not out of revenge but to deter the aggressor.

The PLO representative said Israel was not satisfied to invoke national security in the military field and on questions relating to borders; it wished to arrogate the power to impede the development of other countries in the region.

By a letter of 29 June to the Council President,⁽⁸⁾ Israel expressed regret that it had not, during the Council debate, given a complete quotation of a passage from a lecture by Sir Humphrey Waldock, President of the International Court of Justice, on the self-defence provisions of Article 51 of the Charter; it added that Iraq, in pointing out the omission during the debate, had omitted another sentence suggesting that preparations for atomic warfare would have to be treated as an armed attack under Article 51. Iraq replied on 24 July⁽⁵⁾ that the sentence omitted by Iraq supported Iraq's position rather than that of Israel, since it was Israel which had possessed nuclear weapons for some time and therefore Iraq and other Arab States parties to the non-proliferation Treaty were entitled to treat those weapons as an armed attack.

OTHER ACTION. The United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (p. 689), by a 21 August resolution on the right of nations to develop and control non-fossil energy resources,⁽⁴⁵⁾ strongly condemned the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear research centre. The text, sponsored by Iraq, Morocco and Pakistan, was adopted by a roll-call vote of 61 to 1 (Israel), with 26 abstentions.

Israel objected to the resolution as a blatant act of politicization which violated the non-political mandate of the Conference and added that it did not bother to reaffirm rights which Iraq had systematically violated for over 30 years. Australia, Canada, the United States and Uruguay said they had abstained because the resolution was extraneous to the purpose and mandate of the Conference.

The IAEA Board of Governors, on 12 June, adopted a resolution⁽¹⁾ by which it strongly condemned Israel for its attack. It recommended that the Agency's General Conference consider all the implications, including the suspension of Israel's membership privileges and rights, and that the Conference suspend IAEA technical assistance to Israel. The Board urged the Agency's member States to provide emergency assistance to Iraq to deal with the aftermath of the attack and reaffirmed its confidence in the effec-

tiveness of the Agency's safeguards system as a reliable means of verifying peaceful use of a nuclear facility.

The General Conference, by a resolution of 26 September,⁽⁴⁴⁾ decided to suspend IAEA assistance to Israel, as the Board had recommended. It also decided to consider at its 1982 regular session the suspension of Israel from the exercise of the privileges and rights of Agency membership if by that time it had not complied with the Security Council resolution of 19 June.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION. On 13 November, the General Assembly adopted, by a roll-call vote of 109 to 2, with 34 abstentions, a resolution entitled "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".⁽⁵⁰⁾

By this resolution, the Assembly strongly condemned Israel for its act of aggression; warned it to cease threatening and committing such attacks against nuclear facilities; reiterated its call to all States to cease providing Israel with arms and related material which would enable it to commit acts of aggression; requested the Security Council to investigate Israel's nuclear activities and the collaboration of other States and parties in those activities; reiterated its request that the Council institute effective enforcement action to prevent Israel from further endangering peace and security; demanded that Israel pay prompt and adequate compensation for the material damage and loss of life; and requested the Secretary-General to keep Member States and the Council informed of the resolution's implementation and to report to the Assembly in 1982.

By a resolution of 9 December⁽⁵¹⁾ in connection with disarmament issues, the Assembly stated that the Israeli attack adversely affected prospects for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Provisions on the attack were also included in an Assembly resolution of 11 November on the annual IAEA report (p. 712).

Introducing the 36-nation draft resolution adopted on 13 November, Iraq observed that, unlike the Council's resolution, the Assembly text qualified the Israeli action as an act of aggression—a phrase the Council had not used for political considerations pertaining to the position adopted by certain permanent members.

Israel, explaining its negative vote, said it rejected the resolution for not taking into account several facts, such as the nuclear option Iraq had been developing, Iraq's consistent violations of the prohibition against the threat or use of force, its open rejection of Security Coun-