

cil resolutions on the Middle East, its attempts to bypass its obligations under the non-proliferation Treaty and the safeguards agreement with IAEA, and Israel's attempts by diplomatic means to remove the mortal threat to its existence, leaving it with no alternative but to destroy the nuclear reactor in self-defence. The United States said it strongly opposed the resolution for six reasons: the Security Council had already acted on the matter; the unbalanced text could only complicate the search for peace; the description of Israel's action as aggression was objectionable, prejudiced and legally troublesome; the text diverted attention from the pursuit of peace and security; the call for the United States to alter its relationship with Israel was one-sided, as other major Powers were not asked to stop their arms supplies to Israel's neighbours; and the request for a Security Council investigation of Israel's nuclear activities was politically motivated and would not have positive results.

Speaking in explanation of vote, several countries expressed reservations. The United Kingdom, explaining the abstentions of the EC members, said they did not believe the proposed enforcement action, including a selective arms embargo, would be appropriate, practicable or desirable in terms of the search for a just, lasting and comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East. Fiji abstained on similar grounds, adding that its position was not to be interpreted as endorsement of Israel's attack.

Austria, Canada, Finland, New Zealand, Norway and Sweden said they abstained because they felt the Assembly was assuming responsibilities that, under the Charter, belonged to the Security Council. New Zealand added that it had reservations about the paragraph calling for a Council investigation of Israel's nuclear activities, which appeared to call for the duplication of investigations already being undertaken at the Assembly's request; also, it found somewhat gratuitous the references in the preamble to arms supplied to Israel by the United States. Turkey, though voting in favour, would have preferred that no particular country be singled out as a supplier of weapons.

Chile thought the resolution contained exaggerated language and would not lead to the proper implementation of the Council's June resolution. In Zaire's view, the resolution contained a superficial analysis that did not cover all aspects of Middle East problems.

Reservations about the wording were also expressed by certain States which voted in favour. Panama thought the coercive measures mentioned in the resolution were a matter for the Security Council. Portugal had reservations

about what it considered as discriminatory language and elements contrary to the essential functioning of the Assembly and the United Nations. Venezuela was concerned about some of the terms used, as well as about the Assembly's making reference to enforcement action by the Council.

Spain made a similar point and added a reservation regarding references in the preamble to 1978 and 1979 Assembly resolutions on military and nuclear collaboration with Israel⁽⁴⁷⁾ and Israeli nuclear armament,⁽⁴⁸⁾ on which it had abstained; also, it would have preferred a more balanced drafting of the preambular paragraph referring to the misuse of aircraft and weapons by Israel.

Brazil, India and Zambia stated that their vote in favour was without prejudice to their position on the non-proliferation Treaty, which they had not signed.

In Samoa's view, the Assembly's call not to supply Israel with arms did not conform with the kind of balanced approach necessary to lessen tension in the Middle East. Uruguay thought that this paragraph, as well as the Assembly's requests for enforcement action and an arms embargo, prejudged the future attitude of a State.

Most of the delegations which abstained or expressed reservations stressed their condemnation of the Israeli attack.

The inclusion of the item on the agenda of the 1981 regular Assembly session was requested by 43 countries in a letter of 12 August.⁽¹⁷⁾ In view of the importance of the question for international peace and security, they stated, it was incumbent on the Assembly to deal with the question in all its aspects.

During the debate, many speakers, including Algeria, Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Jordan, Malaysia, the Syrian Arab Republic and Viet Nam, expressed regret that the Security Council had not imposed sanctions on Israel or demanded redress for the damage suffered by Iraq. A number of countries, such as the Byelorussian SSR, China, Czechoslovakia, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Pakistan, Qatar, the Sudan, the Ukrainian SSR, the United Arab Emirates and Viet Nam, also favoured effective enforcement action. Many of these States, along with Yugoslavia, specifically advocated a halt to the supply of arms to Israel, and Mauritania urged an embargo on all nuclear materials for that country. Sri Lanka said the matter had been brought to the Assembly to seek a vital action that the Council had been unable to provide—cessation of the provision of arms to Israel.

Several States, including Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, appealed to the Assembly to adopt a resolution requesting the Council to take every