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

Letter dated 31 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to refer to the "Study on the consequences of the Israeli armed attack against the Iraqi nuclear installations devoted to peaceful purposes" prepared by a group of experts and contained in the annex to Your Excellency's report A/38/337 dated 7 October 1983.

The nature of the Iraqi nuclear enterprise and the action taken by Israel on 7 June 1981 have been discussed ad nauseam during the past two years by various bodies of the United Nations. For its own political and partisan reasons, Iraq intends to make the issue a permanent feature of discussions at the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

While it is not my intention to be drawn into the pattern of discussion desired by Iraq, I should like to make some comments on the following aspects of the report of the group of experts:

(a) The report's biased nature clearly reflects the manner by which its terms of reference were defined;

(b) While Iraq was invited to make its views known to the group, Israel was not invited to do so;

(c) Israel was blamed for not entrusting its security concerns to the "collective security system of the United Nations". However, the best evidence for the vacuity of this argument is to be found in the more than 300 local wars and dangerous confrontations since 1945 which have been dealt with ineffectually and in a partisan manner by the United Nations system;
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(d) The report characterizes Israel's operation as an impediment to Iraq's development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Surely the war unleashed by Iraq on Iran over three years ago has had incomparably graver consequences for the development of those two countries, as well as for other States, which depend upon the unimpeded supply of oil from the two warring countries. This war has also had severe detrimental effects upon the new international economic order and upon the ecology of the Gulf. While Iraq carries a heavy responsibility for this devastation and destruction, the report tendentiously presents this country as a victimized underdeveloped peace-loving nation which was prevented from achieving economic and social progress due to Israel's action of June 1981. It is preposterous that a group of experts should forget this major and largely self-induced dissipation of resources when discussing Iraq's concern for its peaceful development;

(e) In my note verbale dated 29 June 1983 addressed to Your Excellency and subsequently reproduced in document A/38/342 of 1 September 1983, it was stated that "Israel has no policy of attacking nuclear facilities and its views on the substance of the issue were amply stated and hardly need reiterating". The group of experts, in its report, omitted all reference to this statement;

(f) It is also revealing that the group of experts, in dealing with the issue of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, made no reference whatsoever to the principle of free and direct negotiations among the States of the region. This principle was widely endorsed by various groups of experts composed of distinguished members who came from countries representing different political backgrounds, including the non-aligned nations (A/10027/Add.1; A/41/88; A/38/42 l/).

The report is thus tainted with political bias. Predetermined conclusions have clearly dictated the choice of facts and arguments, except for the inescapable scientific aspects of health hazards on which one chapter concurs with Israel's evaluation. The composition of the group of experts largely accounts for this bias: four out of the six experts are nationals of countries which have no diplomatic relations with Israel. Of the remaining two, one subsequently asked the Secretary-General to record his position regarding the report as an abstention rather than approval. Thus, one can only conclude that, had the issues in the study been dealt with impartially and objectively, the report would have reached very different conclusions.

Be that as it may, the Government of Israel urges that the energies of the United Nations be devoted to supporting positive international initiatives and that a determined effort be made to prevent Iraq's misuse of the United Nations and IAEA as forums for introducing in a repetitious manner extraneous political issues as part of agenda item 28. What is at stake are not merely the principles of equality and universality in international organizations in general, but also the very future of IAEA as a technical organization entrusted with a specific mission in the nuclear field.

Moreover, serious attempts should be made to support direct negotiations among the countries of the Middle East for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free
zone on the pattern of the Treaty of Tlatelolco 2/ for Latin America, as has been repeatedly proposed by Israel, including in its draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.8 dated 31 October 1980. Such a framework cannot be created through propaganda exercises of which this report is a prime example.

I have the honour to request that this letter be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly under agenda item 28. In so requesting, I wish to place on record once again my protest with regard to the biased and completely unjustified formulation of the agenda item in question which is clearly intended to prejudge the debate on that agenda item as well as its outcome.

(Signed) Yehuda Z. Blum
Ambassador
Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations
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