

UNITED NATIONS

UN LIBRARY

DEC 18 1972

UN/ISA COLLECTION



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

1461st MEETING: 30 DECEMBER 1968

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1461)	1
Tribute to the memory of Mr. Trygve Lie, first Secretary-General of the United Nations	1
Adoption of the agenda	2
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 29 December 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8945);	
(b) Letter dated 29 December 1968 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8946)	2

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIRST MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 30 December 1968, at 9 p.m.

President: Lij Endalkachew MAKONNEN (Ethiopia).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Algeria, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Hungary, India, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1461)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Letter dated 29 December 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8945);
- (b) Letter dated 29 December 1968 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8946).

Tribute to the memory of Mr. Trygve Lie, first Secretary-General of the United Nations

1. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council must have learned of the passing today, in Norway, of Mr. Trygve Lie, the first Secretary-General of the United Nations. During the seven years of his occupancy of the post of Secretary-General, Mr. Lie served with great distinction and dedication the ideals and aspirations of this Organization as laid down in the Charter. Under his leadership, the international Secretariat was recruited and organized, the Headquarters of the United Nations was constructed, and the Organization itself faced up to and survived numerous perilous crises.

2. His courage, wisdom and statesmanship were a high example and a great source of strength to those who followed him in the service of our common cause.

3. This afternoon I sent condolences, in my capacity as President of the Security Council, to the Government of Norway and to Mr. Lie's family for the sad loss they have sustained in the death of this great son of Norway and outstanding citizen of the world.

4. I should now like to ask the members of the Council and all others in this chamber to rise and observe a minute of silence in tribute to the memory of Trygve Lie.

The members of the Council observed a minute of silence.

5. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the Secretary-General.

6. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: Mr. President, I just want to report to the Council that as soon as I learned of the passing of Trygve Lie, the first Secretary-General of the United Nations, I sent a message of condolence to the Prime Minister of Norway. The text of the message is as follows:

"I express to you and to the Government and people of Norway my profound sorrow and condolences on the death of Trygve Lie. As its first Secretary-General, Trygve Lie holds a unique place in the history of the United Nations. After a distinguished career as a wartime leader of his embattled country he was given the herculean task of putting into operation the new world organization, of recruiting its Secretariat, of finding its permanent home after several years in temporary quarters, of building the New York Headquarters and of installing the Organization in it. The execution of these highly complex administrative tasks ran parallel with the infinitely difficult duty of seeing the United Nations through its first, and halting, steps towards making a reality of the purposes and principles of the Charter. Trygve Lie's tenure of office, from February 1946 to April 1953, was beset by many crises and was afflicted by the increasing rigours of the cold war. Despite the unceasing problems of those years—Palestine, Berlin, Kashmir and Korea, to name only four—Trygve Lie continued as he had started out, a fighter for peace, a defender of the Charter and a tireless builder of the new world Organization. Like anyone who occupies an exposed position of world importance, he was frequently criticized from many sources, as often for doing too much as for doing too little. No one was more aware than he of the contrast between his great responsibilities for peace and the stringent limitations on his authority and on his possibilities for effective action. It was he more than anyone else who was responsible for building from nothing the physical structure and administration of the United Nations. Thus the Headquarters in New York is in a sense his most enduring monument.

"My sympathy goes to his family and to the people of Norway in their great loss, which is shared by all the Members of the United Nations."

7. I also sent another message of condolence to Mrs. Guri Lie Zeckendorff, a daughter of Trygve Lie. The message runs as follows:

"The sudden death of your father has come as a shock to all of us here in the United Nations who knew him and who are daily aware of his great contribution to the Organization. He was a champion of peace and a tireless

worker for a more just and better world. As the first Secretary-General of the United Nations he was the master builder of the Organization, as well as its chief executive in the extraordinary series of crises of its early years. He brought to what he once called 'the most impossible job in the world' the courage and conviction which had sustained him and his fellow countrymen through the darkest days of the war. Even if the job was impossible he managed to do it. I send to you, your sisters and all the family my deep sympathy in your great loss."

Those are the texts of the two messages.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) **Letter dated 29 December 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8945);**
- (b) **Letter dated 29 December 1968 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8946)**

8. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken by the Council last evening, I propose now, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Lebanon and Israel to take seats at the Council table in order to participate without vote in the discussion.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. F. Boutros (Lebanon) and Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel) took places at the Council table.

9. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the question inscribed on its agenda. The first speaker on my list is Mr. Boutros, representative of Lebanon. I give him the floor.

10. Mr. BOUTROS (Lebanon) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I thank you for calling on me to speak; I also wish to thank those representatives who have been kind enough to give way to me.

11. At yesterday's meeting the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations presented the Lebanese complaint. I do not intend to repeat his arguments or to stray into a discussion of unnecessary detail. I believe it to be my duty, however, for the sake of truth itself and so that no element of this deplorable business shall remain hidden, to discuss some of its aspects in order to enlighten the members of the Security Council.

12. I do not consider that I need to defend my country here and its conduct as a member of the international community and of the United Nations. Lebanon can be justly proud both of its record as a very active Member and of its extreme respect for the principles of the Charter. So far it has never been the subject of the slightest complaint or even of the slightest protest to the Security Council. The

Armistice Agreements which it has concluded and the cease-fire decisions which have been taken by the Council in regard to the Middle Eastern region have always been scrupulously respected by my country. That was no doubt the reason why the world was justly disturbed by the aggression recently perpetrated against Lebanon by Israel.

13. In face of that peaceful attitude of Lebanon, Israel has continuously by every means at its disposal, including force, violence and military power, provoked my country, challenged it and threatened its vital interests, by the statements of its responsible officials and the acts of its regular armed forces. Every pretext, every argument, no matter how fallacious, has been used. On the most recent occasion, that is to say, forty-eight hours ago, it did not scrape together such poor twigs, but set off a blaze which puts the region's peace and security in obvious peril.

14. I need only note in passing how tardy and contrived is the complaint, or counter-complaint, which Israel has lodged in reply, to the Lebanese complaint which seeks to blame Lebanon for the incident committed at Athens airport by two Palestinian refugees of their own accord; whereas Israel refrained after that incident from making the slightest protest or from submitting a complaint to your Council against Lebanon. I think, moreover, that that trick will not deceive the Council, and that examination of that complaint at this session is merely formal.

15. But what is the substance of the matter? A clear-cut, flagrant and premeditated aggression was committed against Lebanon, against civilian objectives, threatening not only the lives and property of individuals but also the security of an international business centre, jeopardizing the cease-fire decisions and helping to set the region ablaze. Israel seeks in vain by far-fetched arguments to justify this aggression, this threat to peace, this disregard of the Armistice Agreements and the cease-fire decisions. Such arguments, however, will clearly not withstand examination, since they hold Lebanon responsible for actions committed outside its territory, of course without its knowledge and still less with its connivance, by Palestinian refugees who were chased out of their country solely by the Israeli imperialists and made refugees in Lebanon or other Arab countries. The Israel pseudo-dialectics cannot prove the Lebanon Government guilty of connivance, actual or even possible, with the agents of the Athens operation, or prove it in any way responsible for that operation. I shall confine myself to a few arguments which in my opinion, completely invalidate the Israel pseudo-dialectics. The first argument—to which I have already referred—asks why, if Israel really considered Lebanon responsible for the Athens incident, did it not immediately submit a complaint against Lebanon to the Security Council. Its attitude today is not only fantastic but most clearly fraudulent. In short, Israel makes the Athens incident, with which the Lebanese Government had nothing to do, both a justification for appealing to the Security Council and a pretext for completely unwarranted reprisals. I leave the Council to pass judgement on that claim. Moreover, the allegations that the agents of the Athens incident have found refuge in Lebanon or have some connexion with it are completely unfounded. The Greek judicial authorities are still investigating the incident, and I do not believe that Israel can have such absolute and precise foreknowledge of their findings.

16. Furthermore, the Palestinian National Liberation Front, the organization to which, according to Israel, the agents of the Athens incident belong, stated on 29 December 1968 and the two commandos—the two *fedayeen*—were trained outside Lebanese territory and came to Lebanon only two days before the Athens operation.

17. At this point one question occurs to me and I shall mention it to members. If the two *fedayeen*, instead of passing through Lebanon, had stopped at another airport—at Rome, Paris, Milan, London or elsewhere—would Israel have held the authorities of the particular country responsible for the Athens incident, and have considered reprisals against the airport at which they had stopped? Furthermore, in international law the theory that a State can be held responsible for acts done by its inhabitants abroad of their own choice, no longer has to be shown: the answer is clearly negative. As proof I need only mention the attitude adopted by Israel itself when Argentina complained against it to the Security Council in the Eichmann affair. The then Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel developed quite a theory, which members can find in the archives, that Israel considered that it could not be held responsible for actions of its nationals outside its territory—and the present acts were committed by persons who are not even nationals of Lebanon.

18. I do not wish to waste your time by reading all the statements and lengthy arguments of the then Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel. I am sure you remember them much better than I do and that it is completely unnecessary for me to refer to them.

19. What is the purpose, therefore, of this case against Lebanon? Lebanon is not even charged with intent. Its actual intentions are not at issue. Is official Lebanon to be made accountable for the desires, feelings, longings and passions of the refugees, or held responsible for their faith in their cause and their destiny? Is that really the purpose of the lofty principles which are enshrined in the Charter and of which the United Nations is so proud?

20. The country on whose behalf I have the honour to speak is proud to present to the world a rare if not unique example of constructive and harmonious coexistence between its communities, which are so many spiritual families for whom respect for freedom of thought and of expression not transgressing law or morals is a fundamental article of faith. The human values which it glorifies are based on respect for the individual and his dignity and on the support of just causes against unjust causes in all their forms.

21. Was it by pure chance that the most recent Israel aggression was committed against my wise and tolerant country between Christmas and the New Year? Was it a simple coincidence that the target country is a centre of culture, trade and international transport, which may offend Israel not only by its material and commercial development but especially because of the aberrant philosophy on which Israel claims to be seeking to build a nation?

22. I shall not answer those two questions, since I am sure that you have already done so.

23. I shall conclude my statement by reading out the brief diplomatic note which the President of the Lebanese Republic sent yesterday to the representatives of certain Powers:

“This is the first time in history that a State has used its regular military forces to attack a civilian objective or a private company of another State in alleged reprisal for an action by commandos who are not nationals of that other State and have acted outside its territory.

“This is the first time in history that a State has fabricated a reason for attacking another State so remote from this State’s responsibility that it could not give valid ground, and in fact has not given ground, for any complaint against this State before any international control or decision-making body.

“This is the first time that a State has been held responsible for the acts of persons whom it has in no way assisted to do those acts, and who are refugees happening to be on its territory because they cannot return to their Palestinian homeland and, because of their situation in international law, cannot be domiciled elsewhere. The most recent Israeli aggression against Lebanon has violated not only the Armistice Agreement and the cease-fire decision but also very basic principles, so that it hazards not only the security of Lebanon which today appeals to the Security Council, but also every reason why the United Nations and the Security Council should exist.

“In sum, Israel attacks Lebanon and blames it for the behaviour outside Lebanese territory of Palestinian refugees who are in Lebanon because Israel itself has violently expelled them from their home country and who cannot return thither because of Israel itself.”

24. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Algeria, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

25. Mr. BEN KACI (Algeria) (*translated from French*): While the Security Council is examining the Lebanese complaint, United Nations Headquarters is besieged by a crowd and by pressure groups of supporters of international Zionism chanting anti-Arab slogans the content of which I shall spare the Council.

26. We have no objection to groups expressing their opinion in one way or another, but we oppose these anti-Arab demonstrations outside the very doors of United Nations Headquarters. They should be held on the other side of the street. The host country should therefore take the necessary measures to ensure that the Headquarters of the Organization is respected and that the Security Council can continue its proceedings in peace.

27. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Algeria for drawing the attention of the Council to the fact that these incidents are taking place outside the Headquarters building. I am sure that the representative of the host country will take note of what has been brought to the attention of the Council and will do his best to co-operate with the Secretariat in ensuring that the work of the United Nations is conducted in calm and tranquillity.

28. Mr. WIGGINS (United States of America): My Government is always pleased to respond immediately to any request by the Secretary-General to assist in any way in the maintenance of order whenever he seeks our assistance.

29. Mr. BORCH (Denmark): Denmark, a sister country of Norway, mourns the death of Trygve Lie. This morning the Prime Minister of Denmark made the following statement, which, with permission, I will quote:

"At the passing away of Trygve Lie, not only Norway but the whole world has lost a great personality, a statesman and a great administrator. Over many years Trygve Lie held important posts in the Government of his country, among those the post of Foreign Minister in the Government-in-exile in London during the difficult years of the war. Outside the Nordic countries he will be particularly remembered for the great and unselfish work which he carried out with skill and determination as the Secretary-General of the United Nations from 1946 to 1953. It was to be of great importance to the United Nations and thus to the whole world, and not least to the Nordic countries, that the post of Secretary-General was held by a personality so outstanding and forceful in the first years of the United Nations, when the Organization was to find its shape and the way in which to function. The contribution of Trygve Lie to the United Nations and to the cause of peace shall not be forgotten."

30. Turning now to the complaints before the Council, it is with regret that we have to note that the Security Council has met once again because of violent incidents arising out of the conflict in the Middle East. We have done so repeatedly—regrettably to little avail. We deplore these incidents—all of them—not only because of the senseless human suffering and material losses they inflict but also because such acts of violence do harm to the prospects for peace in the Middle East and the efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to that end.

31. The Danish Government condemns the Israeli attack on Beirut international airport on 28 December. That action endangered the lives of many innocent people and it is of a particularly deplorable character because it extended the area of conflict to Lebanon, a country which has stood for moderation. Israel would have acted wisely and properly by promptly bringing to the United Nations the case of the criminal act of terror committed against the Israeli civil aircraft in Athens on 26 December, instead of committing this grave act upon an international airport, an act that stands out by its scale and magnitude.

32. My country is about to leave the Security Council; therefore I shall avail myself of this occasion to express our hope that the vicious circle of violence may at long last be broken and that the paramount importance of restoring peace and security to the Middle East may soon be recognized by all those concerned. By its resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 the Security Council has shown the way. It is our sincere hope that the coming year will witness a mutual realization by the parties that active and fruitful co-operation with Mr. Jarring in the exercise of the mandate entrusted to him by this Council holds the best promise for peace in the area and will thus best serve

the true interests of all peoples and of all nations in the Middle East.

33. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): Mr. President, before commenting on the question before us on the agenda, I also should like to refer briefly to the sad news to which you and the Secretary-General referred, the death of Trygve Lie, whom I had the privilege of knowing and working with in earlier times. I should like to quote the words of another Canadian who knew Mr. Lie even better, our former Prime Minister, the Right Honourable L. B. Pearson, one of the pioneers of this Organization, who said today:

"He was a man of integrity and great courage and completely devoted to the ideals of the United Nations. His contribution to the growth of the world Organization as its first Secretary-General was an essential one. He will be greatly missed, for his work for international peace and progress will not be forgotten."

34. The Canadian delegation cannot in any way condone actions of violence which breach the spirit and intent of the cease-fire established by the Security Council, especially when this Council is engaged in trying to bring about conciliation in the Middle East. Time and again experience has shown that retaliation and acts of reprisal lead only to a further escalation of violence in a situation already fraught with danger for peace in the area.

35. With the information at our disposal, it is clear that the Council has no alternative but to state its strong opposition to the action taken by Israeli commandos at Beirut Airport on 28 December. This deplorable action, while represented as a form of response to other regrettable actions such as the terrorist attack on an Israeli civil aircraft at Athens Airport last week, is unacceptable; and it cannot but be the subject of severe censure by the Security Council.

36. The Israeli attack on the civil airport at Beirut is unprecedented and out of proportion to any provocation offered. The Lebanese Government has, since the war of June last year, conspicuously endeavoured to maintain an atmosphere of calm at a time when tempers are high and the danger of incidents is very great. Furthermore, the Israeli attack has the disturbing effect, as did the incident in Athens, of widening even further the area of conflict.

37. It is obvious that the Israeli attack seriously risks bringing about a rise in tension and further violent incidents in the Middle East. This kind of reprisal must also be regarded with deep concern by all countries upholding the rights of persons to use civil air carriers to move safely by air from one place to another.

38. The Canadian delegation has remarked on more than one occasion that the road to peace in the Middle East cannot be built with the weapons of war. All the violence in the area only serves to confirm this. The violence now under consideration by the Council is all too clearly a reflection of the frustration, the resentment, and indeed the anguish on both sides over an inherently unstable situation, full of danger.

39. This may be the last opportunity for my delegation to speak on the Middle East situation before 1968 is out and

Canada, like Denmark, leaves the Council. I therefore take this opportunity to appeal most earnestly to the parties concerned to make a renewed and determined effort to break out of the vicious cycle of violence—which is in danger of escalating again—and work for a settlement on the basis of the provisions and principles of resolution 242 (1967), supporting what Ambassador Jarring is doing towards that goal. I would also recall that the responsibility for achieving a settlement must depend primarily on the efforts of the parties themselves.

40. The present course—terror, violence, destruction—as the events now before the Council clearly demonstrate, cannot solve any of the problems; such a course can only make those problems worse and put reasonable solutions further beyond our reach. This is not the time to open fresh wounds, but to help heal those which already exist. Diplomacy, not belligerence, is the best recipe in the long term for the achievement of a state of peace in the Middle East.

41. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I wish on behalf of my Government to join with other members of this Council in paying respect to the memory of Secretary-General Trygve Lie. Even those of us who did not know him personally realize well the high motives and devotion he brought to his task. We all know that no one in public life carries a burden as heavy as that of the Secretary-General of the United Nations; no man carries so great a responsibility with so little power. All the more we admire Mr. Lie's contribution as a leader in the field of international endeavour. To his family and to his Government and his people I tender the condolences and respectful tribute of my Government.

42. I am sorry that I was not in my place last night, but I wish to take this opportunity of repeating and emphasizing what was said on behalf of my delegation. Certainly my Government strongly condemns the attack on Beirut Airport. Certainly we shall continue to emphasize that we deplore all violations of existing cease-fire agreements, and other acts of violence. We regard the attack in Beirut as particularly reprehensible.

43. Moreover, I make no excuse at all, whenever we meet in this Council on the dangers of the Middle East, for turning our attention to the need for a settlement. The scale and frequency of the violence in the Middle East make it essential that we should turn from the violence to consider again how we can achieve the political settlement ever more desperately needed.

44. I have often said in this Council that there is one factor which distinguishes this dispute from nearly every other dispute in the world—that is, that to this problem we already know the answer, to this puzzle we already know the solution, to this dispute we already know the settlement. The outstanding question is not whether there will be a settlement: the question is whether that settlement will be achieved in common sense and peace or after appalling suffering and bloodshed.

45. We know that we cannot accept or condone acquisition of territory by conquest. If we were to accept or

condone that, we should give an advance license to any would-be aggressor. The Security Council could never do that.

46. We know that Israel has a right to exist: it has a right to do so within secure and agreed frontiers. Any suggestion that Israel must be subject to continuous violence, intimidation and harassment is equally and wholly unacceptable to us. The Security Council could never accept or condone the use of subversive violence, which is no less aggression than open attack.

47. We in this Council have consequently declared the twin principles of withdrawal and security. I am sure that we stand by them. We can accept nothing less and nothing else.

48. We have declared other purposes, among which I would always put first a just settlement of the refugee problem. That is a humanitarian necessity. We must no longer shirk that obligation or allow it to be callously shelved or cruelly shuffled aside. Still less must we allow the refugees to be used as pawns in a political game. It is time enough to act.

49. The other purposes are already unanimously declared and accepted, including the freedom of passage through international waterways to all shipping without exception.

50. These principles and purposes have been approved and repeatedly endorsed by the Soviet Union, by the United States, by France and by the United Kingdom—indeed by representatives of every continent and every race in the world. Why cannot the approved principles be put into effect? Why cannot the agreed purposes of settlement be achieved? Why must we watch such wasted bloodshed and such futile destruction? What stands in the way of peace? Too well we know the answer: it is that there is such mistrust, suspicion, bitterness, hate and fear between the two sides that they will not move to carry out the settlement, the settlement which both desperately need and which I believe both genuinely desire.

51. How is the mistrust, suspicion, bitterness, hate and fear to be removed so that the way to peace can be cleared? What I say may be ill received by one side or the other—possibly by both. No matter. We all have a right and a duty to say what we believe needs saying.

52. I would say that the way to remove mistrust and suspicion is not by violence, and I would say that the way to remove bitterness and hate is not by sabotage. I would say that the way to remove fear is not by killing. Anyone who believes that peace can be secured by intimidation, or that security can be won by sabotage is surely making the most terrible mistake. To build a wall of hate will not bring peace: it will attract mounting violence.

53. But we hear the anguished cry: "What else can we do? What other course is open to us?" I go back to what I have repeatedly said in this Council. Here is no blind alley. It is not true that there is no other course but violence. What is the other course—the course of hope and peace? First, it would be the acceptance, without further prevarication or

reservation, of a genuine readiness to implement the resolution of November 1967. Secondly, it would be to let the new refugees go home at once, and to start immediate negotiations through Ambassador Jarring to end the long-term tragedy of the old refugees.

54. "Magnanimity in politics is not seldom the truest wisdom." Is magnanimity a utopian aim? All I would say is that it is much less unrealistic than the delusion that peace is to be won by a spiral of violence and retaliation.

55. Let the conditions for a permanent peace be publicly stated. It will be found that the conditions have been on the record for more than a year. They are the principles and purposes unanimously approved by this Council. Let it be publicly stated and reaffirmed by both sides that if those conditions are met, a permanent peace will be honoured.

56. What then is the role of the Council, and particularly the role of the permanent members? We have long been agreed on the principles and purposes. We have separately and repeatedly urged on the parties acceptance and implementation of those principles and purposes. But we begin to fear that if left to themselves alone the Israelis and the Arabs will never voluntarily come together; even with the help and encouragement of Ambassador Jarring, they may continue to stand apart and hopelessly resort to escalating violence.

57. Particularly those of us who have special interests and responsibilities in the matter can surely no longer be content to allow the declared purposes of the international community to be flouted and frustrated. We must surely refuse to allow the vicious circle of violence to lead to greater disaster. We must surely insist that the parties pay more than lip service to our resolutions. We must surely require that the violence shall cease in order to make permanent peace a possibility and a reality. We must surely find every means to achieve these purposes; we must surely do so without further delay.

58. Mr. CHANG (China): Mr. President, this being the first time that I have occasion to speak this month, let me first of all extend to you the belated congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. Your devotion to the principles and purposes of the Charter and to the traditions of this Council, as well as your unfailing courtesy and sense of fairness, have earned for you the respect and admiration of all your colleagues. I wish also to associate my delegation with the well-deserved tribute paid to your predecessor in the Chair, Ambassador Borch of Denmark.

59. The year 1968, which is now drawing to a close, might have been used in the Middle East to reduce the scope and intensity of Israeli-Arab differences, to narrow the psychological gulf separating the two peoples, and above all to create a climate conducive to the establishment of a just and enduring peace in that area.

60. Unfortunately, that has not been the case. To an increasing degree, there has been a tendency for the parties concerned to rely on force to achieve what they conceive to be their ultimate objectives. In recent months, armed

clashes have become an almost daily routine. If this trend of events is not averted in time, there is no telling what tragedy may yet befall the Middle East area.

61. The Council is now dealing with a case in which Israeli troops landed by helicopter at Beirut International Airport and destroyed or damaged a dozen or so civilian aircraft. Extensive damage has been done to aviation facilities and installations. The representative of Lebanon yesterday gave us a full account of this unfortunate affair.

62. The Council has been told that the military action taken by Israel was in the nature of a retaliation, provoked by an attack on an Israeli aircraft in Athens on 26 December and the previous hijacking of another Israeli jetliner by Arab commandos. It seems to my delegation that this massive destructive foray into a centre of international transportation cannot be justified under the circumstances. There is no evidence that the Government of Lebanon was responsible for what had taken place in Athens or for hijacking the Israeli jetliner. To deal an unwarranted blow to a country which had hitherto shown itself to be moderate and restrained in its attitude towards Israel cannot fail to cause universal concern.

63. On a number of occasions my delegation has in this Council voiced its strong disapproval of the doctrine of retaliation and reprisal. We believe that no Government, even under extreme provocation, should take the law into its own hands. Such unilateral exercise of force must be regarded as contrary to the spirit of the Charter and must be condemned by the Council.

64. It must be realized that no country can always rely on its superior military strength to force the pace of settlement on its own terms. Indeed, the long-term prospects for peace depend not on force but on a lasting conciliation between the parties. If there is anything to be learned from the history of the Middle East in the last twenty years, it is that war and violence are no solution to the problems that have beset the area. Here victory in war brings not security but only an increase in insecurity to the victor, and defeat engenders in the breast of the defeated an increased feeling of injustice and gives an added reason for defiance.

65. In the present case, the responsibility of the Security Council is clear enough. My delegation is prepared to support prompt, effective and just action by the Council for the maintenance of peace and tranquillity in the Middle East.

66. The PRESIDENT: I wish to thank the representative of China for the kind and generous references he has made to me and to my predecessor in the office of the President of the Security Council.

67. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): The death of the first Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Trygve Lie, fills my delegation with deep sorrow. He served the world Organization in the formative years of its life with conspicuous devotion and sincerity. On behalf of my Government, I should like to offer our respectful tribute to his memory.

68. This being the first time, Mr. President, that I have made a statement in the Security Council under your

presidency, may I offer to you the sincere felicitations of my delegation. It is appropriate that at this time the Council should have the benefit of the guidance and leadership of so outstanding and able a representative of Ethiopia as yourself—Ethiopia, a country which has experienced aggression, witnessed its eventual defeat, warned the world at a historic moment of the folly of condoning it, and seen the final vindication of justice. Your own qualities of fairness, impartiality and dedication to the United Nations, and your unfailing courtesy and vast experience are only too well known and hardly need any fresh eulogy from me.

69. I must also take this opportunity to convey my delegation's deep appreciation of the skill and wisdom with which Ambassador Borch of Denmark presided over our deliberations last month.

70. In this year of 1968 the Security Council has met many times to consider the situation repeatedly caused by the acts of massive and indiscriminate violence and destruction wrought by Israel. The latest of such acts, committed by Israel on 28 December at the civil international airport of Beirut, is but the culmination of a series of occurrences which have rent the fabric of peace in that unhappy part of the world.

71. We know that sometimes the Security Council has condemned Israel's acts as flagrant violations of the United Nations Charter and of the cease-fire agreement. We also know that at other times the Security Council has, unfortunately, remained inactive. Whether issuing a condemnation or choosing to remain silent, the Council has so far found Israel acting as a law unto itself.

72. In the present situation there seems to exist no doubt among the members of the Council that the Council's authority should be reasserted and that it should act promptly and speedily. My colleagues who have preceded me in this debate have already established several points. These are:

73. First, Israel's attack on Beirut airport, which was a most serious blow to the sovereignty of Lebanon and to international civil aviation, calls for condemnation by the Council in the most unmistakable terms. If that condemnation is to have any meaning and effect, it must necessarily be stronger than those contained or implied in previous Security Council resolutions.

74. Secondly, the occurrence of a certain act at Athens Airport on 26 December which has been cited by Israel as a justification for its latest act of aggression is not only irrelevant to this debate but is also outside the purview of the Security Council, as has been very ably pointed out by the representative of the Soviet Union, Ambassador Yakov Malik.

75. Thirdly, the Security Council is now confronted with a worsening of the crisis in the Middle East. The repetition and enlargement of the acts of belligerence committed by Israel and the inclusion in the area of conflict of the defenceless State of Lebanon, known for its concentration on the pursuits of peace, are matters of the gravest

significance. They nail to the counter the fiction of Israel as a small State defending its very existence against fearful odds. The actual situation is quite the contrary.

76. This situation must be squarely faced, without any preconceptions, and the Council must issue a solemn warning to Israel to cease and desist from its predatory acts against its neighbours. For if the Council is to reassert its authority in the face of this situation—as it must—responsibility needs to be placed on Israel to make reparation for the damages which it has caused to Lebanon. Further, the Council must ensure full compliance with its demands by Israel.

77. Considering the statements already made by my colleagues in this debate, I do not think that these points need any further elaboration. As the representative of the United States said in his statement last night:

"It must now be plain to the Government of Israel itself that the attack on the international airport at Beirut has introduced new dangers into the already alarming situation in the Middle East. This destructive operation has enlarged the ring of reprisal and widened the circle of terror to touch areas and peoples hitherto struggling to keep aloof from these measures. Surely the Government of Israel must be having sober second thoughts about this act of arrogance." [1460th meeting, para. 75.]

78. It is the hope of my delegation that, with all these considerations in mind, the Security Council will evolve an agreed resolution that will be an adequate response to the requirements of the present situation. But as we concentrate on the measures that are necessary in the present specific case, it is impossible to turn our minds away from the entire situation in the Middle East. The Security Council laid down the framework of a political solution in its resolution 242 (1967) and assigned to Ambassador Jarring the task of establishing and maintaining contacts with the States concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and just settlement. While Ambassador Jarring has made laudable efforts, with remarkable perseverance, Israel has acted consistently as if his mission did not even exist and as if no restraint was demanded of Israel if that mission were to bear fruit. Time and again Israel has shown that it enjoys complete immunity from whatever depredations it might choose to visit on its neighbours. The bombardment of towns in Jordan, the massive raids on areas vital to the sustenance of that kingdom, the defiance of the injunction of the Security Council against the holding of a military parade in Jerusalem, the calculated attempt at the annexation of the Holy City, the attack on civilian installations deep within the territory of the United Arab Republic, and finally, the act of piracy on Beirut Airport—what do all these acts indicate except a systematic policy based on reliance on the use of force without a sense of discrimination or proportion?

79. The indignation felt by the Arab Governments and peoples at the continued occupation of their territories has been continuously aggravated by every act and every declaration of policy by Israel. Can anyone suppose that

the chances of a peaceful settlement will be promoted if this indignation is not assuaged and the explosive element naturally resulting from it removed? For Ambassador Jarring to have any hope of success in his mission, for the Security Council to arrest the trend towards another war, it is essential, first and foremost, that a balance be introduced into the situation by the imposition or the injection of some element of restraint on Israel's reckless course.

80. My delegation is convinced that such a balance can be introduced only if the permanent members of the Security Council concert their efforts for peace in the Middle East. We were greatly impressed by the statement of the representative of the United States last night, and I apologize to him for quoting from that statement for the second time: "The Security Council—indeed every Member of the United Nations—has a responsibility to help break the pattern of violence in the Middle East." [Ibid., para. 76.]

81. It is evident that this responsibility devolves especially on four permanent members of the Security Council. It is their concerted action alone which can bring about the conditions necessary for the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). Without their initiative the prospects for the implementation of that resolution will only worsen. Beyond that, what is required, in our judgement—and I have said this before—is a re-examination of the policies pursued so far. Such a re-examination would be constructive to the degree that it shows at least an awareness of the sense of outrage suffered by the Arab peoples over the historic injustice inflicted upon them.

82. The PRESIDENT: I should like fully to reciprocate the very friendly sentiments that my distinguished colleague and friend Ambassador Shahi has addressed to me and to my predecessor in the office of President of the Security Council.

83. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): Before I take up the item on our agenda, I should like to extend to you, Sir, the congratulations of my delegation on the honour and responsibility which you have assumed as President of the Security Council. Knowing you as we do and appreciating as we do your outstanding personal qualities, neither we nor you need any praise from me here and now.

84. I should also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Borch, the President for November, who also possesses outstanding qualities.

85. During the year that my delegation has been in the Security Council, in the many meetings that have been held to consider the situation in the Middle East, it has had repeated opportunities of expressing its views on each and every violation of the cease-fire ordered by the Security Council in 1967; we have invariably condemned these whatever their origin or characteristics have been. With equal persistence and firmness we have never hesitated most resolutely to condemn premeditated and planned military actions carried out on the territory of another sovereign State, although efforts have been made to justify them as reprisals.

86. The unprecedented attack carried out by units of the Israel Air Force against Beirut international Airport on the night of 28 December 1968 falls within this category of actions.

87. If the principle that a State can arrogate to itself the right to carry out reprisals is to be rejected, then in the particular case before us the fact of carrying out such an action against Lebanon—a country which in United Nations terminology is described as "moderate"—and the damage caused to the airport makes the military action even more reprehensible.

88. The general situation in the Near East is serious and tense. Our individual and collective efforts therefore should be made to establish a just and lasting peace in the entire area. I am referring, of course, to the unanimous Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and to the peace mission entrusted to Ambassador Jarring, whose talent, ability and patience are well known. Incidents as serious as that of 28 December make this picture a very gloomy one indeed.

89. In these circumstances my delegation is prepared to associate itself with other members of the Council in searching for means of securing a unanimous resolution that will reflect the deep concern and anxiety which we are sure not only all members of the Council but all Members of the United Nations feel, to prevent a repetition of events such as those we are now discussing.

90. Those are the preliminary and general comments that my delegation wishes to make. We reserve the right to speak again on this subject whenever we deem it appropriate.

91. Before concluding this brief statement I should like to refer to the death of Mr. Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the United Nations from 1946 to 1953. In your statement at the beginning of this meeting, Mr. President, we find a reflection of the feelings of my delegation. Permit me merely to add that to the memory of Trygve Lie the members of my delegation bow with reverence and respect in silent tribute.

92. The PRESIDENT: Speaking again for myself, as well as for my predecessor, I should like to express sincere gratitude to our friend and colleague Ambassador Solano López for the message of goodwill that he has been good enough to address to both of us.

93. The next speaker on my list is the representative of Israel. I now give him the floor.

94. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Mr. President, I should like to join you, the Secretary-General and members of the Security Council in the expression of regret and grief at the passing of the great and unforgettable first Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Trygve Lie. On behalf of the Government of Israel, I extend profound condolences to his family and to the Government and people of Norway. Trygve Lie will always be remembered for his great loyalty to the fundamental principles of the Charter and his indefatigable efforts to see them carried out in practice.

95. On 26 December, at 1034 hours, a passenger airliner of the Israeli company El Al was preparing to take off from

Athens airport on a regular flight from Tel Aviv to New York. All the passengers were already seated in the plane. The exit doors were shut. The engines were on. It was at that moment that an armed attack of unprecedented character was carried out against the aircraft, its passengers and crew.

96. Using a sub-machine-gun, grenades and flame bombs two Arab assailants opened fire on the cockpit of the airplane and its passenger section. The purpose of the attack was obvious—to blow up the aircraft and kill all on board. There were fifty passengers and crew members on the plane. By the time the attackers were seized one passenger was killed, a stewardess wounded and the airplane's motors destroyed. When Greek firemen tried to approach, the attackers opened fire on them as well.

97. The Israeli passenger killed was an engineer *en route* to Argentina on behalf of the United Nations. He was killed by bullets in the head and chest.

98. The commander of the airport police, Colonel Patroklos Nikos, stated: "There is no doubt that the intention of the attackers was to kill. They fired first on the motors and then on the windows of the plane."

99. "The entire airport of Athens could have gone up in flames," declared one of the Greek officials to the press. "Next to the El Al plane", he continued, "there was a Comet of Olympic Airlines which was refuelling. In the Israeli aircraft alone there were thirty tons of fuel. Several metres away there stood a Boeing of Ethiopian Airlines and a Trident of British European Airways. I tell you that on that spot there were about 300 tons of easily inflammable fuel which was enough to blow us all up."

100. Inhuman in its lust for blood, indifferent to the catastrophic dangers involved, oblivious of international interests and rights, the attack was the most despicable of acts of violence committed in the course of Arab warfare that continues against Israel in violation of the cease-fire.

101. "A cowardly act of barbaric insanity" the *Ceylon Daily News* of 28 December labelled it. "A condemnable act" said *Dagens Nyheter* of Stockholm on 28 December. The Athens daily *Vradyni* stated on 27 December: "The criminal act... the murder of one of the passengers... and the attempt, fortunately unsuccessful, to blow up the aircraft, all these constitute manifestations of a fanaticism inadmissible and condemnable by every free man." The Cyprus daily *Eleftheria* wrote on 27 December: "The attack... should be condemned unreservedly."

102. "This act, like the incident which occurred with the same Israeli company on 23 July last in Algiers, will be condemned by the entire world as banditry. This was a criminal act", stated *Fraternité* of Abidjan on 28 December.

103. On 29 December the important newspaper *Daily Graphic* of Accra, in Ghana, wrote:

"The attack on these defenseless civilian passengers, no matter what their nationality, should be condemned both

for its savagery and for the fact that it took place in a foreign country which is in no way involved in the Middle East crisis. By the attack the Arab guerrillas have indicated that they are determined to carry the war to any country which has dealings with Israel. We feel that any piracy, whether on the sea or in the air, should be treated with the greatest contempt and indignation, no matter what the motivation."

104. The Turkish newspaper *Tasvir* of 29 December, published in Ankara, also warns of the far-reaching consequences of Arab terrorist warfare, as follows:

"This negative action of the Arab terrorists against Israel is not the first one nor the last one. To throw bombs in a crowd in Jerusalem when innocent civilians are going about their business, to kill children on the doorsteps of their homes, or moviegoers, all this is not commando operations, it is cowardly terrorism. The Nasser-inspired terrorists are violating international law, are recklessly and brutally jeopardizing the freedom and safety of aviation. The Nasser-inspired commandos ought to be brought before the United Nations, which should categorically stop the interference with security and with the free communications between the peoples of the world. The problem is not only an Arab-Israel problem but the problem of welfare of the enlightened world."

105. From all continents, from all parts of the world, came expressions of shock and anger. Here was an attack directed against Israel and its citizens but endangering international aviation in general and innocent travellers irrespective of their nationality. It was not the first such act. Last June an El Al aircraft was seized in mid-air by an Arab commando and forced to land in Algiers. The lives of helpless passengers and crew members were put in jeopardy in an act of wanton piracy. Nor was the viciousness and cruelty of the armed attack at Athens Airport entirely unprecedented.

106. The attempt to blow up an airplane with all its passengers and crew and endanger the lives of many others at a neutral airport was of the same character as throwing grenades into a crowded bus station, exploding dynamite charges in a market place, placing button-shaped mines in school yards, planting mines under tourist buses.

107. Defeated in their aggression of May-June 1967 the Arab States are now trying to prove their mettle by war against women and children. Thwarted in their openly proclaimed plan to destroy Israel and annihilate its people in 1967, the Arab Governments have turned in 1968 to bleeding Israel by murder of the innocent and defenceless, by terror and sabotage. At Athens Airport the warfare by stealth, merciless and indiscriminate, reached new depths of baselessness. It was clear that it must not be left without reaction. It was clear that attacks against international civil aviation were becoming a pattern. It was clear that action had to be taken against this menace threatening to bring chaos and catastrophe to international life.

108. Where was the action to come from? The world, shocked as it was, remained paralysed and Governments strangely silent. The people of Israel were once again on

their own. They remembered how over the years the United Nations proved powerless to ensure their rights and protect their lives. They remembered how the Security Council was unable even to condemn attacks on Israel territory and the murder of Israel citizens. They remembered how in 1948 they had to repel by themselves the aggression of seven Arab States defying the United Nations; how the world stood by in silence when Arab armies rained death and destruction on Jewish villages and towns. They remembered how the world remained passive when Israeli shipping was barred from the Suez Canal for twenty years; how nations were caught helpless when Israel's lifeline through the Straits of Tiran was cut. Israel knew that it was again up to itself to uphold its rights, to protect its citizens, to prevent a stranglehold on its air lifeline. Israel knew that as in so many cases in the past it had to act to defend itself and its people.

109. The decision was taken. Israel acted. Yet how different its action was from that of the Arab aggressors.

110. The attackers of the El Al aircraft in Athens testified that they were Lebanese who came from Lebanon. One of them was Lebanese born, the other a resident and national of Lebanon. Both lived in the city of Tripoli. Both were members of the Palestine Liberation Front, the same terror organization that claimed credit for the act of piracy committed against the El Al plane last June. Its headquarters are situated in Beirut, in the very centre of the city, in the building of the weekly *El-Hurriya*. It is to be noted that the office of the El-Fatah terror organization is located in Tarik Abiri *en route* to Beirut airport. The training base of El-Fatah is located east of the airport, while its recruiting office is located in Ein-Gdeda, in Beirut itself.

111. The Palestine Liberation Front headquarters, operating in Beirut with the sanction of the Lebanese authorities, was the first to announce the execution of the Athens attack. Its communiqué was broadcast over Lebanon's governmental radio to be picked up and repeated in sickly exhilaration by information media in other Arab capitals. The activities of these terror organizations are conducted in the open. They issue statements, publish announcements, organize public recruitment to their ranks. They maintain camps at Tripoli, Sidon and Tyre, where hundreds of men receive military training.

112. Two sabotage bases are located in the refugee camps in Ein Hilwa near Sidon. The residence of the Mukhtar Yosef El-Abdallah is being used as the centre of the bases.

113. The raider Khalil Mohamad Musa Sad ad-din, captured by Israel defence forces, testified that he was recruited in Beirut by a person named Taha Hamed and was registered in the Palestine Liberation Organization office near the UNESCO building in Beirut. The head of the office is the notorious Shafiq al-Hut. He added that in the office there were thirty other recruits from Lebanon. Twenty-six of them were sent to receive their training at the Iraqi Expeditionary Force stationed in Jordan and the other four were sent to an officers school in Iraq. The four are: the witness himself; Suheil Hamam; Fuad Abu Ddrum from Beirut; Abd el-Aini from Ein Hilwa.

114. In the last months the concentration of raiders increased especially in the vicinity of the Lebanon-Israel cease-fire line. The number of sabotage raids in this area between August and December 1968 was twenty-two. I have brought this to the knowledge of the President of the Security Council in a number of letters. According to information which has reached Israel, there is a concentration of hundreds of raiders in the area of the Lebanese cease-fire line. The Lebanese authorities are obviously aware of this fact and have appointed liaison officers to the commando units.

115. The financial branch of the Palestine Liberation Front is openly conducting a fund-raising campaign in Lebanon and the receipts issued bear its imprint. They circulate throughout Lebanon with the full knowledge of the Lebanese authorities.

116. The leader of the Front, George Habash, is well known in the Middle East for his sinister past as an operative of the fascist-inspired Arab Nationalist Party. He and his deputy and chief of operations, Ahmed Al-Amini, enjoy special protection and immunity granted to them by the Lebanese police. The political spokesman of the Front, Maarouf Saad, is a member of the Lebanese Parliament for the city of Sidon. The widely-publicized activities of the Front have been the object of special debates in the Lebanese parliament. On 26 June 1968, a well-known political personality, Mr. Raymond Edde, had to admit that Lebanon had granted free movement to the terrorists through its territory. On 11 November 1968, another central political figure, Kamal Joubalatt, called the Lebanese public to assist the terror movement with all the means at its disposal and advocated a "positive collaboration" between the terrorist armed groups and the Lebanese authorities.

117. The encouragement and the complicity of the Lebanese Government are no doubt accountable for the rapid expansion of the Front activities.

118. The attention of the Lebanese Government has been drawn on numerous occasions to the activities of the terror organizations within its borders. The Lebanese Government, however, has not only continued to condone these activities, but has publicly identified itself with them. Prime Minister al-Yafi has announced several times that his Government supports terror operations against Israel. Only this morning he declared again: "The *fedayeen* operations are legal and sacred". It is inconceivable how, in the light of these facts, the Lebanese representatives can come before the Security Council and claim ignorance and innocence. It is well known that the terror organizations which the Lebanese-Government assists have all proclaimed that their aim is Israel's destruction as a State and the annihilation of its people. Even here in the Security Council we have not heard a single word dissociating the Lebanese Government from terror warfare pursued against Israel in violation of the cease-fire.

119. The representative of the United Kingdom indicated in his statement today that it is the United Nations itself that has established the responsibility of Governments for assisting or tolerating within its territory terror activities

directed against another State, activities which, under the Charter and international law, constitute aggression. Surely this applies to Lebanon which, under the cease-fire established by the Security Council, is obligated to prevent military activities of any kind whatever against Israel.

120. Unlike the attempt, organized and launched from Lebanese territory, to destroy an Israel airplane and kill the fifty persons aboard, Israel chose not to act at the international airport of a neutral country, but to direct its measures to the source of the Arab attack—Beirut and its airport. Unlike the Lebanese attack, Israel chose not to take lives but to strike against inanimate objectives. Where there was lustful bloodthirstiness in the Lebanese attack, there was utmost care to avoid loss of life in the Israeli measure. While at Athens Airport there was a premeditated effort to carry warfare to new areas, to extend it to new dimensions, to involve in it the international community, the Israeli action was restricted in its scope and objective. Indeed, there is a difference between the two acts. One was aggression for the sake of murder; the other a desperate attempt, after continued restraint, to impress that aggression does not pay. One was marked by brutal inhumanity; the other by an attempt to revindicate humanity even in war.

121. An opinion was expressed in this Council that Israel's action was disproportionate to the terror attacks that preceded it. When would Israel's action have been proportionate to them? Had the assailants of the aircraft at Athens succeeded in blowing up the airplane and killing the fifty persons aboard, or had they brought about the explosion of other airplanes on the field and of the airport installations, would that have made the Israeli action proportionate? Should we have waited until Arab warfare succeeded in bringing about such a catastrophe? Should we have waited until terror attacks from Lebanon against Israel territory resulted in more casualties and more damage? Are we engaged here in keeping the score of success and failure in murder or in an effort to thwart it? Is proportionality between one act and another to be established by the impressiveness of the damage caused or by the extent of the act's danger, by its purpose, by its background and motivation?

122. It is odd to hear several supporters of Arab aggression in the Middle East suggest that Israel should pay compensation for the aircraft destroyed at the Beirut airfield. And who will pay for the loss of Israeli lives? Is the single life of the Israeli engineer killed in Athens while on a United Nations mission worth less than all the metal, wire and upholstery destroyed in Beirut? Who will determine that? Or are the shares of the owners of the Arab airlines more privileged than human life? Who will compensate Israel for the hundreds of its citizens killed in the course of the existing cease-fire? Who will make reparation for the damage to the border villages that are being shelled incessantly or the Jews lingering since June 1967 in Arab concentration camps, for the property of nearly a million Jewish refugees from Arab lands, or for the twenty years of Arab war against Israeli territory and people?

123. During the Second World War, while six million Jews were being annihilated by the nazis, an offer was made by

the Germans: the lives of several thousand Jews in return for the same number of trucks supplied from the allied Powers. The latter, however, deemed the trucks more valuable than living Jews. The trucks were refused. The Jews were put to death. Here, in the Security Council of the United Nations, a quarter of a century after the defeat of nazi barbarism are we to hear that the scrap iron of airplanes is worth more than Jewish blood? There is apparently nothing so low that Arab aggressors and their supporters would not stoop to it. Theirs is a malevolence which the Jewish people will not easily forget.

124. It is perhaps not by accident, and it may even be symbolic, that the most penetrating assessment of the situation was pronounced under the name of Winston Churchill, the younger Winston Churchill, writing in the London *Evening News* of 30 December.

"On the one hand", he wrote, "a deliberate . . . attempt was made to destroy an Israeli civil airliner as it was taxiing out for take-off with fifty-one people aboard. On the other a raid that resulted in the destruction of thirteen empty aircraft that was meticulously planned and executed to avoid any loss of life or injury to civilians. It is indeed strange that the Israeli action which was deliberately designed to avoid loss of life (and it appears, succeeded in this respect) should come in for so much more condemnation from the British, French and American Governments than the deliberate attempts to destroy an airliner with all its passengers aboard. Surely, even in our materialistic present-day society, human life—even one individual—is worth more than a handful of aircraft. As far as the Israelis are concerned, their raid on Beirut airport was not so much a question of tit for tat retaliation as for keeping their air lanes open."

Finally Mr. Churchill has this to say:

"The Israelis do not glory in this retribution. They say they would willingly turn the other cheek if that were the means of securing a soundly based peace. They clearly do not believe that it is."

125. Those who shrink from truth, those who are afraid of truth, try to keep it out. Such an attempt was made yesterday when certain delegations tried to prevent the inclusion on the agenda of the Israel complaint against Lebanese violations of the cease-fire. Such an attempt will undoubtedly be made again when the Security Council comes to formulate the conclusions of its present deliberations. The truth, however, cannot be shut out—whether by speeches or by resolutions. It is there for all to see, and it is grim.

126. After nineteen years of unabated warfare against Israel, the Arab States in June 1967 mounted a campaign of aggression to wipe the State of Israel and its people off the map. Having failed in their design, they have undertaken to pursue the war, in defiance of the cease-fire, by terror and sabotage. It is not a new method. It is in no way an outgrowth of the June 1967 hostilities. It has been employed by the Arab States for years, in the fifties and sixties. Indeed, it is the Arab method of war against Israel when Arab armies prefer to avoid direct confrontation with

the Israel army. This is the situation that has faced Israel since 1948. For twenty years there has been Arab warfare by terror. For twenty years there have been Israeli self-defence counter-measures. There is only one way to avert this chain reaction: terminate Arab warfare. There would have been no Israeli action at the Beirut airport if not for the savage attack in Athens perpetrated by Lebanese from Lebanon. There would have been no attack in Athens if not for the policy of war which the Arab Governments are continuing in word as well as in deed. The Government of Lebanon is fully aware of Israel's attitude towards it. It is one of "live and let live" When there are no attacks from Lebanon against Israel, there are no Israel counter-measures. When Lebanese territory is used as a base for acts of aggression against Israel, when the Lebanese authorities harbour terror organizations and allow them to operate freely against Israel territory and Israel citizens, Israel has no choice but to act in self-defence.

127. Israel desires tranquillity on the cease-fire line with Lebanon, as on other cease-fire lines. There will be tranquillity if Lebanon abides by the cease-fire and puts an end to acts of violence by terror organizations operating from its territory, contrary to the cease-fire. In the past twenty years such acts of aggression have only brought disaster and suffering to all the peoples of the area. There is no reason why Lebanon should tread this path instead of striving, together with Israel, towards the attainment of peace.

128. I returned from Israel only three hours ago. I found the people and its Government determined to follow a course of peace, resolved to end the war that has plagued the Middle East since 1948. But I found a people which, if war continues to be waged against it, will defend itself with all its soul and all its heart and all its might. To that people it is immaterial how this warfare is waged or how it is defined. Whether attacked by the shell of a regular army's artillery or by the bazooka bomb of an irregular military force, the people of Israel will defend itself. Whether death is forced upon it by an Arab army or by a terror warfare organization supported by Arab Governments and committed to Israel's destruction, the people of Israel will not yield to it. They will repel it as best they can, by whatever means they possess; for in the struggle for life it is the right to live that precedes all. I found a people that has suffered too much for too long, to be deterred from achieving its objective to live at peace, real peace, like all other nations. I found a people that will not agree that laws valid for all should not be applicable to itself. If Governments which permit terrorist attacks to be launched from their territory against another State are considered by the United Nations as being responsible for aggression, Israel will not be ready to consider the Arab States otherwise. If Members of the United Nations, and in particular members of the Security Council, regard themselves as entitled to take military action against the bases of terrorist aggression and sabotage, wherever they may be, Israel cannot be expected to act differently.

129. There cannot be one law for Israel and another for the Arab States. There cannot be inalienable rights for Members of the United Nations and a questioning of the same rights in respect of Israel.

130. There is no doubt that it is such a state of affairs that has contributed through the years to Arab intransigence and fanaticism. There is no doubt that it has encouraged the continuation of Arab aggression. There is no doubt that in the Security Council it has given succour to Arab terror warfare. This must no longer be, if the cause of peace is to be strengthened and advanced.

131. The time has come for the parties to the Middle East conflict to conclude agreement on a just and lasting peace, as called for in the 22 November 1967 resolution. It is not enough to juggle with words in defining respective attitudes towards that resolution. Peace can be achieved only by agreement between Israel and the Arab States. Peace, however, cannot be attained if warfare continues while the Arab States disclaim responsibility for it. It must end. The Arab States can and should end it. The Security Council must call upon them to do so. To omit such a call again can only encourage further breaches of the cease-fire. And if peace is to come, the cease-fire must be maintained. There is no reason why it should not be. Israel hopes that all Governments in the area will now realize that it is in the interest of all of us to respect the cease-fire and to prevent all violations of it by whatever means committed, so that we may devote our efforts fully towards the establishment of a just and lasting peace.

132. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Yesterday the Soviet delegation reserved its right to speak at today's meeting after a thorough study of all the documents and of the facts adduced in the statement of the Lebanese representative.

133. The documents, the statement made yesterday by the Lebanese representative and today's statement by the head of the Lebanese delegation show beyond any doubt that a new act of aggression has been committed by Israel.

134. The repetition by the representative of Israel at today's meeting of all that was said yesterday by the representative of Israel, even in an artificially-dramatized form, introduced nothing new.

135. The new act of aggression perpetrated by Israel against an Arab State has been strongly condemned throughout the world. I am deeply convinced that if the Lebanese representative had begun his statement at this meeting of the Council by quoting the world press—as the Israel representative frequently does—then a single meeting of the Security Council would not have been long enough for him to read out all its indignant comments on this monstrous act of Israel aggression against Lebanon.

136. The consideration of this question at yesterday's and today's meetings has shown that all the members of the Security Council recognize that Israel's aggression must be strongly condemned and that the Council must take a decision designed to prevent future acts of aggressive banditry by Israel.

137. The armed provocations which have been committed in recent months by Israel troops—first against the United Arab Republic, then against Jordan, and now against Lebanon—are not isolated incidents. They represent a new

stage in Israel's aggressive policy against the neighbouring Arab States; they reflect the course set by the Israel Government towards an expansion of the sphere of aggressive acts by Israel in the Near East. That has been recognized in substance by representatives of Member States who spoke in the Security Council yesterday and today, including even those who have previously tried in one form or another to justify Israel's actions, placing Israel, the aggressor, on the same footing as the Arab States, victims of the aggression.

138. The Israel Government's official announcement that it had carried out a raid against the Beirut airport—allegedly as a retaliatory measure—merely proves that the policy of illegal reprisals, armed provocation, and international gangsterism has now been raised to the level of the official policy of the Israel Government, and that violation of the Security Council's decisions and of the Charter of the United Nations has become a method of implementing that policy.

139. It is common knowledge that modern international law—the Charter of the United Nations—forbids States to resort to military reprisals. Even in earlier times, before the adoption of the United Nations Charter, international law recognized the absolute inadmissibility of carrying out reprisals in response to actions of individuals, since such actions cannot be regarded as violations of international law. Israel's aggressive acts carried out against Arab States under the pretext of so-called retaliatory measures are therefore in flagrant contradiction to Israel's obligations as a State Member of the United Nations under its Charter. They constitute a defiance of many decisions of the Security Council, which has frequently stressed in its resolutions that the practice of so-called reprisal measures of a military nature is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. It is common knowledge that the Security Council, in its resolutions adopted in January 1956, April 1962, April 1964 and November 1966, condemned Israel for its so-called reprisal measures against Arab States. The Security Council reaffirmed those decisions in even stronger language by its resolution of 24 March 1968 in connexion with Israel's attack on the town of Karameh in Jordan.

140. On that occasion the Security Council warned Israel in very clear terms that, if its "actions of military reprisal" were not stopped, then "the Security Council would have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such acts" [resolution 248 (1968)].

141. However, the facts of recent months show that Israel pays no attention to that strict warning by the Security Council, and stubbornly persists in its aggressive policy directed against the Arab States, undermining the chances for reaching a peaceful political settlement in the Near East, obstructing the noble mission of Ambassador Jarring, and thus creating a threat to international peace.

142. Recent events in the Near East and the incident at the Beirut airport on 28 December 1968 have yet another major significance. They show that all the various allegations and fabrications to the effect that the leading circles

in Israel have various political approaches to the problem of a settlement in the Near East and that the Israel Government has its "hawks" and "doves", are nothing but political camouflage and a smokescreen deliberately spread to conceal from world public opinion the real unity of the leaders of Israel based on an aggressive policy.

143. The statement of the Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Eshkol, officially confirming that the armed attack against Lebanon was carried out with the sanction of the Israel Government leaves no doubt that the course towards further aggression, towards an extension of the scale of military provocation against Arab States, towards an undermining of the chances of a peaceful settlement, is indeed the official policy of the Israel Government. Therefore, let us not hear any more fables about alleged "hawks" and "doves" in Israel. The entire world regards Israel's present official policy as one of reckless aggression, threatening not only the peoples of the Near East but also the maintenance of international peace.

144. There can be no doubt that in pursuing this policy the Israel aggressor is once again counting for support and defence on its protectors. The question naturally arises whether it will continue to receive such assistance and protection in the future.

145. The Security Council listened carefully to the statement made yesterday by the representative of the United States of America [1460th meeting]. The Soviet delegation noted that for the first time in recent years a United States representative clearly condemned an aggressive act committed by Israel against an Arab State. There was also an expression of willingness to support immediately the Security Council decision designed to prevent a repetition of such acts.

146. If these words of the United States representative are really followed by deeds of the United States Government, if the United States of America joins the majority of the members of the Security Council in supporting the adoption of an effective decision that would restrain the aggressor, then the Security Council will be able rapidly and effectively to put the arrogant aggressor in its place and to compel it to respect the legitimate rights of other peoples, international law, the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the decisions of the Security Council.

147. Gentlemen, let us be frank. We all understand that putting a stop to Israel aggression will depend to a great extent on the position adopted by the United States of America. The entire world is now wondering whether the United States is really prepared to use all its opportunities, jointly with the Security Council and with other States, to bring to bear on Israel the pressure necessary to help to achieve a political settlement in the Near East, or whether the result will merely be another verbal condemnation of the aggressor while the Israel extremists are in fact further encouraged to continue their aggressive policy against the Arab States and inspired to launch new adventures by receiving military and financial assistance and political support.

148. We have also listened with close attention to the statement made today by the United Kingdom representa-

tive, who strongly condemned the aggressive actions of Israel. We are entitled to express the hope that the United Kingdom Government may willingly contribute towards the normalization of the situation in the Near East and take measures which will exert a definite influence on the Government of Israel. The United Kingdom is far from powerless in this regard; we are convinced of this, and the only question is whether there really exists a desire and a will to warn Israel of the grave consequences to which its present course may lead.

149. These comments are my reply to the remarks made by the representative of Pakistan, Ambassador Shahi, concerning the action that can be taken by the permanent members of the Security Council.

150. Yesterday the Soviet delegation put forward its views concerning the content of the decision to be taken by the Security Council on this matter. We should like now to reaffirm those considerations. Their foundation is that new acts of aggression committed by Israel shall require the Security Council to take the "further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter" mentioned in the earlier Security Council resolution.

151. That warning was given by the Security Council some months ago in case Israel did not cease its criminal policy of attacking Arab States. In the light of those considerations the Soviet delegation will approach any draft resolution that may be submitted to the Council.

152. In this connexion we are bound to point out to Council members that—this is becoming well known—during the consultations conducted today among several delegations concerning the text of a draft resolution certain forces tried various backstage manoeuvres clearly aimed at emasculating and watering down the proposed draft resolution, to prevent the Security Council from adopting any decision which would really end the aggressive acts perpetrated by Israel against neighbouring Arab States.

153. In strongly condemning such manoeuvres and attempts, the Soviet delegation of course reserves its right to speak on the substance of the draft resolution when this is submitted to the Security Council.

154. The PRESIDENT: I have received a communication from the representative of Saudi Arabia [S/8955], requesting that he be allowed to participate in the deliberations of the Council. If there is no objection to this, with the consent of the Council I intend to invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to take a seat at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. J. M. Baroodiy (Saudi Arabia) took a place at the Council table.

155. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Saudi Arabia was the next speaker on my list, but he has agreed to cede his place to the representative of Lebanon. I now therefore call on the representative of Lebanon.

156. Mr. BOUTROS (Lebanon) (*translated from French*): I merely wish to make a few remarks about some statements which we have heard here.

157. The artificial pathos of the representative of Israel cannot conceal the leanness and inanity of his arguments. Instead of replying to one argument by another, Israel seeks to broaden the debate tendentiously, so that it has gone far beyond the question submitted to the Security Council and led the Council irremediably astray.

158. In short, because Israel suffered twenty years ago and because its inhabitants today fear for their future, it arrogates to itself the right to cause the Arabs suffering, make them martyrs, occupy their lands, usurp their property, attack Lebanon, and seriously threaten peace. I too have come straight from my country, and I can assure you that my fellow citizens are far from calm, happy and satisfied. The permanent threat that Israel hangs over them—for Israel is not at all the lamb it pretends to be—makes their situation far from enviable.

159. The picture of destruction and damage caused by the commandos, so cleverly painted by the Israel representative in vivid, even glaring, colours cannot in any way conceal the naturally and really pathetic situation of the Palestinian refugees. More than two million uprooted people are living in a permanent hell, suffering misery, disease, unemployment and death. Their plight deserves full sympathy from public opinion and must not be forgotten. If some of them react, they do so because Israel has lamentably left them no choice.

160. But what has Lebanon to do with all this? What is the connexion between the Athens incident and the Government of Lebanon? One of the commandos at the Athens airport was allegedly born in Lebanon. But he is far from being Lebanese, since he was born in Lebanon of refugee parents.

161. Lebanon shelters no commando organization. But we must understand one another clearly. For Israel every refugee camp is a potential commando camp. If a refugee is recruited at Beirut by some representative passing through, what responsibility can the Lebanese Government assume? To accuse Lebanon of encouragement and complicity is an absurd slander, belied by Lebanon's whole political history over the past twenty years and by its extreme loyalty to United Nations decisions.

162. In sum, this entire show is designed to serve only one purpose, which we perceived at the end of the statement. That is to blame the Arab countries for failing to abide by the Security Council decision of 22 November 1967. The accused seeks to become the accuser. I believe that you will treat this claim as it deserves.

163. In concluding these remarks on the particular question of Lebanon, I would say this: Israel is a lamb, Lebanon is a wolf. Gentlemen, does any one of you believe this for a single moment?

164. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Saudi Arabia. I now give him the floor.

165. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, it is a privilege for me to take the floor under your presidency. I say this judiciously, for, indeed, whenever you take the

floor in the Council your words are weighted with wisdom and you are never rash in coming to a conclusion. I must say that you seem to be free from the straight jacket of instructions that often characterizes Members of the United Nations.

166. I take this opportunity also to offer my condolences to our Norwegian colleagues, whether present or absent, on the death they have sustained through the passing of Mr. Trygve Lie, whom I had known since the inception of the United Nations. I can hardly add to the laudatory words that were expressed by our Secretary-General at the beginning of this meeting.

167. I had decided not to take the floor; but after having heard the arrogant allegations of none other than Mr. Tekoah, I feel constrained to take the floor, for indeed if his words are left unanswered they may be taken for granted by many people, Jews and non-Jews, not only in New York City but the world over. The reason is simple. The Zionists control or influence the mass media of information in many countries and it has become habitual for Mr. Tekoah to quote chapter and verse from articles that may have been inspired if not paid for by Israel or its representatives abroad.

168. But I asked for the floor to address myself to the item that this august body is discussing. I read the verbatim record, because I was not here last night to attend the first meeting of the Council on this item. There is a change in the attitude of the United States. They seem to be waking up to the fact that Israel is drunk with power and has taken precipitate action that may lead one day to a world conflict. I say this because, after having read the words of Mr. Wiggins, I find that there is a concern expressed by the United States; but at the same time it is a cautious restraint. For indeed, if the United States means action it would forthwith have stated categorically that it would reconsider the sale of fifty Phantom jets to Israel.

169. But the United States made sure, as far as I can gather from the dispatches I read, that this protest which the Assistant Secretary of State in Washington expressed to the Israeli representative in Washington did not imply at all the reconsideration of selling the Phantom jets to Israel. Therefore I question whether any action taken in the Council will be merely words or whether any resolution will see to it that Lebanon receives reparations for the loss it has sustained by the wanton action on Beirut Airport.

170. The Charter is quite explicit about what could be done in order to stop this usurping State in the Middle East. Chapter VII of the Charter and other articles speak of sanctions. Is the United States ready to apply sanctions if Israel does not offer reparations and an apology to the Government of Lebanon for what it has done?

171. I need not go over what the former Foreign Minister of Lebanon has said. I know Lebanon; I was born in Lebanon. Since the times of the Phoenicians, in the annals of Lebanese history, the people of Lebanon were never known to have aggressed against their neighbours. I am not saying this lightly. And the Phoenicians, that were the ancient Canaanites of the Bible, were the first people to

invent the alphabet, which figures on the sarcophagus of Hiram of Byblos. The word Byblos, thirteen centuries before Christ, gave its name to the Book, to the Bible. That was three hundred years before King Solomon came on the scene in Palestine. The oriental Jews, as well as Europeans, Jewish scholars and gentile scholars, know that the Lebanese engaged in shipbuilding, in trade. They never went to war except in self-defence. They never went to war against anybody.

172. And here, after 3,300 years, come those usurpers from eastern Europe who were converted to Judaism between the seventh and eighth centuries after Christ, according to the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, and who happen to have Judaism as their religion but who are eastern European in origin. They come as colonials and they are supported by some great Powers. They have been supported by the British Government since the days of Balfour, and later they were supported by none other than a President of the United States, Mr. Truman; they created Israel.

173. The United Nations at Lake Success voted for the partition of Palestine by the slim margin of two or three votes, if my memory is correct. And by whose pressure was it? By the pressure of the Western countries; but unfortunately, Mr. Gromyko also voted for the partition. Then, what happened? Palestine was partitioned.

174. I jotted down a few of the phrases used by the representative of Israel. He stated that the armed attack on the airport of Athens was of an unprecedented character. Does he for a moment think that no invasion of Palestine by Europeans had ever occurred before the Zionists' invasion? Has he forgotten the days of the Crusaders, who used religion as a motivation for a political and economic end?

175. Mr. Tekoah uses such words as "despicable acts of violence". Maybe Mr. Tekoah was not in Palestine in 1948. I do not know where he was then, about twenty years ago. Has he heard of the massacre of Deir Yassin, a village that was surrounded at dawn by machine-gunners who killed every creature, including animals, and destroyed the houses? Mr. Tekoah speaks about "barbaric insanity" to describe two frustrated Palestinian desperados, who are fighting to regain their homeland, and in desperation perpetrate such acts as occurred at the airport of Athens and he wishes to attribute their acts to the Lebanese Government.

176. When Mr. Tekoah speaks of "piracy on the sea or in the air", has he forgotten that there were two million Palestinians, more than half of whom now live outside their homeland? Their houses and their orchards have been taken over. They were driven out by tanks.

177. When Mr. Tekoah speaks of "cowardly terrorism", has he forgotten the Irgun bands who even hanged British Tommies? That is why Great Britain could not remain there any longer. Of course, Lord Caradon, out of courtesy perhaps, forgets or wishes to forget about those acts.

178. Criticism is levelled against all the Arabs—and by "all the Arabs" I mean from the Atlantic to the confines of

Iran—one hundred million of them who have awakened to the fact that there is a usurping element in their midst, none other than those European Zionists. The Zionists no longer say “God gave us Israel, or Palestine”. We refuted that religious argument a long time ago. They no longer say “Israel is ours because 3,000 years ago we were there”, because that argument was refuted here in the Council. They always cry and say “we have been persecuted”, forgetting that even their Rabbi in England said: “The history of Jews was glorious in Spain during the Arab occupation”—that was said only a few days ago. But they quote what it suits them to quote from various newspapers.

179. Those poor Palestinians, living in camps or dispersed, as the Jews at one time were dispersed—I am talking of the oriental Jews, the Diaspora—if they think of their homeland, they are called “terrorists”. Most of the members sitting around this table, during the Second World War called the underground fighters “heroes”—the Maquis, the underground. Some of them were what? They were Jews, fighting against the tyranny of Hitler. And rightly so.

180. But when the Palestinians, who have been robbed of their property, of their homeland and chased out of their country, are desperate and try to express their despair by such acts as we hear of, whether it is in the airport of Athens or elsewhere, or even in Los Angeles where one of the leaders of this country was assassinated because he supported the Zionist cause for political reasons—those people are called “murderers”.

181. Are there two yardsticks here in the Security Council or in the United Nations? If there are two yardsticks, the United Nations will founder like the League of Nations founded before it.

182. “The world remained paralysed”—those are the words of Mr. Tekoah—“after what had happened in Athens.” I am quoting Mr. Tekoah: “The people of Israel were on their own.” The people of Israel are on their own when they are supported by most Western countries, which furnish them with arms? For what: In order to make sure that the Palestinians will remain out of their homeland; that they will be crushed. And by whom? By the Arab States?

183. Let me repeat to you gentlemen here: no Arab leader would dare suppress any Palestinian who says “I must go to my homeland”, the same as no European who was fighting to regain his country in the Second World War could have been called a terrorist or a traitor and no one would have dared to call him that. Those who did were liquidated in Europe, and I do not want to mention specific countries now in order not to embarrass some of those represented around this table.

184. Arab aggressors? Why do you not leave us alone, you Western countries? Now you are afraid of the Soviet Union because it is in the Mediterranean. Who brought the Soviet Union to the Mediterranean? You brought them—Mr. Wiggins’ Government brought them. Why should they not come to the Mediterranean? The Mediterranean is not a Western or an Eastern sea. It belongs to the countries that surround it.

185. We are the pawns of the balance of power and poor Lebanon must pay the price. You can condemn Israel in any resolution that you may pass. Israel has been condemned time and again. They laugh up their sleeves. Their leaders have protested to the State Department because it said that it was wrong to commit aggression against Lebanon. What do they care? They have permeated your Government. You cannot do anything. You court them and we pay the price in the Arab East, in the whole Middle East. Why? What have we done to you Western countries? Do you not have a conscience, or is that only in books? What have the Arabs done to you? They opened their doors wide after the First World War and they found themselves under mandates, colonized. After the Second World War, you partitioned part of the Arab homeland. What have we done? How can we trust you? The Governments have to deal with you; but what about the Arab people? There are a hundred million Arab people. I do not represent them. They are taking matters in their own hands. Do you want the Arab Governments to be attacked by the Arab people? That is what will happen if you pursue your policy. What have we done to you? Why do you not leave us alone to work out our destiny without interference? We are the pawns of a balance of power that has existed since the Congress of Vienna, that existed during the First World War and that foundered miserably after the Versailles Conference. You are repeating the same pattern for vested interests and for the Zionists who have permeated your institutions and your Governments. What have we done to you? Why do you not leave us alone?

186. What has happened in Lebanon is a serious matter. It shows that there can be no coexistence between those European usurpers and the Arab countries. If they aggress against peaceful Lebanon the way they have, what will they do when they get stronger? “Oh, live in peace with them.” They will colonize us economically. They will do anything, without being deterred. But there is some morality even in nature. He who oppresses others will finally pay a big price. And the people of Palestine have not aggressed against the West or against the Jews. As I have said in many of my interventions, many of them may have been Jews and embraced Christianity or Islam. I have warned this Council during the last three or four years that the question is no longer one between the Arab States contiguous with Israel and the usurping State of Israel. It is between the Palestinian people and those who robbed them of their homeland. Has that not yet sunk in enough? Do you not see how the Palestinians are laying their lives on the palms of their hands and throwing them so as to regain their homeland? Of course you see it. But why do you act like that? “Oh, because if we do not act like that the Soviet Union will gain a foothold in the Arab lands.” That is your argument; I have heard it time and again; it is in your papers. But you coexist with the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is a big Power. It has certain interests, and it wants to develop those interests. You had interests there before the Soviet Union, but you are spoiling your interests. One day your interests and our interests may go up in flames.

187. And here Lord Caradon speaks in platitudes of making peace. He reminds me of Mr. Cabot Lodge in 1956. At the end of that session in 1956 he came out with two draft resolutions in order to liquidate the Palestinian

question. Now Lord Caradon brings up the question of the refugees and its settlement. Why does he not go and poll the refugees and see what they want? We have no right to talk for the refugees. No one has the right, not even the Arabs have the right, to talk for the refugees. It is their country. He speaks about resettlement. The Arabs cannot tell the refugees, "Give up your homeland." They would be called traitors. The Arab Governments would be called traitors, and any Arab would be called a traitor. Anyway, no Arab Government would tell the Arab refugees, "Do not try to regain your homeland." Either there is a right of self-determination or there is no right of self-determination. Is the right of self-determination only for you in Europe? How did the people who lived under the colonial yoke free themselves except by fighting? Now you concede that there is the right of self-determination. It took me eight years to elaborate that principle of self-determination into a right. No other than President Wilson enunciated the principle at the Conference of Versailles, but when we came to elaborate it into a right here at the United Nations it took us eight years, because of colonial interests. And what is Israel but colonialism by proxy?

188. Whom are we fooling around this table by talking in platitudes? Everyone reads his statement as if reciting a lesson. There is a people there in Palestine. If you want to crush it, try to crush it. If you want to throw it into the sea, try to throw it into the sea. If you think an accommodation can be worked out with the Arab Governments, I wonder whether any such accommodation can be worked out. If it does not have the approval of every Palestinian, it is null and void. They are a people with an identity, with a personality. Sovereignty lies in the people, and they have the right to self-determination, whether you like it or not, whether we, the Arab Governments, like it or not. That is the fact. That is the truth. Here come the eloquent representatives of Israel—and I checked again from various sources that those two Palestinians were not Lebanese—and they pick on Lebanon in order to provoke action, thinking that by that action the Arab people will be made to yield and submit to their will. As I said, those who ordered such wanton action either are drunk with power or think that this is a way which will bring about peace in the long run. Such action will stiffen the Arab people from the Atlantic to the confines of Iran, down to the heart of Asia and the Sudan.

189. Israel talks of newspapers in Lebanon writing about the Palestinian commandos and calls them terrorists, and yet they have a right to malign the Arabs in their newspapers all over the world. They say that one Israeli killed at the Athens airport—whose death as a human being we all deplore—is worth I do not know how many lives. I think they have a psychosis. They think they are the chosen people of God. This is a psychosis. This is discrimination on the part of God. We deplore the death of any human being, whether he be Jew or gentile. But what right have these usurping eastern European Zionists to use Judaism, an ancient religion, as a motivation for a political and economic end? They have no right whatsoever, and in your hearts you know they have no such right. But you plead their case here because they are financiers and try to ease your trade. They worm themselves into your governments. You let them do whatever they want, because you have no

control any longer. They bring you votes. We know it from the newspapers: we read it every day. That is your business. More glory to them if they want to do these things in your country. But why should the Arabs pay for it? Why should small Lebanon pay for it? By what right do the eastern European Zionists plant themselves in Palestine? Only by the connivance of certain Western Powers, in order to dominate the whole area, the gateway to the continent of Asia from the west. I say to the United States: these are your plans. You sell them Phantoms. You do not wait until the next President comes in. You sell them Phantoms. We warned you that this would aggravate the situation. There will be no peace in the Holy Land of Palestine, unfortunately, until the great Powers—and I address myself now not only to the United States but also to the Soviet Union—see to it that any resolution that may be elaborated and submitted to the Council demands that reparations should be made to Lebanon and that if reparations are not made effective forthwith there will be sanctions under the provisions of the Charter. Otherwise we shall be the laughing-stock of the whole world and the United Nations arguments would then consist of random talk. We are being uncovered by the people outside the United Nations, and it saddens me, because, after all, many of us are dedicated to the United Nations, for there is no alternative to the United Nations. If the two major Powers in the Council do not see to it this time that reparations are made to Lebanon, with a warning that sanctions will be applied otherwise, all the work here in the Council, if you will allow me to say so, will be like trying to start a fire in an empty hearth by blowing into the ashes. Let us not deceive ourselves. Let us be honest with ourselves.

190. I must say one last word to my good friend Mr. Wiggins, the representative of the host country. We are all dedicated to free speech, but things are getting out of hand around the Headquarters of the United Nations. My colleague from Algeria said something to that effect. In the West such words as "bastards" and "bitches" are common jargon, but they are insults in our part of the world. We are Members of the United Nations. Of course, we do not ask that anyone's mouth be sealed. But there should at least be a little more consideration shown to States Members of this Organization.

191. I would ask the Secretary-General to be kind enough to see to it that a full report is made about these epithets and what his guards themselves heard. I myself checked, but I do not want to embarrass this Organization by reporting anything before the Secretary-General has had a chance to investigate. At the same time, I request my good friend Mr. Wiggins to see to it that we are not subjected to indignities and insults. We are insulted enough in the newspapers, in writing. After all, we represent sovereign States. We do not call people names. Even if our enemies come to us, we are courteous. I am not saying that as a reflection on the people of the United States: it is a reflection on the city of New York, which seems to have many pressure groups that sometimes get out of hand and are discourteous and impolite. I shall not refer to some letters which I have received during the past three or four years and which would make even a man in his early sixties, like myself, blush.

192. We must see to it that our personal dignity is respected, that the dignity and worth of the individual are respected.

193. In conclusion, I wish to thank the President again for giving me the floor. After I have seen any draft resolution that may emerge from the consultations among members of the Council, I may ask the President to give me the floor again—of course with the permission of the members of the Council.

194. The PRESIDENT: I should like to thank the representative of Saudi Arabia for the friendly and generous remarks he addressed to me and to my country at the beginning of his statement.

195. I should also like to inform him, as well as the members of the Security Council, that I have received a communication from the delegation of the United States stating that the people who were causing the difficulties in front of the building of this Organization have been removed and order has been restored.

196. The representative of Israel has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply, and I now call on him.

197. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): It would be superfluous for me to say that it is not in order to reply to the last speaker that I have asked for the floor.

198. We all know that what is a matter of life and death to one nation may be only a game of dialectics to another. Yet, even if viewed as a mere game, Security Council debates are all too serious to entitle a State guilty of aggression to preach about aggression, a defiler of the rights of nations to parade as a mentor on correct relations between States, a prime contributing factor to the Middle East conflict to claim the privilege of giving advice on Middle East peace. By its unchanged policy, by its unreserved support of Arab intransigence and belligerency, by the encouragement it gives continued Arab terror warfare against Israel, the Soviet Union has made the attainment of peace in the Middle East more difficult. Until it modifies its attitude, it must be regarded as having

disqualified itself as an acceptable partner in the search for understanding in the Middle East. Until that time, the world will not accept the Soviet Union in the concert of peace-loving nations striving to end the twenty-year Arab war against Israel.

199. As for the references the Soviet representative made to precepts of international law, it is clear that he has offered to the Security Council concepts specially tailored for this debate. He may be interested to hear the following comment published today by the well-known Danish international jurist, Professor Foighel, through the Danish news agency:

"I am inclined to agree that the Beirut Airport action should be regarded as an act of defence. Lebanon did not put forth an official protest or an expression of regret when the terror group assumed the full responsibility for the attack on the Israel plane at Athens Airport. International law and also the Soviet draft convention to define the concept of aggression lay down that the State from whose territory a group of armed men carry out actions against another State carry the full responsibility for the acts of the group."

200. I should like to reiterate for the benefit of the representative of the USSR that there will not be one law for all nations and another for Israel—not even Soviet law.

201. The PRESIDENT: There are no other names on the list of speakers. As members of the Council are aware, very extensive consultations have been going on and are continuing. It appears that some very encouraging progress is being made. I am happy to say that perhaps by this afternoon we may be in a position to reach a stage in our work that will allow us to consider an agreed text of a draft resolution. Therefore, in order to allow those consultations to continue and to enable us to finish our work by this afternoon, if possible, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to adjourn the meeting until 3 o'clock this afternoon.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1 a.m., Tuesday, 31 December 1968.