

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

JAN 18 1973

UN/DA COLLECTION

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

**1462<sup>nd</sup>** MEETING: 31 DECEMBER 1968

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1462) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
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) .....	1
Statement by the President .....	17

#### 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-SECOND MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 31 December 1968, at 3 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/1462)

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).

### 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)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the Council's previous decisions, I propose now, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Lebanon, Israel and Saudi Arabia 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), Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel) and Mr. J. M. Baroodi (Saudi Arabia) took places at the Council table.*

2. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the items on its agenda.

3. I am pleased to be able to announce that, after intensive consultations during recent days, the members of the

Council have been able to reach agreement on the text of a draft resolution which appears to command unanimous support. It gives me particular satisfaction that on such an important issue faced by the Council we have been able to obtain unanimity, and I express the hope that this unanimous decision will have a favourable impact on the effort being made to achieve a lasting and peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

4. I would now request the Under-Secretary-General to read out the text of the draft resolution.

5. Mr. KUTAKOV (Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs): The draft resolution reads as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Having considered the agenda contained in document S/Agenda/1462,*

*"Having noted the contents of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon (S/8945),*

*"Having noted the supplementary information provided by the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization contained in documents S/7930/Add.107 and Add.108,*

*"Having heard the statements of the representative of Lebanon and of the representative of Israel concerning the grave attack committed against the civil international airport of Beirut,*

*"Observing that the military action by the armed forces of Israel against the civil international airport of Beirut was premeditated and of a large scale and carefully planned nature,*

*"Gravely concerned about the deteriorating situation resulting from this violation of the Security Council resolutions,*

*"Deeply concerned about the need to assure free uninterrupted international civil air traffic,*

*"1. Condemns Israel for its premeditated military action in violation of its obligations under the Charter and the cease-fire resolutions;*

*"2. Considers that such premeditated acts of violence endanger the maintenance of peace;*

"3. *Issues* a solemn warning to Israel that if such acts were to be repeated, the Council would have to consider further steps to give effect to its decisions;

"4. *Considers* that Lebanon is entitled to appropriate redress for the destruction it suffered, responsibility for which has been acknowledged by Israel."

6. The PRESIDENT: The text of the draft resolution has been read out by the Under-Secretary-General, and, as no members of the Council have asked to speak before the vote, I propose to put the draft resolution immediately to the vote.

*A vote was taken by show of hands.*

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.<sup>1</sup>*

7. The PRESIDENT: A number of members have asked to speak now in explanation of their vote.

8. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): The general attitude of the Canadian delegation towards the question before us has already been outlined in my statement of 30 December [1461st meeting]. Therefore, at this juncture I shall confine my remarks to the briefest explanation of vote on the resolution that has just been adopted.

9. I think it must be evident that the resolution just adopted was an inevitable result of the military action undertaken by Israel against the civil international airport at Beirut, an action which was bound to be condemned. But in supporting this resolution, the Canadian delegation thinks it important to emphasize that the attack on the civil airport at Beirut took place against a background of growing violence throughout the area. Neither this incident nor other incidents can be taken out of context, because otherwise they are inexplicable.

10. Thus it must be noted that the terrorist attack on an Israeli civil aircraft at Athens Airport preceded the attack on the airport at Beirut, although it cannot be accepted as a justification for what happened at Beirut; that earlier incident, which is now under judicial inquiry by the responsible authorities concerned, must be seen as a part of the atmosphere of hostility existing in the area. The Athens incident did take place, damage was done, and a life was lost. These are facts, just as the attack on the airport at Beirut is a fact. Both actions must be understood as expressions of extreme feelings of frustration and of anger provoked by a state of mutual hostility, fear and suspicion.

11. In making these comments I have in mind that, as some other delegations have already remarked, surely there can be no peace in the Middle East unless both sides—Israel and the Arab States—feel free to develop their national life, free from violence and free from the threat of violence. Otherwise the prospects in the Middle East are grim indeed.

12. Mr. DE ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil): First of all, my delegation is moved to join all the other delegations which yesterday expressed their sorrow and their sympathy at the

passing of Trygve Lie, whose personality is so intimately linked with the early days and the organizational stage of the United Nations. He was a dynamic personality and a good fighter for peace who gave shape and life to the Secretariat and put the United Nations into action. To Secretary-General U Thant and to the Norwegian Government we express our heartfelt sympathy and grief.

13. My delegation feels called upon to explain the reasons why it voted in favour of and supported the draft resolution which has just been adopted unanimously by the Security Council. This unanimity speaks for itself.

14. At our 1460th meeting, the Brazilian delegation had the opportunity of stressing that the premeditated, unjustified attack by Israel against the civilian airport of Beirut could not be ignored by the Security Council. My delegation is therefore gratified to see the Council promptly respond, under your leadership, Sir, to this new challenge to its authority and its prestige. The Council could do no less and perhaps at this stage it was wise to do no more. At any rate the text we have adopted is a clear indication of a firm purpose to deal with the actual threats to peace in the Middle East.

15. At this stage my delegation wishes to make it quite clear that it does not condone such violent acts as the one that recently occurred at Athens Airport. We wish to point out, however, that no responsibility, direct or indirect, of the Lebanese Government has been established in that connexion. The delegation of Brazil is emphatic in its condemnation of any act of violence or any breach of the cease-fire, wherever it may come from.

16. As this will be Brazil's last intervention in its present term as a non-permanent member of the Security Council, my delegation wishes once again to express its apprehensions with regard to the unfolding of events in the Middle East, which may well be at this time the most sensitive and explosive spot in the general pattern of the world political situation.

17. We adhere to the conviction that, although the Council should act, as it has acted today, when confronted with an actual disruption of the peace, this body cannot limit its action to a mere police precinct role of registering complaints and counter-complaints. It should strive towards a definite political settlement on the basis of the principles contained in resolution 242 (1967) and it should do its utmost to check the arms escalation which is daily building up in the area. It should act as a diplomatic body encouraging the parties towards a final settlement, which would restore peace and security to the area. Without a political settlement, incidents of violence are likely to continue. Peace-making is indeed more vital and more important than peace-keeping.

18. On leaving the Security Council, I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude to all the representatives, on whose advice and collaboration both my predecessor and I were always able to count. It would be superfluous for me to add how much I have benefited from those contacts and how much I have learnt from this experience, which unforeseen events have extended to the very last days of our term. We

<sup>1</sup> See resolution 262 (1968).

express the hope that the authority of this body will be strengthened and reasserted in the interest of world peace and security and we express the hope also that the years ahead will be considerably less impregnated with power and force than was this disturbed year of 1968, which brought serious blows and frustrations to the people who see in the Charter of the United Nations their best guarantee for a peaceful world, free from fear and intimidation, free from injustice and violence.

19. Let us overcome the frustrations of this disturbed year—a year of aggression and a year of power—with a solemn pledge to renew our endeavours towards strengthening an Organization which, with all its shortcomings, is still the best hope for the peace and progress of all mankind. My country pledges its full co-operation towards the attainment of those lofty aims and will never shirk its responsibilities in all forums and organs of the United Nations.

20. Finally, Mr. President, I wish to express my highest admiration for the skill and statesmanship you have displayed in leading us in the constructive course we have taken on the matter under consideration.

21. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Brazil and should like to reciprocate the friendly sentiments he has been good enough to express.

22. Mr. BORCH (Denmark): The reasons for the Danish vote in favour of the resolution just adopted will be apparent from the statement I made yesterday in this Council [ibid.]. In that statement, moreover, I emphasized the well-known position of the Danish Government that we deplore any and all violent incidents arising out of the conflict in the Middle East. We firmly maintain that all such incidents must be prevented. Therefore we should have preferred the Council to deal more directly with the criminal act of terror committed against the Israeli civil aircraft at Athens on 26 December, an incident which is also included in the present agenda of the Security Council. However, the last preambular paragraph should leave no doubt that the Security Council insists that all undue interference, whatever its source, with international civil air traffic be henceforth discontinued. We hope that the resolution will thus contribute to the restoration of respect for international civil air traffic and for the lives and well-being of the international public, men, women and children who daily entrust their safety to international airlines from all countries.

23. It has been said often, but it must be emphasized again, that violence will produce no lasting solutions. Violence breeds violence and hampers the efforts of those who strive for just and lasting peace in the Middle East. It is a deplorable fact that over the last months there has been a deterioration of the situation in the Middle East. This is the last time I shall be addressing the Council, and I can think of no better way to conclude than by expressing the sincere hope that the resolution adopted today by the Council, although specific in its aims, will help stop that trend and prevent further violence, which, as I have already said, can only unfavourably affect efforts towards peace in the Middle East.

24. If you will allow me to conclude briefly on a personal note, I should like to thank all my colleagues around this table for the friendship and advice they have so willingly proffered me during the time I have served at this table.

25. Mr. CHAYET (France) (*translated from French*): Before I explain my vote, allow me, Mr. President, to associate myself with the tribute you paid yesterday to the memory of Mr. Trygve Lie, the first Secretary-General of the United Nations. As the present Secretary-General recalled yesterday, Mr. Trygve Lie had the formidable task of organizing the Secretariat of our Organization as an instrument in the service of the States. He discharged this responsibility meticulously. Moreover, he stood up with honour to the danger inherent in a particular situation, while recognizing the limits imposed on the action of one man, by the individual interests of States. Setting a high standard for himself, Mr. Trygve Lie imparted the first lustre to the hazardous office of Secretary-General. He has added lasting brilliance to the fame of his country Norway, which he served with distinction in turn as soldier, trade unionist, politician and statesman. He will always be remembered as a great servant of peace. We here offer his family, his country and the Norwegian people our deepest sympathy.

26. I now come to the item which we are debating. My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution, the contents of which, though not absolutely satisfactory, meet the main concerns which I expressed at the opening of the debate. It is natural that my delegation should have adopted this stand which is justified by the facts of the case fully proved in the debate.

27. Israel's attack on the international civil airport of Beirut was in fact a patent and intolerable violation of the various resolutions adopted by the Council on the Middle East situation, in particular of its resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

28. This violation is all the more serious because the Israel raid was not provoked by Lebanese action. It is useless to try to draw a parallel with the events at the Athens Airport. Of course these are regrettable, and how could one fail to deplore any loss of human life? But the Lebanese Government was obviously not directly responsible.

29. The Israel aggression was premeditated. Its aim was to strike a vital blow at a country which has always shown itself anxious to respect the principles of the Charter and has therefore for many years now been admitting a very large number of refugees. Moreover, it carried *de facto* war into an area that had previously been spared and thereby rendered the maintenance of peace all the more precarious.

30. Our vote also corresponded to a feeling of justice towards a country in which a sense of proportion and moderation has been made a political principle of its policy. Lebanon has kept faith with its vocation of uniting and not dividing, despite the difficulties that can be imagined, has fully assumed its responsibilities and has managed so far to play a moderating part which is recognized by the international community.

31. My delegation's vote has also reflected the solidarity which in trying times should unite two friends, two countries which have been so close for as long as Lebanon and France.

32. What seemed to us necessary in the present situation was to demonstrate to Lebanon that, however dismayed we may be by the ordeal it has undergone, our main concern is that it should be able, by obtaining the reparations and assurances to which it is entitled, to live again in peace and security.

33. This resolution is the logical outcome of a debate during which we were happy to note a certain consensus of views on the need for concerted action by the permanent members of the Council, in order to achieve a settlement of the Middle East conflict.

34. We trust that the unanimous vote cast a few moments ago will embody this determination to act and guarantee that it shall be fulfilled.

35. Sir Leslie GLASS (United Kingdom): Although we have in this resolution condemned a specific act of violence of a most grave nature, my delegation in explanation of vote wishes once again to emphasize that in its duty of maintaining international peace and security the Council must take a wide view. We must recognize that such acts are part of a tragic pattern of violent acts and violent reactions. We must deplore all acts of violence, wherever they occur, and all violations of the cease-fire. In particular, we must all be concerned at the deeply disturbing new trend of threats to the safety of international civil air traffic. We must further recognize that this pattern of violence emerges from the fundamental unsolved problems of the Middle East; that the cease-fire itself, though essential, is but a temporary palliative; and that the Charter of the United Nations lays on all of us the duty to bring about by peaceful means the settlement of dangerous situations.

36. May I take the opportunity of this last debate in 1968 to say a brief farewell to our colleagues who are leaving us at the end of this year: you, Sir, as the representative of Ethiopia; and the representatives of Brazil, Canada, Denmark and India. Nothing teaches one so much about a man as the experience of long days and nights in the Council, and we have learned from that experience that we are losing outstanding colleagues with whom we have been privileged to serve.

37. The PRESIDENT: I am sure I speak not only for myself but also for my colleagues who are also leaving the Council at the end of this year when I say that we appreciate the very friendly sentiments expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom.

38. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): Earlier in the discussion my delegation stated its views on the extreme seriousness of the most recent aggressive action by Israel directed against the civil international airport of Beirut. We stressed that similar acts of armed aggression, in addition to constituting a flagrant violation of the Charter, tend to heighten tension in the area and seriously diminish the chances of a political settlement of the Middle East situation.

39. We have been heartened to note that this time all the members of the Council strongly condemned Israel's conduct and demanded that it should comply with the principles of the Charter and the resolutions of the Security Council. We regret to state that this unanimous condemnation has not been matched, on the part of a certain number of Council members—including some very important ones—by the necessary will to take action against Israel as envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter for such eventualities. The reluctance of those members has, unfortunately not for the first time, resulted in a considerable weakening of the text of the resolution. The text as adopted does not fully meet the requirements of the dangerous situation we are facing in the Middle East. It is no more than the strict minimum, which once again counts on Israel's compliance with the principles and purposes of the Charter and our earlier resolutions.

40. Normally such an expectation would be fully justified by the obligations States Members of the United Nations undertake in becoming Members of our Organization. Israel's record, however, does not encourage us to share the optimism of those members whose optimistic affirmations have so far been frustrated by Israel's non-compliance.

41. The present resolution, while condemning Israel for its armed attack against Lebanon, again requires that Israel should stop its armed aggressive acts against its neighbours. That demand is clearly warranted by the continuing activities of Israel, whose air force carried out the dastardly act on the Beirut civil airport three days ago and whose jet fighters, moreover, have been deliberately violating Lebanon's air space ever since, thus creating the risk of a new outbreak of fighting and more destruction of human and material values, which constitutes a grave breach of international peace and security.

42. Those influential members of the Security Council that feel that this resolution is adequate to bring about Israel's compliance with its terms now have an opportunity of using their considerable influence with Israel to that end. Israel must understand from its growing isolation in this Chamber and in world public opinion that it must mend its ways; it must pay adequate compensation to Lebanon for the damage it caused.

43. The Hungarian delegation is convinced that a political settlement of the Middle East situation must lead through a radical revision of Israel's policies. It was with that eventuality in mind that we voted in favour of the resolution just adopted.

44. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): (*translated from Russian*): I should like to begin my statement by recalling that partings always give rise to a certain sadness, which may be greater in some cases than in others but is undoubtedly a natural feeling. With such feelings, therefore, we bid farewell today to our colleagues, the representatives of a number of States, who are leaving the Security Council. We, the Soviet people, however, in the most difficult and mournful circumstances prefer optimism to pessimism. So, in taking leave of our colleagues, we would express this optimism in the words of the Russian proverb: "Mountain and mountain will never meet,

but man and man always". Thus we hope to meet our colleagues again and work with them as we have in the Security Council.

45. I should now like, in exercise of my right of reply, to make the following observation. In connexion with the pronouncement made by the Israel representative at the end of our last meeting in reply to the Soviet Union delegation's statement at that meeting concerning Israel's armed aggression against Lebanon, the Soviet delegation deems it necessary to make the following statement.

46. In the Israel Government's official statement of 30 December 1968 and in the Israel representative's statement at the Security Council meeting on the same day, the armed attack on Beirut airport was described as an act of "retaliation" for the shooting at Athens airport on 26 December 1968 on an aircraft belonging to the Israel airline.

47. The attempt by the Israel Government to describe that act as a "retaliatory" measure has no foundation in law.

48. As the Soviet delegation has already observed, according to classical international law, reprisals meant one of the measures which, without declaring war, one State could take in answer to violation by another of the rules of international law. They were of two kinds: without the use of armed force (embargo, seizure of merchant vessels, boycott, etc.), and with the use of armed force (naval blockade, shelling or occupation of part of the territory, etc.).

49. According to modern international law, reprisals taken by a State as a means of self-defence against illegal acts of another State are permitted only within strict limits, i.e. if they do not involve the use of armed force. The United Nations Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States reached the unanimous conclusion that "every State has the duty to refrain from acts of armed reprisal".<sup>2</sup> This point of view is also expressed in the doctrine of a number of bourgeois jurists. In particular Mr. Verdross writes: "The Charter of the United Nations prohibits not only war but also armed reprisals; it does not, however, prohibit reprisals without the use of armed force".

50. The Israel argument that the destruction of the aeroplanes at Beirut Airport was a retaliatory measure for the acts of fighters of the organization of Palestine refugees, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, is unacceptable for the following reasons.

51. In international law, support given by a State to armed bands organized on its territory and entering the territory of another State must be regarded as an act of aggression. That is how such acts are described in the Soviet definition of aggression proposed in 1953.<sup>3</sup> However, no convincing arguments were adduced by Israel to show the responsibility

of the Lebanese Government for the attack on the Israel aircraft at Athens Airport. The Lebanese Government disclaims all part in that action. It should be emphasized that the Israel aircraft was fired on by the citizens of a third State and, what is more, in the territory of a third State. In accordance with international law a State can be held responsible only for acts committed by its own organs, armed forces and citizens in the territory of a State. International law does not hold a State responsible for acts of citizens of other States in the territory of a third State. Accordingly, in the case under consideration the so-called "retaliatory" action taken by Israel against Lebanon constitutes a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter, an act of armed aggression, in relation to which the Security Council may take action under Articles 41 or 42 of the Charter of the United Nations.

52. Israel armed forces have invaded the air space of Lebanon—this must be especially emphasized; they have invaded the air space of Lebanon and damaged State property of Lebanon and property of the airlines of other countries. These acts constitute a flagrant violation of the General Armistice Agreement concluded between Lebanon and Israel on 23 March 1949.<sup>4</sup>

53. That Agreement provides in particular that "No element of the land, sea or air military or para-military forces of either Party . . . shall commit any warlike or hostile act against the military or para-military forces of the other Party, or against civilians in territory under the control of that Party; or shall . . . pass over for any purpose whatsoever the Armistice Demarcation Line . . . or enter into . . . the air space of the other Party".

54. The Soviet delegation deems it necessary to emphasize in particular the following provision: by the Armistice Agreement between Lebanon and Israel, Israel is not entitled to enter the air space of Lebanon. This Israel has done, and by its action it has flagrantly violated, not only the United Nations Charter and international law, but also its own document—the Armistice Agreement with Lebanon. These are the facts, and no amount of manoeuvring by the Israel representative here can justify Israel's aggression against Lebanon.

55. Inasmuch as Israel, by its actions, has inflicted damage on Lebanese territory, it must be held materially responsible. To this must be added that reports are coming in from all parts of the world of the indignation which this new act of aggression by Israel against Lebanon has everywhere aroused. The Governments of many States throughout the world have issued statements in which they roundly condemn Israel's policy of aggression and military provocation towards the Arab States. Peace-loving States demand that the Security Council should take severe measures against the aggressor.

56. We have just been informed in a communiqué that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic has sent the following telegram to Ambassador Makonnen, President of the Security Council:

"On behalf of the Government of the German Democratic Republic, I wish to express my serious concern and

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session*, agenda item 87, para. 111.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Ninth Session, Supplement No. 11, annex.

<sup>4</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 4.*

indignation at Israel's criminal attack on the international airport of Beirut. This bare-faced provocation constitutes a gross violation of the Charter of the United Nations. It heightens the danger of ever-increasing and wider military clashes in the Middle East and undermines the implementation of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. The Government and people of the German Democratic Republic demand that the Security Council shall apply appropriate sanctions against the aggressor and take steps to prevent fresh acts of aggression by Israel."

57. The Soviet delegation has already explained in its statements in the Security Council the position of the Soviet Union towards this new piratical act of aggression by Israel—the raid on the international airport of Beirut. The unanimity with which the members of the Security Council have condemned in their statements the criminal actions of the Israel soldiers must surely confirm recognition of the urgent need to take the most energetic steps to restrain the high-handed Tel Aviv extremists, put them in their place, and compel them to respect Security Council decisions and stop sabotaging the efforts to achieve a peaceful political settlement in the Near East.

58. Unfortunately, however, while certain members of the Security Council who have spoken in the debate, including even some permanent members, have verbally condemned the piratical attack by the Israel aggressors on Lebanon, in what moreover seemed to be quite strong terms, nevertheless they have shown no desire or anxiety to proceed from words to action and join forces with all the other members of the Security Council in an effort to secure the adoption of the only decision which the troubled situation in the Near East demands: a decision in keeping with this Council's chief duty—to restore and maintain international peace.

59. It is now already quite evident that those who have encouraged and abetted Israel aggression in the past have this time, too, done everything possible behind the scenes in the Security Council in the way of "arm-twisting", as it is called in United Nations terminology, to water down the draft resolution and weaken its impact on aggression and its effectiveness, thereby preserving the Israel aggressors from the international and political sanctions which they would justly and legally incur in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

60. This is also confirmed in today's edition of *The New York Times*, which, without any reference to sources—although these are obvious—reports:

"In the private consultations before the session Edouard Ghorra, the chief Lebanese delegate, proposed that the Security Council vote a boycott of Israel's commercial aviation under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, which provides for economic sanctions.

"This idea was discarded, however, in view of the opposition by the major Powers . . .".

The newspaper coyly refrains from mentioning which of the major Powers opposed this proposal.

61. I wish to state officially that the Soviet Union, as a major Power, has no part in this business. We have nothing to do with it, nor did we express any opposition to these provisions, which were included in the original—quite forceful—draft resolution condemning the Israel aggression. I wish to make this point clear, for this newspaper, which is an organ of big monopolistic United States capital and Zionist circles, very often indulges in ultra-scurrilous slander against the Soviet Union. For this reason also I wish to declare officially at this meeting of the Security Council that the Soviet Union, as a major Power, has no part in this dirty affair.

62. The results of these manoeuvres and intrigues are plain to see. Not only does the resolution just adopted by the Security Council bear the stamp of compromise; it is also an example of how much harm can be done to the work of devising effective measures against aggression by the backstairs intrigues and machinations of those who continue to protect the aggressors and thereby incite them to new criminal acts of aggression against the Arab countries.

63. Of course, the resolution contains a number of provisions which tend in the right direction: condemnation of Israel for its aggressive acts against Lebanon, and recognition of Israel's responsibility for the damage and destruction wrought on the Arab airlines and Beirut Airport. It also issues a warning to Israel and considers that such premeditated acts of violence endanger the maintenance of peace. All this is contained in the resolution, but is clearly not enough. We are convinced that the interests of achieving a political settlement in the Near East and ensuring the success of the noble mission of Ambassador Jarring, who is executing the instructions of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, based on the Security Council's decisions, and also the interests of peace in that part of the world, would be served by a decidedly more forceful and clear-cut Security Council decision, providing for the adoption against the aggressor of the measures envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. This is all the more necessary because at this very moment when the Security Council is considering the question of Israel's attack on Beirut Airport, Israel troops are committing new outrageous and provocative acts of aggression against the Arab State of Jordan.

64. The Security Council was informed of this in a letter from the Permanent Representative of Jordan, Ambassador El-Farra, addressed to the President of the Security Council [S/8951], in which he writes:

"On 29 December 1968, at 1205 hours local time, Israel military forces opened fire from heavy artillery and indiscriminately shelled the following areas for four hours: Al Shunah Al-Janoubiyyah, Um Ash-Shurat and the King Hussein bridge.

"As a result of this lawless and wanton attack, two civilians were killed and nine others were wounded, including a woman and a child.

"The Israel indiscriminate shelling caused severe damage to a mosque, to the Municipality Building, the Post Office and the local market. Four civilian cars were destroyed."



65. Gentlemen, you all heard yesterday the over-acted dramatic pathos with which the Israel representative spoke of a single Israel citizen who was killed at Athens. But here, in the official letter from the Jordan representative, it is reported that as a result of this unlawful and senseless attack two citizens were killed. How does the Israel representative react to these murders? According to his logic, to answer this question it would be necessary to carry out a raid on Tel Aviv Airport and destroy thirteen aircraft or, as he said at our last meeting, "a handful or so of aeroplanes". A nice "handful"—thirteen modern aircraft, including a Boeing 707 and a Caravelle! It would not be a bad thing if each Government represented here had a few such "handfuls" of aeroplanes.

66. But the Israel representative, defending this illegal and aggressive action, seeks to play down its significance. He is ready to speak of the death of a citizen of this country, but passes over without comment the murders committed by Israel troops.

67. Those are the facts, which even the eloquent Mr. Tekoah cannot refute.

68. We have just received a communiqué from United Press International, an American agency. I quote:

"Amman radio reported three Israeli helicopters escorted by two jet fighters swooped down on a Jordanian security forces patrol thirty miles north of Aqaba and just inside the border and killed three men and wounded two others in an attack which burned the car."<sup>5</sup>

Once again murders, once again bloodshed, and all this the result of acts of aggression by Israel troops.

"Israel did not acknowledge a helicopter attack but said only 'an army unit' pursued a number of Jordanian infiltrators into Jordan and killed one of them. It said the infiltrators had lobbed mortar shells at the Tinma copper mines in the Negev desert.

"Eshkol, speaking in Jerusalem, said Israel 'would prefer criticism to sympathy'.<sup>5</sup>

Eshkol can be satisfied. There was more than enough criticism of Israel here in the Security Council. Indeed there was not only criticism, but strict censure.

"He asked the world at large to consider what would have happened if the attack on an El Al Airliner at Athens Airport by two Arab commandos had killed all fifty-seven aboard.

"He said the Israeli raid on Beirut caused no loss of life even though it means added risk for the attackers."<sup>5</sup>

But although there were no murders in Beirut, deaths are officially reported in the letter from the representative of Jordan and in this report of Amman Radio, transmitted by United Press International. More murders, more bloodshed.

69. These are the facts, and the Security Council must undoubtedly take them into consideration.

70. In the light of what has been said, the delegation of the Soviet Union considers it necessary to draw special attention to the following.

71. First, the fact that the draft resolution adopted by the Security Council was introduced by its President cannot mean and must not be taken to mean that the Soviet Union should be regarded as a co-sponsor of the text.

72. Secondly, the resolution adopted by the Security Council can only do any real good if all the members of the Council, especially the permanent members, take all the necessary steps for their part to preclude a repetition of Israel's acts of aggression against the Arab States.

73. It was precisely on this understanding—I emphasize this—and in view of the position of the Lebanese delegation in regard to this draft resolution that the USSR delegation voted for it, albeit with the most serious reservations, because in our view it is weak and inadequate.

74. The PRESIDENT: Speaking again for myself and for my colleagues who are leaving the Council, I should like to express appreciation to our colleague, Ambassador Malik, for the message of good wishes that he addressed to us.

75. Mr. BEN KACI (Algeria) (*translated from French*): During the discussion of the Lebanese complaint, in this Council, my delegation has had an opportunity to set forth its position briefly. With your permission, Mr. President, I will now explain in greater detail the position of my country as defined by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria in his message to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, His Excellency, U Thant:

"Scarcely has the General Assembly ended a session which has been largely dominated by Israel expansionism and its dire consequences to international peace and security, when a new act of aggression has been committed against an Arab country of the Middle East, dangerously increasing the tension in that region and rendering still more remote and illusory the possibility of an adequate settlement.

"The unspeakable attack on the international airport of Beirut was carried out by methods which have become commonplace. Increasing its warlike declarations, intimidations and threats, Israel is today more than ever identified with permanent aggression against the Arab countries, although for a certain sector of international public opinion that is no cause for concern or alarm. The criminal destruction of numerous aircraft belonging to civil transport companies and of technical installations vital to the safety of air navigation in a region crowded with international traffic undeniably illustrates Israel's determination to snap its fingers at international morality and conventions and at the resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly.

"This fresh provocation directed against Lebanon and the entire Arab world is a further act of defiance to the international community. In fact these acts of aggression are additional evidence of the consternation felt by Tel

<sup>5</sup> Quoted in English by the speaker.

Aviv at the growing successes achieved by the Palestinian patriots in their legitimate struggle against the foreign usurper to recover their inalienable rights and of the ever keener awareness throughout the world of the injustice done to the Palestinian people and of the new dimensions of its splendid resistance to the occupying Power. Our indignation is all the greater because this attack has been committed against another Arab country which, by very definition and by vocation, identifies itself with the promotion of justice and peace.

"Whatever the motives attributed to the demonstrations and deeds of the noble Palestinian resistance, it is an objective reality which cannot in any way be imputed to a sovereign, independent country which is a Member of the United Nations.

"Israel has just been guilty of a heinous crime which will undermine neither the unshakable determination of the Arab countries to free their occupied territories nor that of the Palestinians to obtain justice by methods to which they have been driven on every side."

76. In our opinion the criminal attack committed by the Israel authorities on Lebanese territory on Saturday, 28 December, constituted a serious threat to international peace and security. Consequently the Security Council should have taken the necessary steps in accordance with the Charter, in particular Chapter VII, in order to put an end to the systematic policy of aggression pursued by the Israel authorities vis-à-vis the Arab world. A Security Council resolution on a problem of such gravity for peace should necessarily have reflected, in clear and plain terms, the Council's determination to take speedy and effective action against the aggressor. Such determination is all the more necessary because according to the latest news Israel, not satisfied with its aggression of 28 December, is concentrating its troops on the frontiers of Lebanon and violating that country's air space with impunity. We are today witnessing an escalation of the policy of war and aggression which the Israeli authorities have been applying for twenty years against Palestine and the Arab countries. The dangerous situation now prevailing in the Middle East and the threats which hang over that region in consequence of the recent attacks on Lebanon call for serious attention by the Security Council—whose main mission is to preserve peace in the world—and for urgent effective and rigorous action calculated to discourage both aggression and the aggressor.

77. A resolution to this effect would undoubtedly have helped to ease the tension which is building up unceasingly on account of the concentrations of Israel forces on the frontiers of Lebanon.

78. My delegation voted in favour of the resolution for the following reasons: first, the resolution condemns the Israel authorities in clear and plain terms for their aggression of last Saturday; secondly, it emphasizes Lebanon's right to redress; thirdly, it issues a warning to Israel and envisages further measures to be taken in case of any new aggression. In short, we voted for the resolution because it is exclusively in favour of the Lebanese complaint.

79. That is how we interpret the reference in the preamble to document S/Agenda/1462.

80. Before concluding, Algeria would like to pay a fervent tribute to those members who are participating for the last time in the Council's work. Leaving aside political divergences and conflicting views, we are bound to recognize the exceptional moral qualities and undeniable competence of those who are preparing to leave us.

81. This tribute is addressed to you, Mr. President, a worthy representative of an African sister country with age-old traditions, who have on many occasions made a decisive contribution to the settlement of the problems referred to us.

82. This tribute is also addressed to our friend and brother the Ambassador of India, who is aware of the profound esteem in which my country and our delegation hold both himself and his colleagues.

83. We are far from forgetting our illustrious friend Ambassador Castro of Brazil, who in the course of events has shown us that his personality is outstanding in every respect, and whose distinguished attributes are matched only by his modesty.

84. We also venture to pay tribute to the representative of Canada, a country whose international vocation is becoming ever more apparent and with which Algeria maintains increasingly fruitful and friendly relations.

85. Lastly, we salute the representative of Denmark, which occupies a very important place on the map and will leave by its retirement a big void in our midst.

86. The PRESIDENT: Thank you. Again I make myself the spokesman of my colleagues around the table to whom our distinguished colleague, the representative of Algeria, has made reference, in reciprocating in full measure the friendly sentiments that he has been good enough to address to us.

87. Mr. WIGGINS (United States of America): I wish first of all to join my colleagues in expressing my country's sorrow at the death of Trygve Lie, the first Secretary-General of the United Nations. This Organization will always bear the imprint of his inspired leadership in its most formative early years. We regret the passing of one of the great statesmen of our time.

88. In view of the extent to which this debate has wandered from the matters relevant to the agenda adopted on Sunday, 29 December [1460th meeting], I feel obliged to say that the remarks of my delegation have been addressed to the attack upon Beirut Airport on 28 December and the incident at Athens Airport on 26 December.

89. We wish quite explicitly to dissociate ourselves from the sweeping generalizations, the crude denunciations and the reckless attacks upon Israel for alleged policies and acts having nothing to do at all with the episodes properly before us. Israel is not here on trial for its life. Israel is not being asked here to defend its right to exist. This Council is not a court sitting on all the issues of the 1967 war, the 1956 war, the 1948 war, and authorized to pronounce final

judgement on all the matters in between the wars. If it were such an omnipotent court, we doubt not but that Israel could give an effective accounting of its struggle to survive the repeated acts of hostility that have contributed to the climate in the Middle East out of which these latest acts of violence have emerged.

90. It has been alleged in the course of this debate that my Government, in supporting the resolution before us, has exhibited inconsistency. It is the kind of inconsistency of which Abraham Lincoln spoke when he said that he stuck by his friends while they were right and parted with them when they were wrong. We do not apologize for the fact that our policies are governed by principle or for the coincidence that friends sometimes disagree on principle. On the contrary, we suspect that if some other members of this Council were equally willing to differ with their friends on occasion, peace would be more secure than it now is.

91. I have spoken previously on the views of my Government towards disarmament in the Middle East and on the willingness of the United States, at any time, to discuss measures to limit the flow of arms into the area. President Johnson has repeatedly pointed out that the suspension of this traffic is one of the conditions of peace in the Middle East.

92. The resolution we have just adopted does not entirely suit my delegation. It is our view that all these interventions against civil aviation are intolerable and that they place in jeopardy the lives and property of innocent persons, even when by good luck or good fortune that risk does not result in great loss of life. This body, in our view, should put the United Nations in the forefront of an effort to perfect new rules of international law that will give to the great airports of the world and to civilian air transport generally a special status that will provide for appropriate examination of every situation in which that status is disregarded. Not having dealt extensively with this matter in this resolution, it remains for the Security Council or other appropriate agencies to deal with it soon, so as to make it clear that no pretext whatever justifies interference with international civil aviation.

93. Notwithstanding any differences over language or substance, however, my Government has supported this resolution and endorses its condemnation of the military action against the airport at Beirut, in accordance with my Government's initial response to this operation.

94. I wish, in conclusion, to add my tribute to our colleagues who now conclude their work upon this Council. Even in the brief time that I have had an opportunity of working with them, their ability and skill and statesmanlike qualities have made a profound impression upon me. They deserve the praise of their colleagues here, the thanks of their own countries and that of all the nations of the world as well.

95. The PRESIDENT: I am sure that I express the feeling of all my colleagues around the table when I say that the friendly sentiments of our colleague, Ambassador Wiggins, are fully reciprocated, and that we have also greatly enjoyed his short but eventful and stimulating association with us here at the United Nations.

96. Mr. M'BENGUE (Senegal) (*translated from French*): My delegation would like briefly to explain its vote, as I had the opportunity to define in my last statement [*ibid.*] my country's position on this problem.

97. In supporting the draft resolution my delegation wished once again to express its opposition to recourse to violence for the settlement of international problems. My country's political policy is shaped by principles. The unjustified and unjustifiable attack on Beirut Airport, which it absolutely condemns, is bound to extend the area of conflict and deal a very severe blow to the economic life of Lebanon.

98. In voting for the draft resolution my delegation is also convinced that it has acted in accordance with justice.

99. Before concluding this short statement I should like on behalf of my delegation to pay a last tribute to the outgoing members of the Council. We all know how great has been their devotion to the cause of peace. Throughout these last months we have had an opportunity to appreciate their qualities of heart, their talents, courtesy and wisdom. They have always co-operated with us fruitfully and constructively in our work.

100. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Senegal for his expression of friendly sentiments.

101. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): The reasons which determined the affirmative vote by which my delegation contributed to the unanimous adoption of the resolution this afternoon are to be found in the statement which I made at our last meeting and to which I would therefore refer the Council.

102. Nevertheless, I should like to emphasize three points to which my delegation attaches special importance.

103. First, the achievement of a stable and just peace in the Middle East is the fundamental and permanent objective of my delegation's action both inside and outside this Council. Consequently we regard every single act of violence committed in breach of the Council's cease-fire decision of 1967 as a further obstacle to the achievement of that objective, making an inherently difficult and complex task still more difficult.

104. Secondly, in contributing by our vote to the adoption of today's resolution we hope that its effects will be manifested by scrupulous respect for the Council's cease-fire decision which I have mentioned, to facilitate the creation of a climate at least sufficiently favourable to the success of Ambassador Jarring's difficult mission.

105. Thirdly, we would draw attention to the last preambular paragraph of the resolution, which reflects the concern of this Council and its members with the need to preserve free and uninterrupted international air traffic. My country is land-locked, far from the sea, and consequently attaches vital importance to air communication. For the same reasons, any act which conspires against, interferes with or jeopardizes freedom of air transit deserves our unqualified condemnation.

106. I now venture to turn to another question. The terms of office of five members of this Council expire at midnight tonight: Brazil, Canada, Denmark, India and your own country, Mr. President. They and their representatives have served this Council, the United Nations and the cause of international peace and security with great distinction, and I deem it an honour to express to them my country's sincere appreciation.

107. I acknowledge personally that in the year in which I have served on this Council I have learnt much of great value from the representatives of those countries—from yourself, Mr. President, and from Ambassadors de Araujo Castro, Ignatieff, Borch and Parthasarathi, all of whom honour me with their friendship. To each one as he leaves this Council I offer my sincere and heartfelt personal thanks.

108. The PRESIDENT: Again I should like to be the spokesman for my colleagues and friends in expressing our gratitude for the warm and friendly remarks addressed to us by Mr. Solano Lopez.

109. I should like also to say that we have now exhausted the list of speakers, and, with the permission of the Council I should like to make some concluding remarks. I understand that the representative of Israel wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now give him the floor.

110. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): A meeting of the Security Council without a verbal skirmish between the Soviet representative and myself would be considered unusually dull. I would be the last one thus to detract from the drama of our deliberations. Therefore allow me to refer, first of all, to the statement made today by the representative of the Soviet Union.

111. On 21 May 1948 the Soviet representative in the Security Council and present Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR stated:

"The USSR delegation cannot but express surprise at the position adopted by the Arab States in the Palestine question, and particularly at the fact that those States—or some of them, at least—have resorted to such action as sending their troops into Palestine and carrying out military operations aimed at the suppression of the national liberation movement in Palestine."<sup>6</sup>

112. On 28 May 1948, the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic stated:

"... we do not know of a single case of invasion of the territory of another State by the armed forces of Israel, except in self-defence, where they had to beat off attacks by the armed forces of another State on Israel territory. That was self-defence in the full sense of the word."<sup>7</sup>

113. The war that was described in 1948 as a war of Israel's defence is still continuing. It is still the same war

that the Arab States are waging against Israel today. It is the same war that the Arab States still refuse to end.

114. History, truth and fact do not change at the whim of the winds that blow through the cold corridors of the Kremlin. As long as this Arab war of aggression against Israel continues, Israel will insist on its right to defend itself in the best way it finds necessary and possible, whether the guardians of international law in Moscow are pleased by it or not. That is especially so as the United Nations itself has already established, in particular in resolution 2131 (XX) of 21 December 1965, that the organization of, assistance to, fomenting, financing, inciting or tolerating of terrorist activities directed against another State is to be regarded as aggression. It is to be observed that that resolution was initiated by the Soviet Union, which in all its definitions of aggression has always included indirect armed attacks by irregular forces and terrorist groups. Thus, in a draft resolution submitted by the Soviet delegation to the General Assembly on 5 January 1952, we read:

*"The General Assembly,*

*"Considering it necessary to formulate directives for such international organs as may be called upon to determine which party is guilty of aggression,*

*"Declares:*

*"1. That in an international conflict that State shall be declared the attacker which first commits one of the following acts:*

*"...*

*"(f) Support of armed bands organized in its own territory which invade the territory of another State, or refusal, on being requested by the invaded State, to take in its own territory any action within its power to deny such bands any aid or protection."<sup>8</sup>*

Surely that definition applies to the operations of terror organizations against Israel from the territory of Lebanon and other Arab States.

115. The time has come for the Soviet Union to stop giving advice on how to conduct and how not to conduct military activities, especially when these activities are undertaken in self-defence. The time has come for the Soviet Union to help in securing peace in the Middle East by terminating its unilateral support of Arab aggression.

116. For months now we have been treated to the Soviet representative's expertise on the concept of aggression. I should like to tell him, in the words of an ancient Hebrew saying: "Taunt not your neighbour with your own blemish". It is a wise saying that has stood the test of centuries. Soviet concepts are new, and time has not always been kind to them. I would suggest that the Soviet representative and his Government ponder over this Hebrew saying: "Taunt not your neighbour with your own blemish".

<sup>6</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, 299th meeting, p. 7.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 307th meeting, p. 15.

<sup>8</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 49, document A/C.6/L.208.

117. This morning, at approximately 7.30, a package containing ten sticks of dynamite with detonators inserted and a timing device already released was found in a school bus in the Israeli village of En Kerem. Thanks to the watchfulness of one of the passengers, who alerted the driver, catastrophe was averted. In a grocery store several kilometres away, a stick of explosive was found in a milk bottle and rendered harmless before it caused disaster. That is the kind of cowardly and sneaking Arab warfare that Israel is subjected to, in violation of the cease-fire. That is the kind of warfare, organized, sponsored and encouraged by the Arab Governments, that Israel has to defend itself against. That is the kind of warfare that some in this Chamber prefer to close their eyes to.

118. By ignoring the fundamental principle of the United Nations, equality of all Member States, the resolution now adopted by the Security Council is contrary to the United Nations Charter and cannot therefore be considered as applicable. A resolution which fails to take account of Israel's rights under the cease-fire, disregards the right of its citizens to be free from Arab attack, overlooks and slights Israeli dead and wounded, is an affront to the basic values of the United Nations. The resolution reflects the moral, political and juridical bankruptcy of the Security Council in respect of the Middle East situation. It cannot but raise the question asked by the Psalmist in the Bible: "How long will ye judge unjustly, and respect the persons of the wicked? ".

119. The people of Israel will see in today's decision another sign that the strength to vindicate their rights and protect their legitimate interests must come from within themselves. This is the world we live in. The troubles and grief and suffering of a nation frequently remain of limited concern to others. We have recently witnessed an entire people enslaved and then almost forgotten. Massacres of human beings are still taking place in some parts of the world without evoking undue anxiety. Thus it has also been in the Middle East. The central and gravest fact in that region—the Arab war of aggression relentlessly pursued against Israel since 1948, the continued Arab warfare in violation of the cease-fire of 1967—is frequently lost sight of or relegated to the background.

120. However, the people of Israel cannot afford the luxury of such callousness. There is a daily struggle for life, a continuous titanic contest with death. Let no one misjudge their mood and their resolve. Let no one make the mistake of thinking that the people of Israel might be swayed by inequitable pronouncements. Let no one make the mistake of thinking that the fate of the people of Israel can be decided by others; not the fate of a people with a 4,000 year history; not the fate of a people which has re-established its sovereignty after twenty centuries of subjugation, exile and dispersion; not the fate of a people that has been subjected to genocide; not the fate of a people that has waged a war of defence and survival for twenty years.

121. That is why the attitude and actions of the Governments in the area, not Security Council resolutions, will determine the destiny of the Middle East. That is why Israel's action in Beirut, taken in defence of its rights,

should make the Arab Governments understand the full depth of Israel's determination to ensure its right to peace and security. When the Arab States realize that determination, become persuaded by its tenacity and draw the appropriate conclusions, there will be peace in the Middle East. There is nothing that the people and Government of Israel desire more. There is nothing that depends more on the Governments of the Arab States.

122. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Saudi Arabia has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply, and I now call on him.

123. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Thank you, Mr. President, for giving me permission to speak again.

124. I have some comments to make on the resolution that has just been adopted. As you may recall, Sir, I reserved my right to address myself to the resolution. I tried to take down the text of the resolution from the dictation of the Under-Secretary-General. I could not do that fast enough, however, because I do not know shorthand. Fortunately, I was furnished with a typewritten copy of the resolution. Curiously enough, the resolution was not circulated in the Council. Of course, like any other organ of the United Nations, the Council is master of its own procedure. However, if my memory is correct, this is the first time in the history of the United Nations and of this Council that a resolution has been adopted without having first been circulated in order to give those who wish to address themselves to the substance of the text the benefit of knowing the contents. Members have a right, once they have been called on to speak, to address themselves to the substance of a resolution.

125. But fortunately, whilst the explanations of vote were going on, I had the opportunity of reading and studying that resolution. First of all, I must salute all the members of the Security Council for having, in such a short time, achieved a unanimous agreement on what I might call a common denominator of condemnation, and also for decrying the wanton act committed at Beirut Airport, and also for warning Israel that it may expect what is tantamount—of course, I am paraphrasing—to economic and other sanctions, as provided in Chapter VII of the Charter.

126. All that is good enough, and the members of the Council should be congratulated, as I said. Coming from various parts of the world and representing various States and areas of the world, it was really quite unusual that such a resolution should have been adopted. But in the light of my own humble past experience, having personally heard Israel being condemned many times in this Council, without any effect whatsoever, I begin to question whether any condemnatory resolution will carry weight with the usurping State of Israel. On the other hand, the warning of the use of sanctions is tantamount, in my view, to the derision that Israel has manifested towards condemnation; it will, as we have just heard from the representative of Israel, cast the resolution by the wayside. Not only that; but I will come to that question a little later.

127. However, I must call attention to a particular word in paragraph 4 of the resolution, which reads as follows:

*"Considers that Lebanon is entitled to appropriate redress for the destruction it has suffered, responsibility for which has been acknowledged by Israel."*

We might go to the origin of the word "redress". It is as if somebody was naked and he was re-dressed. Lebanon was "re-dressed" in the context of "consoled"? Why does the Council not call things by their names? There is the word "reparations" which could be used instead of "redress". Or "compensation". Why did the Council not call things by their names? No wonder Ambassador Malik said the resolution was inadequate. Whom are we fooling here by the word "redress"? The representative of Israel is already laughing; and he has the right to laugh, because he knows there will be no redress. Redress by whom: the United Kingdom insurance companies? My friends from Lebanon have not provided me with the insurance policies so that I could read the fine print and see what it says. Is it to be redress by the insurance companies or by the culprit? Well, it seems that Lloyds of London is paying what is stipulated. It is the best insurance company in the world, in spite of what the British have done in Palestine. I think they will pay and will no doubt gain a greater reputation and will gather more insurance business from the world, because there are going to be many incidents, maybe. So that is a gap in the resolution which should never have been allowed to appear: merely providing for "redress", without specifying who is to effect that redress.

128. Now, I listened very carefully to my friend the representative of the United States, none other than the illustrious Ambassador Wiggins, whom we have come to admire during his short tenure of office, and we shall all be sad when he leaves the United Nations—enviously, I might say, for he will have a retreat in the state of Maine, far from the madding crowd. However, Mr. Wiggins—and we all respect and admire him—referred to a country which he described as being a friend. First of all, we use the word "friend" individually. We may sometimes have different views but still be friends. But when it comes to the Council, journalistic terms such as "friend" should be weighed and seen in the context in which they have been used. Mr. Wiggins mentioned that friends disagree—I am of course paraphrasing—and should be admonished when they err.

129. Now, this is my question: by the same token, my dear Mr. Wiggins, and using that word "friends" to describe the country I represent and your country, we have consistently disagreed with the United States Government, in so far as its support of Israel is concerned. This is nothing new; this was so even before the partition of Palestine; it goes back to the time when the late Franklin Roosevelt met with the late King Abdul Aziz in 1943, during the Second World War. After that conversation the late President had with His Majesty the late King, Mr. Roosevelt said: "I have learned in a short time what I could never have learned from all those who were informing me about the Palestine question", and he promised His Majesty the late King that he would not do anything with regard to the Palestine question without consultation with him, or with Saudi Arabia, for that matter. Unfortunately, the President died not too long afterwards.

130. And now we want to talk as friends, because it is high time that we should do so, although I am sure certain things have already been mentioned; they do bear repetition, however, because, as we say in Arabic, there is benefit sometimes in repetition.

131. Mr. Wiggins said the Council is not a court of justice. How true. The Council, as we all know, was constituted by the Charter to deal with situations which may endanger peace—especially world peace—in any area. We knew that. We were signatories to the Charter in 1945. I witnessed the signing of the Charter. This is why we told the United States Government to refer the question of Palestine to the International Court of Justice. Some members of the State Department were favourable to the idea. It is true, the Security Council is not a court of justice; but there was a court of justice, one bound to the United Nations. The President of the United States, none other than Mr. Truman, refused, however. In 1948, twenty-one years ago, we warned our friends—and here I use the word "friends" in the sense that we have a great many interests in common with the United States—we warned them that this question might involve us and all the other Arabs in great difficulties, but they did not heed our warning.

132. I think I have a right to refer to that historic event. The politicians saw to it that the question was not referred to the International Court of Justice.

133. Mr. Wiggins, my good friend, you said, "Israel is not on trial for its life". I am paraphrasing; I jotted down a few words of what you said, but I grasped the substance of it. Of course Israel is not on trial for its life. There is an item here which we have been dealing with; specifically it concerns the aggression against Lebanon.

134. "Its struggle to survive is legitimate"—again I am paraphrasing Mr. Wiggins. I should like to ask my good friend Mr. Wiggins the following question: do not the Palestinians have the right to survive and return to their homeland? I repeat: inasmuch as Mr. Wiggins says that Israel is not on trial for its life, and that its struggle to survive is legitimate, I should like to inquire from our friend: do not the Palestinians have the right to survive and return to their homeland?

135. Time and again we have been told, "Israel is a fait accompli; it is here to stay". We reply that there is a Palestinian people which has an identity, just as the Lebanese people has, the Syrian people, the Iraqi people, any people, for that matter, whether they happen to be in the Middle East, in Latin America, in North America, wherever they may be. Yesterday [1461st meeting] I mentioned that none other than a great President of the United States, Mr. Wilson, enunciated the principle of self-determination at the Conference of Versailles. Ever since that day the United States has been proud of being a champion of liberty. What would those who struggled for their survival as a people against the British have said about Lafayette when he left the shores of France to assist the struggle of those Americans who, curiously enough, were many of them of Anglo-Saxon origin but who were fighting for their self-determination in America? Would he have been called an abettor, a traitor? I do not think that in the

annals of British history—Sir Leslie will bear me out—Lafayette was ever called a traitor. On the contrary, the Americans had their champions in the British Parliament, men like Burke, who said that the Americans in the colonies—or the British in the colonies in the New World, if you prefer to call them that—should have some sort of autonomy or independence.

136. Have the Arab States no right to say that the Palestinians are entitled to independence? By what logic, by what standard have they no right to say so? There are many parallels in history.

137. Let us not address our speeches to just our friends or just our enemies. We should all live as a human family, including the Jews who came from eastern Europe, but not under the deceitful banner of those who have usurped the Palestinian people.

138. The State of Israel was constituted by the United Nations because of pressure which the Zionists had brought to bear on the Western Powers. Let us admit that once and for all. I explained in many of my interventions how it came to happen, that it was because of the influence the Zionists wielded in Western Europe, at one time, and, since 1914, in the United States of America. None other than Mr. Morgenthau, who at one time was the United States Ambassador to Turkey and a loyal American Jew, said: "We are first and foremost Americans, and Zionism is an illogical movement that may bring sorrow to the Jews themselves." How prophetic he was. That is in Mr. Morgenthau's memoirs. I am not sure, but I believe that there is someone here in this city who is his grandson. I knew his son; he was a Zionist, Mr. Morgenthau's son, and he was at odds with his father.

139. Israel was constituted at the expense of the indigenous people of Palestine who, in 1919, constituted 94 per cent of the people of that land. Can the United States or any other Power contest that fact? I do not want at this juncture to give an array of facts, to marshal the details of what happened during the period of the Mandatory Power's rule over Palestine. It is all in the record, even of this Council. The Council is indeed not a court of justice; but there were permanent members in the Council who saw to it that the International Court of Justice in 1947 was barred from pronouncing itself on the question of the self-determination of the Palestinian people. That is where all the perfidy stems from.

140. There is nothing about friendship here in international relations, unfortunately. Though there can be friendship between peoples, usually it is between individuals. With peoples, there are interests that may harmonize or may not, that may in fact conflict. However, the Arab world did have a great community of interests with the United States and other Western countries, and for the last twenty years we have been telling them that they were threatening those interests—not to speak of friendship.

141. There are not only harmonizing or conflicting interests amongst peoples and nations. But, unfortunately, we are still pursuing a policy based on the balance of power and spheres of influence. And here the United States, in

spite of our warnings—and, I saw you, Mr. Wiggins, when it was announced that your Government was considering sending fifty Phantom jets. You will remember that; it was early in the session. I did not do it on my own. I was requested to do so by four Arab Foreign Ministers who had cut off relations with your Government. I told you: "you are not only exacerbating relations with those Governments but, unfortunately—and this is not in our interest—you are also alienating all the Arab people, a hundred million of them." But your Government saw fit, dressing its policy with such words as "friendship", to go ahead. Sometimes they use figures of speech such as "that oasis of democracy in the Middle East", meaning Israel—forgetting what the Arab has contributed in history and culture. Even your alphabet came from Lebanon, that tiny State of Lebanon. That was the first alphabet as I told you yesterday, on the sarcophagus of Hiram of Byblos, thirteen centuries before Christ. You forget that.

142. The Bible? Of course the Bible. The Bible is our Bible too. It is our Book. It was not written by eastern European Jews, Khazars, converted into Judaism in the seventh century. The Bible was written by prophets of the area who were Semites. These gentlemen—there is nothing wrong in being from Europe—were converted into Judaism. They may have been mixed with some Sephardic Jews. They are no more Semites than, as I said, a Scandinavian who has embraced Christianity, or for that matter Judaism or Islam, is a Semite. They can never make a nationality out of a religion in the twentieth century. In fact, they are a conglomeration of peoples from everywhere. Due to an unfortunate situation in Europe in the Second World War, they huddled together under the banner of Israel.

143. Mr. Tekoah no doubt is an eloquent speaker. He modulates his voice and uses adjectives mostly deleterious to the Arabs. But the Arabs have a tongue too. However, we will not use such deleterious words, nor throw aspersions at any human being. I think it is beneath my dignity to do so. Also, I respect the dignity of the human person, and I will defend his dignity if anyone as an individual tries to insult him.

144. Mr. Tekoah quotes what suits him from the Bible. I can quote chapter and verse from the Bible; that is not a way out. It may be an oratorical stance, but how true that Hebrew saying, "Don't throw taunts at your neighbour with your blemish".

145. I wish to refer Mr. Tekoah to the New Testament, which is part of the Bible: "You see the thorn that is in your brother's eye, but you do not see the beam which is in your own"—a little thorn in your brother's eye. That was Christ. He was a Semite, incidentally. He was not from eastern Europe. Mr. Tekoah used such words as "cowardly" and "sneaking". We can use such words. Those cowardly and sneaking people of Europe who were fighting for the liberation of their countries were heroes, but those Palestinians, because they come from Asia—some of you Western countries have changed your terminology during the last twenty years, but your attitude is still the same—those of us coming from Asia are a second class or a third class people. Incidentally, Mr. Malik, you are Asian too. Be careful that you are not considered as second class.



146. Israel is a conglomeration of people of many nationalities. The Arabs believe that they have been gathered there by leaders who are secular so that one day they may exploit the whole of Asia and Africa. Whom do they think they are fooling? I feel sorry, indeed sorry—I am not saying this sarcastically—for Mr. Tekoah, the representative of that State. For one day he will wake up—I could be his father; he will wake up; he is still young—to the fact that no one can rob a people of its birthright. Of course he will say that the Israelis are one people. But I just said that they are a conglomeration of people whom their secular leaders—mostly secular; some of them may be religious—are trying to thrust as a wedge to penetrate the Arab lands.

147. But let us forget about the Arab Governments and the Arab lands. What about the Palestine people, those people who are perpetrating acts of violence because they can do nothing to regain their homeland, except by shaking, or rather jolting the people of the world into a consciousness that they have been neglected and ignored. Do you consider those people as sub-human, instead of feeling sad and trying to redress—here is the word that should be used, redress—what you Western countries mostly have done to make them what they are today: desperadoes, frustrated. Think of your days of struggle, the colonial days, and think of 1776. Are they sub-human, those Palestinians? You talk of the Arab Governments. Who are Arab Governments? They come and go.

148. It is the next generation amongst the Arabs, Jews or gentiles that we salute. They know what has been done. It will be unfortunate if the redress has to come about by violence. Do you think that we welcome violence? No, sir. We have been trying to evolve our Arab nations, to shape our destiny. Like other people we make mistakes. But a wedge from eastern Europe was placed, pointing at the Arab east with all that it involves in economic exploitation. Money, standards of living—we do not live by standards of living alone. For heavens sake, we could have been your friends and the friends of all the peoples in the world if you had left us alone and not made us the pawns of the balance of power. This question is not in the hands of the Arab Governments. It is in the hands, first and foremost, of the Palestinian people, who will resolve the question. Either that, or they will die; and I doubt that the other Arabs—the Arab people, not the Governments—will let them die. Because, as I said in another meeting, when it comes to opposing tyranny, every Arab, rightly or wrongly, becomes a Palestinian. People, not Governments, shall decide; Governments try to survive by hook or by crook in every country.

149. Go and sell your Phantoms. The Russians will also sell arms. But why? Because the Russians sell arms to the Arab States, the United States has to sell Phantoms to Israel. You are the arbiters of the balance of power. But the Russians would not have sold arms to the Arab States—remember we are not customers of the Russians; I am talking objectively—if there were no Israel introduced into the area, a foreign incursion. But this is your answer: what shall we do? It is a fait accompli. A stamp of legality had already been appended to agreements in the United Nations by a vote brought about by pressure. But there is a solution. The solution is to poll the Palestinian refugees and

ask how many of them would want to go back to their homeland, to live on their lands and tend their orchards.

150. After a few more incidents, as will be the order of the day—as I mentioned two years ago here in this Council, this is a link in a long chain—ask how many Israelis would like to emigrate from Israel? Those who allegedly are friends of Israel, open the doors of your countries and you will see how they will swarm in. Those Israelis are good technicians. They will increase your skyscrapers, machinery and computers. They are physicists. Let us Arabs evolve our own institutions. We are beginning to have our own technicians, our own graduates. We have 60,000 students abroad, 12,000 of them in the United States and Canada. And they take issue with us, the representatives of Governments, that we are neglecting the Palestinians. They are the pillars of the future, not you and I, Mr. Wiggins, or our ilk. We have reached our sixties. They are the people to decide the future, not the past Presidents of the United States. Youth has awakened, and the Arabs have their own youth. Youth is rebelling against injustice everywhere, including the United States—I do not know about Russia. Arab youth will rebel against injustice.

151. Once in a while I like to make people laugh, as a relief from the tragedy that is confronting us. When you laugh it may purge you of whatever looms in your spirit of darkness because of the tragic situation. I say this judiciously because, God forbid, if this balance of power game should get out of hand, there will be a conflagration, we shall all burn and blow up. Is this the fate of man, after 6,000 years of history?

152. It seems, as I said the other day in the Assembly, only yesterday that the Sumerians in Iraq invented the wheel. And the dinosaur survived for two hundred million years before it became extinct. Because man does not choose to live by truth and justice, he may render himself extinct in time. He has probed outer space, but unfortunately he has not gained mastery over his inner self. These are the words of a man not only representing Saudi Arabia, but dedicated to this Organization, without which we shall founder. We must mend our ways. We do not use such words as "friendship" and this and that journalistically, but we go to the root of the matter, if we choose to survive as *homo sapiens* in this world.

153. I thank you, Mr. President, for having granted me permission to speak, and I have a few words to say to you. I congratulate you on having presided over this Council with the dignity of a man, as we say in Arabic, a man of "origin", with the intelligence and perspicacity that became evident to all members of the Council and also to your colleagues in the General Assembly.

154. At the same time I congratulate you, not that you are turning your back on the Council, but that you are making your exit, luckily for you, because nettlesome questions will continue to confront this Council as long as man does not decide to face such questions justly and without using the old rubrics and slogans that spelt the foundering of the League of Nations.

155. The PRESIDENT: In reciprocating the friendly sentiments of my good friend, Ambassador Baroodi, I



should like to say that he is one of those people on whom I look as the father of the United Nations in the same sense that Winston Churchill used to be regarded as the father of the House of Commons. I have always enjoyed his friendship. I have always relied on his encouragement and advice. At this time, when I am leaving the Council, I should like to thank him for the very friendly sentiments and encouraging words that he has expressed.

156. The representative of the Soviet Union has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply, and I now call on him.

157. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Before reacting to the usual attacks on the Soviet Union which the Israel representative permits himself at Security Council meetings, I should like to refer to a single sentence which Mr. Wiggins, the representative of the United States, used and which, to be frank, pleases me. He said, if I understood and noted it down correctly from the interpretation, that this Council, the Security Council, is not a court. That is an excellent statement. The delegation of the Soviet Union precisely in order to prevent the Security Council from being turned into a peculiar kind of court has twice objected to the inclusion in its agenda of document S/8946. This document has nothing to do with the Security Council, because the incident took place in the territory of a sovereign State Member of the United Nations, at the airport of Athens, the capital of that State; and the national authorities and a national court can deal with it. If this argument by Mr. Wiggins had been advanced earlier, we should clearly have been able to discuss it and keep this document, which has nothing to do with the Security Council, off the Council's agenda.

158. The Israel representative employed in his statements the usual familiar tactics. When he is at a loss for arguments he resorts to slander and fabrication against the Soviet Union. But that is a very weak position. Israel's aggressive conduct cannot be justified by methods of this kind. As a matter of fact, he had to employ these tactics in order to avoid replying to the plainly-worded questions contained in the Soviet delegation's statement. The first question was that international law and the Charter of the United Nations prohibit armed reprisals. No matter what quotations the Israel representative may have cited here, it is a generally recognized fact, an international rule, that international law and the Charter of the United Nations prohibit armed reprisals.

159. Anyone who resorts to them commits a crime against the Charter of the United Nations and against international law.

160. The second question was that Israel flagrantly violated the Armistice Agreement between Lebanon and Israel in that the Israel air force invaded Lebanon's air space. That is why the Israel delegate, in order to escape from these two incontestable facts, had to slander the Soviet Union and its peace-loving policy.

161. He quoted a statement by Mr. Gromyko, the present Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union. Yes, that

quotation does exist. The statement was made when Israel was not ruled by so aggressive a clique as it is now. Power in Israel has now been taken over by a group of persons who think and act aggressively.

162. Experience has shown that it was previously this group which embarked upon a course of aggression—an expansionist course of aggression towards the Arab States.

163. The Soviet Union is closely following developments in the Near East. That is quite understandable, because everything that happens in the Near East and the Mediterranean region directly concerns the Soviet Union. If there is war there, the firing is on our own doorstep. If there is peace, we work quietly, develop our productive forces and raise our people's living level. We therefore cannot be indifferent to events in the Near East.

164. From the first day of the crisis our country has been on the side of the Arab peoples, and we are proud that it has. We have come forward in defence of their national independence and of their territorial integrity, which has been violated by the aggressors.

165. The Soviet Union has decisively condemned Israel's aggressive action and supported the efforts of the United Nations to restore peace in the Near East. It is making every effort to restore peace in that area and to achieve a peaceful political settlement. This fact is known to the Security Council, the United Nations, the peoples of the world, the Secretary-General of the United Nations and Ambassador Jarring, who is carrying out an international mission on instructions from the Secretary-General of the United Nations with the full support of the Soviet Union.

166. Just when efforts are being made both inside and outside the United Nations to achieve a peaceful settlement of the Near East problems as quickly as possible, and just when the Arab States have declared most definitely their readiness and intention to seek such a settlement on the basis of the Security Council's decisions, the Government of Israel is repeating again and again that it will continue to sabotage those decisions. Those are the facts.

167. Mr. Tekoah, you are fond of quoting newspapers, including your favourite *New York Times*. Would you kindly read the report in today's *New York Times* of the fresh efforts made by the Soviet Union to achieve a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East? For you, reports in *The New York Times* always ring with a convincing argument. Please acquaint yourself with this one.

168. In conclusion, I can only remark that the longer the present ruling circles of Israel continue to obstruct a peaceful settlement in the Near East, the more dearly they will have to pay for it. The peoples cannot allow Israel to violate the political and economic interests and the security of States in the Near East or of their neighbours.

169. Those are the facts of the case, and no slanderous fabrications or inventions by the Israel delegate about the policy of the Soviet Union will succeed in diverting attention from them or distorting the real situation. The

sincere wish of the Soviet Union is to achieve a peaceful political settlement in the Near East.

170. The PRESIDENT: The last speaker inscribed on my list for exercise of the right of reply is the leader of the delegation of Lebanon, on whom I now call.

171. Mr. BOUTROS (Lebanon) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I should like to have welcomed today's resolution with unreserved gratitude and with satisfaction unclouded by regret. Indeed, all the delegations in this Council, and you at their head, Mr. President, deserve my country's thanks for the unanimous moral support you have given it during this session by formally condemning Israel and denouncing its aggression.

172. Unfortunately this decision obliges me to express reservations, for it has not drawn the conclusions that it should have drawn from your findings and has hesitated to order the application to Israel of Chapter VII of the Charter. This deliberate omission might have been intelligible in regard to a country which was an international first offender; but it is no longer so in regard to such a notorious and hardened recidivist as Israel. International ethics and morality have been flouted by Israel for so long that platonic decisions, even of the Security Council—all the decisions accumulated against it—seem after all to be of no use but to furnish the Council's archives.

173. I am quite aware that the decision contains a paragraph solemnly warning Israel to desist on pain of a decision to take coercive measures against it. There is the real essence of the problem, for in attacking the civil international airport of Beirut the aggressor was well aware that it was flouting international law, armistice agreements and cease-fire decisions. Nevertheless it deliberately chose to run this risk and commit this further act of defiance to the Security Council and the international community.

174. To become convinced of this fact it is only necessary to scan the Israel press and the statements of the Israel authorities following this aggressive incident. In these statements, without caring a rap for the reaction of public opinion or governments, they maintain that their alleged security—it is hard to see how security comes into the picture—is more important than the currents of international public opinion. After that, is there any ground for believing that a platonic condemnation will restrain Israel? I should willingly believe it if my experience and daily events did not keep on proving me right. This very day further threats are being made against Lebanon and arouse fear of new adventures, new acts of aggression. The same applies to the other Arab States.

175. Whatever happens in the future—and I must emphasize this here and now—your decision commits you irrevocably to meet Israel's acts of aggression with sanctions unless paragraph 3 of your decision is to be a dead letter, which is just what you do not want it to be.

176. Israel is likely to be the chief agent of the bankruptcy of the United Nations if it is allowed to go on flouting the international community. It depends on you, gentlemen, whether the predictions just made by the Israel

representative (I was going to say his *desiderata*) come true or not. The disaffection from which the United Nations is suffering is very largely due to Israel. Is it not surprising, therefore, that the representative of Israel should address one of the principal organs of the United Nations, yours, with the arrogance which marked his statement a few minutes ago?

177. On another aspect: I am bound to endorse the view implied in your decision that no effect should be given to Israel's counter claim against Lebanon based on the Athens incident, with which—as more than one speaker has pointed out here—my country and my Government have absolutely nothing to do.

178. Your decision of today, though inadequate, is nevertheless a milestone on the road to peace of which you are the supreme guardians. I hope it will be a barrier to injustice, adventure and aggression. Whether it will, only time can show. For my part I regret to say despite my earnest wishes to the contrary—that the answer will certainly be negative as far as it depends on Israel. The past is generally a pointer to the future.

179. I should not wish to end without a word about the last paragraph of the Council's decision, to which the representative of Saudi Arabia has just referred—the paragraph concerning indemnity and reparation. Unfortunately I am not sufficiently familiar with English to understand the shades of meaning of the word "redress". I have before me the French translation of this text, which uses the word "*réparation*". If words still have meaning, in my opinion there is clearly no need to split hairs here. Nevertheless, I must add that my delegation has not taken any major interest in this question since it has desired to prove that its prime concern was the condemnation of Israel and the adoption of sanctions against it—that is, respect for the principles which are the pride of your Charter. Lebanon wished as far as possible to keep away considerations which might have seemed rather sordid from the issues of major principle which were at stake.

180. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel has indicated a desire to exercise the right of reply, and I now give him the floor.

181. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I shall not prolong the discussion with the Soviet representative, but I should like to leave him with one thought to ponder over.

182. A quarter of a century after a desperate fight for life against Hitler's Nazi hordes, the Soviet Union finds itself today completely identified in the Middle East with aggressive Arab Governments, which are the only ones in the entire world that still publish and still distribute Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. Twenty years after supporting, in the words of Mr. Gromyko, "the Jewish national liberation movement in Palestine", the Soviet Union now gives succour and encouragement to Arab terror organizations openly proclaiming as their aim the destruction of the Jewish State and the annihilation of its people. I have no doubt that the time will come when the Soviet Government and the Soviet people will look with a blush of shame upon this disgraceful chapter of Soviet history.

## Statement by the President

183. The PRESIDENT: There are no other names on the list of speakers. With the permission of the members of the Council, I should like to say a few words.

184. Distinguished colleagues and friends: since this happens to be the last month of Ethiopia's membership of the Security Council and since, by happy coincidence, Ethiopia's representative has had the honour of being President of the Council during this month, perhaps I may be allowed to say a few words in concluding the work of the Council on this the last day of 1968.

185. I should like first of all to say what a tremendous and challenging experience it has been to serve on the Council during these past two years.

186. It may be said that the year 1968 has brought little change to the characteristic ups and downs in international relations of recent years, with events that have caused recurrent cycles of hope and despair and of optimism and frustration. But the present year and the year that preceded it have not, I submit, been completely empty of achievements which, if modest, are none the less meaningful.

187. As we look back in thoughtful reminiscence to what we have tried to do together in this Council and to world events in general, we can at least record certain hopeful beginnings.

188. For one thing, we can take some deserved pride in the fact that in our work in the Council during the past two years, and in the face of grave dangers to world peace, we have lived up to our collective responsibility as Council members and have honestly tried to face international reality by always relying on action through the method of mutual consultations and consensus. Today's outcome is but one good example of this encouraging trend in the Council's effort to advance its work.

189. We have also made a good beginning in unanimously adopting resolution 242 (1967) of November 1967, which established the machinery and laid down basic principles for the attainment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

190. We have likewise taken some meaningful steps in the direction of world disarmament. The treaty to ban the spread of nuclear weapons is a potentially significant forward step in that direction. The promises of that accord must be made good by further progress in this field.

191. Again, during this time the United Nations has also manifested a high interest in the problems of outer space, as well as those of inner space, and has adopted appropriate resolutions which affirm the universal interest. The recent wondrous achievements of the United States Apollo 8 project mark both a new climax and the beginning of a new era in the relations between man and the vast world of nature that surround him. It is also relevant to note in this connexion that appropriate interest was shown by the

twenty-third session of the General Assembly in the problems of the human environment.

192. Then we have the beginning of the Viet-Nam peace talks in Paris. Although the United Nations is not directly involved in those talks, the Secretary-General played a very persistent and vital part in their initiation. Here again a hopeful beginning has been made which, if followed up with common good faith and determination, can lead to the achievement of a just and lasting peace in South-East Asia.

193. I have picked out those four areas of international endeavour at random as constituting the credit side of the international balance sheet. The debit side is unfortunately too long to elaborate. There are still many world problems which continue to test and challenge the very *raison d'être* of our Organization. And if I may be allowed to say so, the problems of southern Africa must figure at the top of this awful list.

194. It has been said in justification of the existence of the United Nations that if it did not exist we would be obliged to bring it into existence. We are all aware that the alternative to life with the United Nations is life without international law and morality. Surely the validity of that proposition is clearly demonstrated by the decline and fall of the League of Nations and by all that happened thereafter.

195. While it is our primary duty to see that the United Nations lives, it is our supreme responsibility to guard against the danger of the United Nations slowly and inadvertently falling into the same unfortunate situation of erosion of authority and prestige. That is bound to happen unless we, the membership, wake up to our responsibilities and become willing to respect and to oblige respect for the principles of the Charter and all decisions based thereon.

196. By virtue of their great power and the responsibility given to them in the Charter, the permanent members obviously have a special role to play in this regard, and I for one feel that periodic meetings between the four permanent members of the Council within the framework of the United Nations, as suggested at the beginning of the twenty-third session of the General Assembly by the Secretary-General and as recently called for by the Government of France, would enhance the effectiveness of the Organization and would advance the cause of world understanding and peace. The Middle East could perhaps be the first of the problems on which such consultations could be profitably conducted, since in that particular case all four permanent members have supported the Middle East resolution 242 (1967) of November 1967.

197. And so, my friends and colleagues, as we prepare to receive new members in the Council for next year, we must do so with a certain sense of cautious optimism, coupled with a sense of dedication and determination to continue to strive together for our mutual well-being—indeed our very survival.

198. Again I thank all my colleagues in the Council for their friendship and their co-operation and for the wonder-

ful opportunity and experience of having worked with them during these past eventful years.

199. I wish also to thank the Secretary-General and, through him, all my colleagues in the Secretariat, including the staff—the interpreters, the verbatim reporters and all others—for their unfailing kindness and courtesy during my

close and fruitful association with them during the past two years.

200. In conclusion I wish to one and all a very happy and prosperous New Year.

*The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.*