

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

1706th MEETING: 13 APRIL 1973

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1706)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 12 April 1973 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10913)	1

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.

SEVENTEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTH MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 13 April 1973, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Javier PEREZ DE CUELLAR (Peru).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Austria, China, France, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1706)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 12 April 1973 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10913)

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 12 April 1973 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10913)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with the decision taken by the Council [1705th meeting], and with its consent, I shall invite the representatives of Lebanon and Israel to take places at the Council table.

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

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Again in accordance with the decision of the Council [*ibid*], I invite the representatives of Egypt and Saudi Arabia to take the places reserved for them in the Council chamber, on the understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when they wish to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. E. Abdel Meguid (Egypt) and Mr. J. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to inform members of the Council that I have received

letters from the representatives of Algeria and the Syrian Arab Republic in which they ask to participate, without the right to vote, in the Council's consideration of the item on its agenda.

4. In accordance with the established practice, and with the consent of the Council, I shall invite the representatives of Algeria and the Syrian Arab Republic to take the places reserved for them in the Council chamber, on the understanding that they will be invited to take places at the Council table when they wish to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. Rahal (Algeria) and Mr. H. Kelani (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The first name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Algeria, I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

6. Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Once again the Security Council is meeting in order to learn of and discuss a complaint against the brutal aggression of Israel. Once again the international community is confronted with this Middle East crisis, which undoubtedly disturbs consciences, but which keeps on thrusting itself to the forefront to remind us of the dangers inherent in it and of the futility of the efforts undertaken thus far to find a remedy to it through partial and superficial solutions.

7. It is therefore upon you, Mr. President, that the weighty privilege devolves of directing the Council's proceedings at a time when there returns to it—just as a letter is returned to a careless sender who has failed to comply with all the conditions of its dispatch—a problem which reflects its concerns, but also its powerlessness to find a solution. May I therefore express our satisfaction at seeing the representative of Peru presiding over this debate. The high esteem in which you are unanimously held and the personal friendship that I bear you justify our hope that the Council's discussions will succeed in breaking out of what has unfortunately become a shabby routine and, in the study of a complex situation which involves so much passion, so many considerations of all kinds and the future of so many men, women and children, will be able to distinguish the subjective from the real and the temporary from the definitive in order to move towards the effective exercise of the true responsibilities of the Security Council.

8. The Council is meeting today at the request of Lebanon which, once again, has been the victim of an act of aggression by Israel. Once again Israeli forces have struck

that country and, in a brief and rapid action, using the effect of surprise and supported by the most powerful means, more death and destruction has been added to all that which already stands to Israel's discredit following its criminal policies.

9. Yet throughout the world there are admirers of what they describe as "Israeli efficiency", people who add their satisfaction to that of the Israelis themselves. That efficiency, which is still all too fresh in our memories is, however, in no way glorious, for it calls into play power founded on considerable external assistance, cunning founded on immorality and boldness founded on impunity.

10. But the international community would do well to concern itself otherwise with the danger to its own security, in the present and above all in the future, from the aggressiveness of Israel's behaviour, an aggressiveness which, if it is manifested directly and brutally in its immediate environment, also has grave repercussions in other areas. Indeed we might well ask why the Israelis should abandon this policy of the "fait accompli" which has stood them in such good stead so far and thanks to which they are imposing their law and extending their domination, knowing full well that the discussions and the debates to which their actions will give rise will not affect the results they have achieved in the field.

11. This attitude of defiance of international law and of contempt for the decisions of international organizations, through its persistence, its repeated manifestations and the acquiescence it enjoys in certain sectors of opinion, constitutes in the longer term a serious threat to international order and an encouragement to the establishment of a situation in every respect similar to those which, in the past, have given rise to world conflicts. It would be a mistake to think that the events which are today the subject of the Council's debate are of concern only to the countries of the Middle East or that they are confined to the limited framework of the conflict between Arabs and Israelis.

12. Israel's aggressive policy is, to be sure, directed in the first instance against the Arab countries, but it is neither fortuitous nor provisional; it is indelibly stamped on Israel's behaviour on the international scene. The arrogance it shows in regard to the resolutions of the Security Council is one aspect of it and should give pause to those who are so unwise as to give it their nod. It is surprising enough that a State should be allowed to keep territory it has acquired by force, it is still more disquieting that the international community should fail to react to the measures taken by that State with the obvious aim of ensuring its permanent presence there. The world is today too small for us to suppose that the danger that affects the Middle East because of such acts remains limited to that region, or that its extension and its inherent contagion cannot reach the rest of the world. Action by the great Powers is unquestionably necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security, action by a small country is sufficient to destroy them, particularly when it is a small country which, like Israel, has at its disposal resources whose size we are well aware of, and is too much used to act without

scruple and without fear of either disapproval or punishment.

13. The Council is accustomed to the explanations that Israel gives of its successive acts of aggression, and we have already witnessed a repetition of this in the course of this series of meetings. We are told that it is a matter of struggling against Arab terrorism by the only methods which can put an end to it. Let us say immediately, in order to put facts in their real light and against the historical background, that, no matter how much Israel may dislike the fact, there is no Arab terrorism, and if we are to speak of terrorism at all, it must properly be described as Palestinian, which would give it its true meaning and its real foundation. There is Palestinian terrorism, just as yesterday there was Algerian terrorism, in which we glory, and which it occurred to no one to describe at that time as Arab terrorism. But the confusion which Israel seeks to maintain is deliberate, because it serves its propaganda objectives and seeks to maintain in international opinion the simplistic image of a small Jewish people confronted with the stubborn hostility of fanatical Arab masses bent on its destruction.

14. And first of all Israel uses this in order to pretend that it is authorized to commit acts of aggression against an Arab country like Lebanon, using the pretext that that country is harbouring Palestinian refugees that are involved in terrorist action against Israel. We know that, as regards terrorism, the Israelis hardly need to take lessons from anyone, and that the experience they have gained and not hesitated to put at the service of anti-revolutionary movements, particularly during the Algerian war, undoubtedly enables them better to understand and confront it. And it is now with the means it has at its disposal as a State, and that are lavished upon it by the United States, that Israel in its turn is practising the same terrorism that it condemns in the Palestinians. It is curious to say the least that the United States should recognize no responsibility for the use that is made of the arms and financial aid that it furnished Israel, or that it should express astonishment at the suspicion shown towards it when events such as those in Lebanon take place.

15. Israel's explanations would undoubtedly be more plausible and more convincing to us if the brutality of its interventions in Lebanon had been matched in other countries—for example, in Europe or in America—where it could also find justification in the presence of groups of Palestinians engaged in terrorist action. But Israel's boldness and temerity find an easier field of action in Lebanon, a country whose peaceful inclinations need no further demonstration and where the accidents of geography expose it to acts of aggression without risk and without glory on the part of an unscrupulous neighbour.

16. The Israeli leaders say they wish to force Lebanon and the other Arab countries to put an end to Palestinian terrorism and to oblige the Palestinians to abandon the struggle to which they have committed themselves. The term "Arab" which they apply to Palestinian terrorism is in their mind intended to confuse international opinion in a manner which is to their advantage and furthers their designs. But that is to overlook at once the nature of the

bonds between the Arab countries and the Palestinian people and the very nature of the Palestinian struggle.

17. If the Arab countries show their solidarity with all peoples struggling for their freedom and independence, how can anyone suppose that they would withhold their support from the Palestinian people, which continues to be the victim of a conscious and deliberate injustice on the part of the international community and whose very existence as a national community is today under threat?

18. When the Algerian people was conducting its liberation struggle it found wide support throughout the world, but more particularly and quite naturally in the brother and neighbour countries of Morocco, Tunisia, Libya and Mali. No one could accuse France of having at that time failed to be firm in its action against the Algerian revolution, yet it managed to contain its war efforts within the limits of Algeria without mounting acts of aggression against the neighbouring countries, which nevertheless harboured and gave refuge to the Algerian fighters. The brazenness of Israel is now introducing into international relations a new dimension the more remote consequences of which some are not yet willing to gauge.

19. That attitude obviously reflects a total misreading of the nature of the Palestinian struggle. For the Palestinians, this is not just a liberation struggle to break foreign domination and to recover a homeland of which they were dispossessed. It is, rather, a struggle for their survival as a people—an Arab people, of course, but a people with its own history and an ancient national tradition, a people which finds in its deep feeling of attachment to its community the strength and the justification for its fight.

20. But we are told that terrorism is an inhumane form of struggle which does not distinguish between the guilty and the innocent and which disturbs international order. Yes, that is true, and we all deplore the blind violence it sets in motion, which threatens all equally. But do the Palestinians have the choice of any other form of struggle more acceptable to those who uphold international order? What, after all, has the international community done to make good the injustice visited on that people beyond adopting resolutions which remain without effect and providing humanitarian aid which maintains that people in wretched refugee camps? Does it have an organized army that could face the Israeli forces in accordance with the classic rules of war? Like many other people before them placed in the same situation as this, the Palestinians are resorting to the only form of struggle open to them, in which the risks to which they are exposed are at least as great as the threat they level against others.

21. It is essential that we understand that this is a struggle to which an entire people is committed, a struggle that does not rest solely on a few leaders whose disappearance will result in the abandonment of the struggle. It is a dangerous illusion to think that Israeli terrorism can break the determination of the Palestinians or compel them to accept their lot. On the contrary, their determination will only be further sharpened, and the present generation of Palestinian leaders will be succeeded by another even more determined and assuredly better prepared to carry on the combat.

22. In this case as in many others, the ineffectiveness of international institutions and the Security Council in tackling this problem stems from the fact that too much attention is given to its immediate manifestations and too little to its deep-seated causes and the failure to take them as a matter of priority.

23. The situation which exists in the Middle East, which bears within it the seeds of tension that threaten not only the people of the region but world peace, did not arise spontaneously or without reason, and it has not persisted for a quarter-century without valid reasons that we may not ignore. It is, however, clear that this crisis is to be explained by the conditions which obtained at the time of Israel's creation, by the foreseeable consequences of that creation and by the very nature of Israel.

24. I do not want to go into developments that would be beyond the framework of this statement, but we should like to recall the responsibility of the countries that did not, despite the controversies at the time, hesitate to take a dubious decision, thus vitally affecting the future of a population and arbitrarily deciding its fate. We may understand the emotional atmosphere in which a decision of such importance was taken, immediately following a war which had threatened the freedom of peoples; but it is only all the more astonishing that it could have been possible in all conscience and on the pretext of making good an injustice to commit another injustice which was every bit as unpardonable against a people that had no reason to suppose that so unhappy a destiny was awaiting them.

25. Yet the objectives of Zionism were well known to all and no one could have had any illusions about the consequences that the creation of Israel would bring with it. No one can claim to be unaware that the Zionists aspired to the creation of an essentially Jewish State within limits that explain the present expansionism of Israel. The elimination of the Palestinians from what had been their homeland therefore followed inexorably from the decision to create Israel, and those who took the decision are thus responsible for it.

26. The fundamental problem is that of the Palestinian people, but it is not just a humanitarian problem. The political facts of the situation are quite clear; they rest on the legitimate aspirations that can be concealed neither by the periodic explosions of violence nor by the complexity of a situation that has now grown to encompass the whole of the Middle East. This problem will not be solved so long as Israel maintains its Zionist character, through which it presents itself as the State of all Jews in the world. Because of this Zionist character Israel not only is opposed to the rightful claims of the Palestinians to live in their own country, but also is a real danger because of its claim to represent all Jewish colonies wherever they are, even in countries where they enjoy full citizenship. This perhaps explains the wide support it has always enjoyed on the international level. This is the key to the power on which it can draw and which it uses in order to carry out the most extremist objectives of international Zionism, but this could ultimately lead to the gravest disturbances in international life.

27. I am well aware that the Security Council has not met in order to find a solution to the Middle East crisis, and in any case it is no part of my intention to propose one. But the situation created by the Israeli aggression in Lebanon must be seen in its over-all context, which highlights an Israeli policy which is simplistic in its conception, subtle in its formulation and monstrous in its execution. This is not just the deliberate violation of the sovereignty of a State Member of the United Nations; this is not just the use by a Member of the Organization of its armed forces for a terrorist action. It is in fact far more than that: what is happening goes far beyond a mere infringement of the rules of law or a breach—even a grave breach—of the principles of international law. The problem before you is that of a people that has rights to claim and that refuses to resign itself to an intolerable fate. Israel's aggression against Lebanon is reprehensible not only because it is directed against a sovereign country, but also and above all because it futilely claims to furnish a reply to the inalterable aspirations of the Palestinians.

28. The humanitarian aspect of these events, no matter how important, must not distract the Council's attention from an objective consideration of the situation and the appalling disparity between the two terrorisms which face one another and which, on the Palestinian side, can be offset only by an unshakable faith in the justice of their cause and by the determination to accept the heaviest sacrifices so that it may triumph.

29. In taking up this problem which is so painful for all, the international community must be aware of its own responsibility in the tragedy of the Palestinian people. It cannot ask that people to respect an international order which neglects its rights or to bow to international law which is so unjust vis-à-vis itself. The Palestinian people cannot resign itself to waiting until a solution to its tragedy comes from international institutions that have been quicker to ruin its national life than to see its rights restored. The struggle it is carrying on today by the only means that remain available to it is part of the normal process which has led all oppressed peoples to rise up against domination, all humiliated peoples to rebel against the arrogance of power and all peoples that are the victims of injustice to claim their rights.

30. The international community must also cast an unwavering eye on the behaviour of Israel, a State which it has itself created and sustained, and whose policies, based on force and contempt for international law, represent one of the gravest dangers to world equilibrium. The monstrous terrorism in which it is engaging, supported by the immense resources at its disposal, is unquestionably one of the most disquieting phenomena of our time. It was the wont of the great Powers to practise the policy of intimidation and intervention in the affairs of other countries; it was their privilege to trample under foot the rule of law and to make their own law. That these same dangerous and criminal tendencies are now seen in the attitude of a small country, installed through force in the Middle East in the midst of nations that have only just become independent themselves and are at grips with the problems of strengthening, organizing and developing themselves—this is what gives cause for the gravest concern as regards the future of the

international community. For the Security Council, whose fundamental mission is to watch over the maintenance of world peace and security, here is food for thought and here are guidelines for its action, if it wishes to rise to its responsibilities and to justify the hopes that the peoples continue to place in it.

31. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

32. Mr. KELANI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I thank you and the members of the Council for allowing my delegation to participate in the discussion of this agenda item. I also wish to express to you my most sincere congratulations on the occasion of your becoming President of the Security Council and reiterate our tribute to your dear country and your eminent person.

33. The representative of Lebanon [*1705th meeting*] has given the Council an account of the terrorist escalation in which the Zionist authorities are engaging and the declarations of their intention to intensify it, in particular against Lebanon and the neighbouring countries in the area. Their purpose is avowed, and the torrent of propaganda cannot conceal it. It is genocide, pure and simple, against the people of Palestine—to stifle its voice and eliminate its personality. Yesterday the Council heard the representative of Israel [*ibid.*] apply to the Palestinian Arabs epithets worthy of himself—"assassins" and "barbarians". What he tried to do was to make us forget that the Palestinian Arabs are a people, a people with its personality and its inalienable rights and one which has been chased away from its home by a foreign conquest which was racist and colonialist. Since then the most atrocious conditions have been imposed on that martyred people. The representative of Israel dwelt at length on the manifestations of a few young Palestinians filled with frustration and despair. He never mentioned the behaviour of the authorities of Israel towards the Palestinians, a behaviour which is even extended to their camps of exile. No reason was given for the attitude of that colonialist Power in regard to resolutions of the United Nations on the Palestinian people or on any other resolutions on self-determination, the return of the refugees to their country, the Statute of Jerusalem, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and the return of displaced persons to their homeland. The tragedy which has struck the people of Palestine and has been extended to the neighbouring countries by the neo-colonialist racist forces which make a cult of force and have loudly proclaimed the policy of terrorism was not mentioned, and the representative of the State that has violated every United Nations resolution and caused the failure of every action intended to lessen the injustices committed against the Palestinian Arabs comes to ask the members of the Security Council for their support to consummate the massacre of the Palestine people which his Prime Minister described as "very marvellous".

34. It would take too long to mention here the endless list of resolutions which were adopted by the General Assembly and by the Security Council after the Israeli

aggression of June 1967. Those resolutions referred mainly to the refusal of Israel to recognize the fundamental rights of the Palestinian refugees. Those rights are enunciated in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

35. More recently the General Assembly, in its resolution 2963 A (XXVII),

"1. *Notes with deep regret* that repatriation or compensation of the refugees as provided for in paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III) has not been effected. . .";

In its resolution 2963 D (XXVII) it

"5. *Calls again upon* Israel to desist forthwith from all measures affecting the physical, geographic and demographic structure of the occupied territories;"

In its resolution 2963 E (XXVII) it

"1. *Affirms* that the people of Palestine are entitled to equal rights and self-determination, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations;

"2. *Expresses once more its grave concern* that the people of Palestine have not been permitted to enjoy their inalienable rights and to exercise their right to self-determination;

"3. *Recognizes* that full respect for and realization of the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine are indispensable for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East."

36. The real question before the Security Council at present is the terrorism practised by Israel as a doctrine, as a faith and as a cult. The details of its latest crimes are only the first fruits of the application of this doctrine, and the blood-thirsty leaders of Israel openly tell us: "We shall get to the Palestinian leaders, wherever they are." Neither the rules of justice or law nor the sovereignty of States are any barrier to their aggressive thrusts, their expansionism and genocide.

37. It is this State terrorism—fundamentally different from individual acts of violence, which are an expression of despair—which the Council is called upon to consider, particularly in its flagrant manifestations of violation of the sovereignty of Member States and their territorial integrity.

38. Under the pretext of security, Israel has broken the June 1967 armistice lines, conquered new Arab territory and established colonies and settlements there which are military fortresses where militarily trained people are settled. Under the pretext of security, Israel retains the occupied Arab territories and fights by every means against the return to their homes of the children of the Palestinians and other displaced persons. Under the pretext of security, Israel is now striking at the front lines and deeply into Arab territories. Under the pretext of security, Israel will sooner

or later try to undertake one aggression after the other until, on the basis of its calculations, it can achieve the "great Israel".

39. Under the pretext of security, Israel wishes to retain the newly acquired territories which were not under its domination in 1967, in order to preserve Israeli colonies. Assuming that that were true, why does Israel set up new colonies in the recently occupied territories near the cease-fire lines? Are not those new colonies to serve as a pretext for soon claiming new territories which will remove them from the cease-fire lines with the Arabs? Yes, colonies which need new territories for their security, new territories which need new colonies for their security, and then new colonies which need new territories, and so on, *ad infinitum*, until achievement of the "great Israel".

40. This terrorism is now escalating. The Zionist authorities are preparing international public opinion for a new war to be unleashed against the Arab countries in order to eliminate forever what remains of the Palestinian people, and to impose their own peace terms on the neighbouring countries. It is this escalation which the Council must consider with all due seriousness, before a new conflagration once again jeopardizes international peace.

41. Israel's attitude of defiance could not have attained these dimensions of arrogance and intoxication had it not been for the unconditional support furnished it by a great Power, the United States of America. The representative of the United States becomes indignant in the Council at the rumours of the complicity of his authorities in the acts of terrorism perpetrated against Lebanon. But he says not a word about the aid and sophisticated material for all-out war, about the participation of his authorities in the deadly war industry of Israel and the promotion of that industry by American capital and technology, about the funds disbursed by the United States to Israel to maintain its tyranny over the Arab peoples and perpetuate its occupation of their territories and, finally, about the veto cast by his delegation last September in regard to a draft resolution which only asked for a cessation of military operations, or the immense encouragement which Israel has received to perpetrate with impunity its aggression against innocent people. Is this not an invitation to Israel on the part of the United States of America to do anything it wishes against the Arab countries, since Israel is always sure that the United States will never oppose its acts, however abominable they might be?

42. At this stage, I should like to affirm that the attitude of the Syrian Arab Republic in regard to the question of Palestine and the imperialist Zionist aggression against the Arab countries and against Lebanon in particular is firm and based on the principles and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations; it is based on the rules of international law and precepts of justice and equity. I affirm also that two conditions are essential for the establishment of peace in the Middle East: first, recognition of the right of the people of Palestine to their land, their homeland, free exercise of their right to self-determination, and then, the complete, immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from all occupied Arab territories.

43. Many Security Council resolutions have condemned Israeli acts of aggression similar to the latest aggression, and the Council has warned Israel unequivocally that a repetition of such acts would lead to the adoption of enforcement measures. There has been no change in Israel's attitude, however. Its leaders loudly proclaim their defiance of United Nations resolutions and of the resolutions of the Security Council in particular. A State which thus tramples under foot the resolutions of the international community should have no place in this Organization. Israel persistently breaches the principles enunciated in the Charter. It is high time that the Security Council discharged its obligations. Similarly, the Council can no longer postpone adoption of appropriate measures so that the consequences of Israeli aggression can be eliminated.

44. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Mr. President, before making the Soviet delegation's statement on the substance of this item, I should like to express to you the sincere and cordial satisfaction and congratulations of the Soviet delegation on your present occupancy of the lofty and responsible position of President of the Security Council. We are quite sure that you, distinguished diplomat and the representative of a friendly country, will discharge these weighty duties with honour. You may count on the co-operation of the Soviet delegation as you carry out the lofty and honourable obligations incumbent on the President of the Council.

45. I should also like to express the deep satisfaction I have felt at working with your predecessor and to comment on his outstanding work as President of the Council. I am referring to our colleague Mr. Boyd, the representative of Panama, whose actions added a new page to the history of the Security Council—the holding of a second series of meetings of the Security Council away from United Nations Headquarters. As President of the Council during that period, he displayed his brilliant qualities, and he had an equally brilliant helper and deputy—his Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Tack.

46. That series of meetings was so well organized in Panama that, as I have already remarked during informal consultations among members of the Council, many members feel tempted to hold meetings of the Council away from Headquarters more frequently.

47. The Security Council is once again compelled to consider the question of a new act of aggression by Israel against the peace-loving State of Lebanon, an act unprecedented in its insolence and in the cynicism in international affairs which it reveals. As we learned from the statement of Mr. Ghorra [*1705th meeting*], the distinguished representative of Lebanon, on 10 April a large group of Israeli troops carried out a gangster-like raid on the Lebanese capital city of Beirut and the town of Sidon. Like thieves in the night, using the methods once used by Hitler's SS cutthroats, the Israeli terrorist saboteurs penetrated into a foreign country and into a foreign capital, where they committed their bloody crime. As a result of this act of banditry and terrorism, 12 persons lost their lives and 29 were wounded. In addition to these bestial murders, the Israeli terrorists blew up a number of buildings in Beirut

and Sidon and caused great material damage to the Lebanese.

48. This criminal act perpetrated by the Israeli aggressors in their unbounded insolence is the latest link in the chain of crimes committed by Israeli extremists who are seeking, through terrorism elevated to the level of State policy and through intimidation and aggression, to put into effect their predatory plans to annex the lands of other countries and to achieve the Israelization of the Arab territories seized in 1967.

49. For the tenth time in the past four years, the Security Council is considering questions relating to Israeli acts of aggression against Lebanon. As it discusses today this new act of international gangsterism committed by Israel, the Council cannot fail to recall the long list of crimes of aggression by Israel against Lebanon which have been brought before it.

50. In December 1968 the Council considered the armed attack by Israeli armed forces on the civilian international airport of Beirut. On that occasion Israel was condemned by the Council for its premeditated military actions.

51. In August 1969 the Council condemned, in resolution 270 (1969), the premeditated air attack by Israel on populated areas in southern Lebanon. In May 1970, referring to the invasion of Lebanese territory by Israeli armed forces, the Council demanded, in resolution 279 (1970), the immediate withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from Lebanese territory. Also in May 1970, in resolution 280 (1970), the Security Council condemned Israel for its premeditated military action against Lebanon. In September 1970, referring to another invasion of Lebanese territory by Israeli armed forces, the Council again demanded, in resolution 285 (1970), the complete and immediate withdrawal of those Israeli armed forces.

52. In February 1972, after new acts of aggression by Israel against Lebanon, the Council demanded, in resolution 313 (1972), that Israel immediately desist and refrain from any ground and air military action against Lebanon and forthwith withdraw its military forces from Lebanese territory.

53. In June 1972 Israel was again condemned by the Council, in resolution 316 (1972), for its repeated attacks on Lebanese territory and population. Lastly, in July 1972 the Council, considering the question of the latest acts of aggression by Israel against Lebanon, deplored, in resolution 317 (1972), the fact that the Syrian and Lebanese military personnel abducted by Israeli armed forces from Lebanese territory had not been returned and called for their immediate return.

54. In September 1972 the Council considered further acts of aggression by Israel against Lebanon. At that time three members of the Security Council submitted a relatively moderate draft resolution [*S/10805 and Rev. 1*] calling for the immediate cessation of all military operations and requesting the parties—primarily, of course, Israel—to show the utmost restraint in the interests of international peace and security. Unfortunately, this ex-

tremely moderate and undemanding draft resolution was not adopted by the Council because one of the permanent members—the United States—voted against it, that is to say, used the veto and thus made it impossible for the Council to take the necessary steps against the Israeli aggressors. It is quite obvious that actions of this kind amount to nothing less than support and encouragement for the aggressor to carry out further gangster-like attacks on the Arab States and to use force in any form.

55. In this connexion we must also draw attention to the following fact: it was certainly not by chance but by design that Israel, as the aggressor State, was one of the States which refused, at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly, to support resolution 2936 (XXVII) on non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. That this was far from a chance decision is confirmed by Israel's subsequent behaviour, namely, the continuation of its policy of aggression and the use of force in all its forms and manifestations against the Arab States. That is why the aggressors and the advocates of the use of force and the use of nuclear weapons had no liking for this resolution, which is cast in the form of a solemn declaration by the General Assembly on behalf of all States Members of the United Nations. It was and remains clearly repugnant to them.

56. Moreover, subsequent events—the continued aggression by Israel in the Middle East and the aggressive actions of Portugal, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia against African States—have made it even clearer that this General Assembly resolution protects the legitimate interests of the victims of imperialist and colonial aggression. The resolution, as we are all aware, also reaffirms the principle of the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by force. It again upholds the inherent right of States subjected to aggression to recover such territories by all means at their disposal. That is why the overwhelming majority of Arab States, with the unfortunate exception of two, voted for the resolution and for this solemn declaration by the General Assembly on behalf of all States Members of the United Nations.

57. In the light of these facts it is quite evident that those who spoke against adoption of the resolution, voted against its adoption or abstained in the vote were in fact encouraging Israel and the other aggressors to continue the policy of aggression and to continue to use force in international relations.

58. At the same time it is quite obvious that, by virtue of the adoption by the General Assembly, at its twenty-seventh session, of this resolution in the form of a solemn declaration on behalf of all States Members of the United Nations, the principle of the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons has become a new rule of international law. Consequently, any new act of aggression on the part of Israel against the Arab States is now a violation not only of the Charter of the United Nations but also of this important new rule of international law. And this fact must be stated plainly in the resolution which the Security Council will adopt on this question.

59. Furthermore, it is incumbent on the members of the Council to take another important decision. In that resolution the General Assembly recommended that the Council should take, as soon as possible, appropriate measures for the full implementation of the solemn declaration of the General Assembly. The Council is under an obligation not to defer this question any longer but to consider it in the immediate future and, in accordance with its competence and powers under the Charter, to adopt an appropriate decision and affirm that the renunciation of the use or threat of force in all its forms for the settlement of disputes among States has become a law of international life.

60. The Soviet Union firmly and consistently advocates the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. Anyone who opposes this position is in fact giving "grist to the mills" of the aggressors, including Israel, and undermining the defence of the rights and interests of the victims of aggression.

61. We must add that four times in recent years—in December 1968, August 1969, May 1970 and June 1972—the Security Council warned Israel that, if it continued its acts of aggression against Lebanon, the Council would meet to consider further action and would be obliged to provide for the adoption of appropriate effective measures, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, to ensure that its resolutions were carried out.

62. Israel, however, is continuing its established practice of outright disregard for and violation of Security Council decisions and General Assembly resolutions.

63. As the representative of Lebanon correctly pointed out in his letter and in his statement [*1705th meeting*], the repeated criminal acts committed by detachments of the Israeli armed forces in Lebanon are carried out as part of the Israeli Government's policy of intimidation and State terrorism.

64. In this connexion we cannot pass over the fact that the latest gangster operation by the Israeli aggressors is praised to the skies by the Government of Israel and is depicted as a kind of "retaliatory measure". Attention has already been drawn here to the unprecedentedly cynical and misanthropic statement by the Prime Minister of Israel, Mrs. Golda Meir, who termed the gangster-like raid on the Lebanese capital by the Israeli saboteurs an absolutely magnificent operation, about which glowing pages would be written. The Israeli Chief of Staff, General Elazar, used equally bare-faced and boastful words when, in violation of the generally accepted elementary rules of international law and morality, he stated that Israel did not intend to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

65. The Soviet Union's position with regard to acts of international terrorism is well known. We are categorically opposed to international terrorism. The Soviet Union speaks out from positions of principle against acts of terrorism which disrupt the diplomatic activities of States and of their representatives, transport links between them,

and the normal course of international contacts and meetings, and against acts of violence which serve no positive purpose and cause the deaths of innocent people. We oppose equally firmly and categorically any attempts to influence the policy of a State through inhuman acts of terrorism.

66. The USSR opposes with equal vigour an aggressor's use of terrorist activities carried out by individuals and irresponsible loners as an excuse for its own aggression against other countries and for barbaric, gangster-like attacks by a State on a neighbouring State under the pretext of "equal retribution", that is to say, a pretext aimed at justifying international lawlessness and gangsterism. We are categorically opposed to the "law of the jungle" in international relations. Accordingly, we condemn the terroristic methods used by Israel in its international policy and Israel's elevation of terrorism to the level of State policy.

67. The Soviet Union firmly opposes all acts of aggression and advocates the complete and speedy elimination of any aggression and its consequences; it favours, of course, the withdrawal of the aggressor's troops from its victim's territory. As far as the Middle East is concerned, this indicates the urgent need for a just settlement which will establish lasting peace on the basis of implementation of all the provisions of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). It means that Israeli troops must be withdrawn from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967. It means that the Arab people of Palestine must be given a guarantee of their legitimate rights; this guarantee, together with the withdrawal of Israeli troops, is a basic requisite for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Quite clearly, the responsibility for everything which is going on in the Middle East, and elsewhere in connexion with the Middle East problem, rests wholly and entirely with Israel. It is Israel's aggressive policy which lies at the root of the dangerous tension and all its disastrous consequences in and beyond that troubled and dangerous part of the world.

68. The Israeli Government's claims that the piratical raid by the Israeli saboteurs was undertaken as a "reprisal" against the activities of Palestinian organizations cannot serve as an excuse and do not stand up to critical examination. We are all aware that the Security Council categorically condemned any attempts to use pleas of so-called reprisals for justifying aggression or any other attacks by one State on another. In this connexion, it must be noted in particular that, in resolution 270 (1969) of 26 August 1969, which deals specifically with acts of aggression by Israel against Lebanon, the Council categorically condemned military reprisals. Security Council resolution 248 (1968) adopted in March 1968 contains a similar provision to the effect that military reprisals by Israel against another Arab country—Jordan—cannot be tolerated or permitted. This position of the Council was also clearly reflected in a number of its subsequent decisions.

69. No matter how much the Israeli militarists try to confuse the matter and obscure its essence, they will not succeed. The root of the evil and of the perpetuation of a

situation in the Middle East which endangers the cause of peace is that the consequences of Israel's aggression against the Arab countries in June 1967 have not yet been eliminated and, moreover, that Israeli armed forces, supported by the forces of imperialism and Zionism, continue to commit new acts of aggression against neighbouring Arab States.

70. The Israeli representative in the Security Council has done his utmost to justify this latest monstrous act of aggression by Israel against Lebanon. He has claimed that certain individuals, who have committed or attempted to commit acts of terrorism in other countries, came from Lebanon. We are expected to believe that Israel is thus justified in committing any act of aggression against Lebanon. If we are to follow this logic of aggression argued by Israel and its representative in the Security Council, who has defended recourse to the "law of the jungle" in international relations, then Lebanon in turn ought to launch reprisals against those countries through which the Israeli saboteurs came to Beirut.

71. According to press reports, they came to Lebanon as tourists from Western countries, dressed in civilian clothing and with United Kingdom, West German and Belgium passports. They based themselves in the Sands, Coral Beach and Atlantic hotels. After careful preparations, these gangsters carried out their criminal mission on 10 April. What action should Lebanon take if the logic and philosophy of the Israeli aggressors were to be followed? It should send its terrorist saboteurs to London, Bonn and Brussels to commit there acts similar to those committed by the Israeli gangsters at Beirut. Such is the monstrous logic of Israel and its representatives.

72. Mr. Tekoah, if you think seriously and responsibly about what you were saying and what you were proposing, you will yourself realize how absurd, ridiculous and monstrous are your attempts to justify this latest criminal act of aggression by your country against Lebanon. You are proposing and defending the "law of the jungle" and lynch law in relations between States. You are advocating the mediaeval law of blood vengeance—an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. How strange and monstrous! And this in the second half of the twentieth century! Eulogizing the adoption and use of such criminal methods in international relations was a characteristic only of the paranoid Hitlerites, who lost their reason in bloody orgies of permanent aggression and terrorism elevated to the level of State policy in Fascist Germany.

73. In a vain attempt to indict Lebanon and to shift the blame from the sick to the healthy, the representative of Israel expatiated on the theory that Lebanon wanted to obtain from the Security Council "licence for the continuation of terrorism". In fact that is far from being the case; the truth is quite the reverse. Israel has come here to justify its policy of international terrorism and to obtain from the Security Council licence for the continuation of its terrorism and its policy of gangsterism. But Israel's efforts and hopes are in vain. Israel has not obtained and will not obtain such licence from the Security Council. On the contrary, as many speakers have noted, Israel has been

repeatedly condemned by the Council for its policy of aggression and international gangsterism, and it will be condemned on this occasion too. The representative of Israel need have no doubt of that. Israel will be recognized as morally and politically guilty and will be condemned by the United Nations and world public opinion for this new bloody crime, even if one of its friends and highly placed protectors prevents the Security Council from adopting an appropriate resolution.

74. The Soviet Union persistently and consistently advocates a political settlement of the Middle East crisis, the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the occupied Arab territories and respect for the lawful rights of the Arab people of Palestine. Only if the question is resolved in this way can a just and lasting peace be established in the Middle East. The ending of the war in Viet-Nam has now prepared the way for all advocates of peace to multiply their efforts to liquidate the hotbed of war in the Middle East and to eliminate the consequences of Israeli aggression against the Arab States.

75. In this connexion we cannot fail to agree with those representatives who have called on the great Powers—the permanent members of the Security Council—to take active measures and do all they can to liquidate the dangerous hotbed of war in the Middle East and curb Israeli aggression. Of course there is no justification for the unfounded, indiscriminate and uncritical attempts to saddle all the great Powers with the blame for Israeli aggression. That is not the true situation. To take just one example: it is common knowledge that, in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967), the permanent members of the Council, that is to say, the great Powers, were given responsibility for providing all possible co-operation to Mr. Jarring as he carried out his noble mission of seeking a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East. We also know that, to this end, consultations were held among four permanent members of the Council, without of course the participation of the Chiang Kai-shek agent, who represented no one in the United Nations. We also know who opposed, during these consultations, the adoption of effective measures to eliminate the consequences of the aggression and to achieve a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East. Lastly, everyone is aware who sought to break off the consultations and why they were broken off. It is also common knowledge that now two of the five great Powers, permanent members of the Council, are unwilling to take part in the consultations and are thus preventing their resumption. Nor is it difficult to see who benefits from the position adopted by these permanent members. It benefits the aggressor and is directed against the victims of aggression, against the defence of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

76. For its part, the Soviet Union is ready, together with the other permanent members of the Council, to make every necessary effort, up to and including the adoption of the most effective measures, in the matter of eliminating aggression and achieving a political settlement in the Middle East. It is ready to renew immediately the consultations on the Middle East among the five permanent members of the Security Council, with a view to providing assistance to the

Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr. Jarring. And we are certain that the person who is due by rotation to preside over those consultations—I mean our distinguished colleague and friend Mr. de Guiringaud, representative of France—would also be ready to convene in the next few days a consultation meeting of the five permanent members, provided that there was no objection from certain participants in such a meeting. This is how matters stand with regard to the responsibility of the great Powers for the situation in the Middle East and the apportioning of that responsibility.

77. The essence of the problem before the Council today is Israel's stubborn unwillingness to proceed towards a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East on the basis of the well-known decisions and resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. In the five years which have elapsed since June 1967, when it carried out its imperialist aggression against three neighbouring Arab States, Israel has stubbornly refused to withdraw its troops from the unlawfully occupied Arab territories. It is cynically sabotaging a peaceful political settlement based on the decisions and demands of the United Nations and is carrying on a destructive policy of assimilation and Israeliization of the Arab territories which it seized by means of war and aggression.

78. The Israeli militarists, carried away by the impunity which they enjoy and relying on the support of international Zionism, are stoking the fires of crisis in the region more and more and are resorting to systematic gangster-like attacks and acts of violent provocation against the neighbouring Arab States.

79. Consequently, the acute conflict in the Middle East region—a result of Israel's continued aggression against the neighbouring Arab States and its continued occupation of the Arab territories which it seized—still represents a grave threat to the cause of peace.

80. Pursuing its policy of aggression and assimilation of the occupied Arab territories, the Israeli Government is flagrantly flouting the United Nations. It tries to justify its refusal to carry out the decisions and resolutions of United Nations organs with the preposterous argument that these decisions are "one-sided". No, these decisions are just. In his letter of 9 April 1973 addressed to the Secretary-General [S/10910], the representative of Israel went so far as to make the absurd assertion that the United Nations has been—I quote from his letter—"deprived... of its ability to play a meaningful role in solving the Middle East conflict".

81. This Israeli policy is a gross and unworthy challenge to the United Nations and poses a serious threat to international peace and security.

82. Recently, on 22 March 1973, on the occasion of the visit to the USSR of Mr. Saddam Hussein, Vice-President of the Council of the Revolutionary Command of Iraq, Comrade A. N. Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, stated:

"We have never doubted, nor do we now doubt, that the aggressor's attempts to impose his will on the Arabs

will fail and that he will have to leave the occupied Arab lands. The longer Israel opposes the establishment of a just peace in the Middle East, the more inglorious will be the end which awaits its aggressive policy. Such an end is inevitable. The experience of Viet-Nam proves conclusively that not even the most powerful military machine of imperialism can conquer a people which defends its freedom and independence with self-sacrifice, a people whose just cause enjoys the support of all progressive mankind."

83. The Soviet Government expresses serious concern at the tense situation in the Middle East, which has recently become even further exacerbated as a result of the piratical raids of the Israeli terrorist saboteurs in Lebanon. As was pointed out in the joint Soviet-Finnish statement of 6 April last on the occasion of the visit to Finland of Comrade N. V. Podgorny, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the Soviet Union and Finland

"have reaffirmed their conviction that it is essential to establish in the immediate future a just and lasting peace in this region on the basis of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, which provides for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied territories and for guaranteeing the security of every State in the area. Constant support must also be given to future United Nations efforts to achieve a settlement of the Middle East problem on this basis".

84. The Soviet delegation fully supports the Lebanese Government's protest at this new, unprecedentedly barefaced act of aggression by Israel against Lebanon. We categorically condemn Israel's policy of continuing its acts of terrorist aggression against Lebanon and other Arab States.

85. The Soviet delegation believes that the Security Council should take the following points into account when deciding on its course of action in this matter. The Council has not only repeatedly condemned Israel but has warned that country that if it continues its armed attacks on neighbouring Arab States, the Council will consider the question of adopting appropriate effective measures in accordance with the Charter. The time for such action has arrived. The Soviet delegation believes that the Security Council must not only categorically condemn Israel's latest gangster-like activities but also take effective steps to put an end to the extremist Israeli militarists' acts of aggression and gangsterism. The Soviet delegation is ready to support, in the Security Council, effective sanctions against Israel, even the expulsion of Israel from the United Nations on the grounds that it is a State which has made aggression a main objective of its foreign policy, stubbornly, systematically and deliberately violating the decisions of the United Nations and the fundamental purposes and principles of the Charter, which are designed to maintain and strengthen international peace and security.

86. The PRESIDENT (*Interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Israel.

87. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): If an explanation were required for the deterioration in the stature of the United Nations

and in its ability to play a constructive role in the Middle East situation—a fact which is apparently known to all but which the Soviet representative found it necessary to question today—it is sufficient to consider simply the nature of some of the statements made at yesterday's and today's meetings. Yesterday, for instance, the Council was treated to a parody of Jewish history which would be simply considered ludicrous in its mockery of truth were it not sinister in its anti-Jewish overtones. If the vicious libels against the Jewish people as compiled in the ill-famed Czarist Protocols of Zion are allowed to be repeated here in lengthy cacophony year after year, debate after debate, what can the world think of our deliberations? What can it think of a Council meeting like yesterday's, half of which was taken up by a sermon about human rights and human suffering delivered by the representative of a State, Saudi Arabia, in which slavery exists to this very day?

88. This sorry spectacle has continued at today's meeting, especially in the statement just delivered by the representative of the Soviet Union. For a representative of the Soviet Union to accuse other States of aggression, of gangsterism, of expansionism, borders on a farce. For him to speak of the non-use of force in international relations or of the right to liberty and independence of small peoples is the height of audacity. For the Soviet Union to preach about international morality, about respect for the rights of groups or individuals, is a sham. This is especially so when the discussion centres, as it does today, on measures against international terrorism. It was the Soviet Union that helped the Arab delegations to frustrate the effort made at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly to deal effectively with the scourge of international terrorism. Now the Soviet representative comes to the Council and, though he deplures acts of terrorism, he counsels victims of terrorist atrocities not to defend themselves. I wish to tell Mr. Malik that the Jewish people has had enough of that kind of advice. Our history is replete with demands that Jews passively hold their throats out to the butcher's knife. This will not happen.

89. It is high time to understand that Israel has the same right to defend itself and protect its citizens as other States and other nations. If Arab Governments refuse to abide by their international obligations and continue to support and supply terrorist groups that constantly violate the sovereignty of other States and spread violence and bloodshed all over the world, the least that Israel is entitled to do is to strike at these murderers wherever it can reach them. There cannot be one law for the Arab States and another for Israel.

90. The method of argumentation used by the Soviet representative today is perhaps best illustrated by his references to the resolution on the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. The representative of the Soviet Union built almost his entire case against Israel on Israel's vote on that resolution. However, he did not mention two simple but rather significant facts: first of all, that that resolution was initiated in the usual annual propagandistic exercise of the Soviet delegation and, secondly, that 50 States, not Israel alone, refused to support it, 46 abstained and 6 voted against.

91. It is not surprising that the Syrian Arab Republic should have chosen to participate in the debate in order to defend Arab terrorism. Its role in the inception and operation of the terrorist organizations is well known. Support of terrorist operations has been a central tenet in the policy of the Ba'ath leaders who have ruled the Syrian Arab Republic since 1966. Today it supports on its territory the largest group of terrorists based in any Arab country. Of 14,000 terrorists based in Arab States, 9,000 are located in the Syrian Arab Republic. The central military commands of some of the terrorist organizations are situated in Damascus. President Asad, in an interview with the newspaper *Al Mussawar* on 2 September 1971, stated:

"The *fedayeen* are to be found in more than one area of Syria, and they have absolute freedom of movement on the Syrian front. Moreover, we encourage and stimulate them, and often we complain that they are not sufficiently active".

President Asad also declared on Damascus Radio on 21 April 1972:

"If it had not been for Syria, there would not have been any *fedayeen* action."

The Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of the Syrian Arab Republic declared:

"We, the Syrians, wish that the support [of the *fedayeen*] should not be merely in words but that it be practical and in deeds. The *fedayeen* military activity springs from Syrian soil, and carries out successful operations with every assistance from Syria."

I am certain that the representative of Lebanon is fully aware of the truth of these facts.

92. The terrorist organizations maintain command offices in Damascus. In addition, there are regional commands in those areas of the Syrian Arab Republic where there are military bases, for example in the Dera's area. The following terrorist organizations maintain their offices in Damascus: Sa'iqa, El Fatah, the National Front and the Democratic Front. The Syrian Arab Republic is also the main centre in which conferences of the various murder groups are held. Among those groups which hold meetings regularly in that country are: the annual Conference of the El Fatah Organization, the Central Committee of the so-called Palestine Liberation Army, the Palestine Supreme Military Council, the General Council of the Palestine National Front and the Central Committee of the Democratic National Front.

93. The Syrian Arab Republic is a territorial base for several terrorist organizations, as I have already indicated. First of all, there is the organization known as Sa'iqa. This is a terrorist group established by the Syrian Ba'ath Party, the ruling party in the Syrian Arab Republic. For all practical purposes, it is part of the Syrian Army. It is headed by Syrian officials, such as Zuhayr Muhsin and Colonel Mustafa Saad el Din.

94. According to reports, it has now been established beyond any doubt that some Syrian-trained commandos in southern Lebanon are actually Syrian army soldiers in commando uniforms. Ostensibly, the Syrian-trained commandos, called Sa'iqa, aim to harass Israel. In fact, those commandos are seeded with camouflaged Syrian regulars. Three thousand of their approximately 9,000 terrorists in the Syrian Arab Republic belong to the Palestine Liberation Army. These are under Syrian army command. The status of the Palestine Liberation Army in the Syrian Arab Republic is regulated by special agreement.

95. Moreover the Syrian Arab Republic, as is well known, actively supports the Popular Front and the General Command, which split away from the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine in the summer of 1968. The Commander of that terrorist organization was a colonel in the regular Syrian army until 1967.

96. The Syrian Arab Republic maintains tight control over terrorist operations based on its territory. The Syrian Government has established a special office in Damascus which is responsible for liaison with the terrorist groups. Every terrorist operation from Syrian territory must receive the prior approval of that office. In effect, authorization is given by top-level Government and military authorities.

97. The El Fatah representative in Damascus, Abu Amar Saad, assures liaison between his organization and the Syrian Government. Military equipment destined for the terrorist organizations passes freely through Syrian ports. Syrian passports and other papers are available to terrorists on foreign missions. The Syrian authorities enable foreign volunteers to enter the Syrian Arab Republic to join the terrorist organizations.

98. In the Syrian Arab Republic are located several training bases primarily of the El Fatah organization, in addition to the training bases of other organizations such as Sa'iqa. The training in them includes basic training, naval training and special weapon training. Training is carried out in former camps of the regular Syrian army, which also provides instructors and weapons. It also supplies special courses within its own army bases.

99. The support which the Syrian Arab Republic offers those terrorist organizations is apparent through the Syrian communications media: the terrorist organizations have regular daily broadcasts on Damascus Radio. On those programmes the announcements of the terrorist organizations are broadcast, as well as political incitement against Israel. There is direct supervision by the Syrian Government of those broadcasts. In addition, the terrorist groups have their own broadcasting station in Dara. That station is also used by the terrorists to attack Jordan.

100. My observations regarding the oddity of States guilty of international depravities and yet sermonizing on proper international behaviour apply especially to the Syrian Arab Republic. Its complicity in international terrorism is only one of many of these depravities. It has simply torn to pieces the Charter of the United Nations in relation to Israel. Its Government has openly proclaimed, time and again, that it has no intention of ever making peace with

Israel. It has unequivocally rejected Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. The avowed objective of the State whose representative lectured the Council today on international law and morality is to destroy a neighbouring State Member of the United Nations.

101. This is also the declared objective of another Government that has abused this forum—Algeria. Its President put it very succinctly when he said: “The true freedom of the entire homeland must be won through the liquidation of the State of the Zionists.” And this was confirmed again today by the Algerian representative. This is the key to the understanding of what Israel confronts in Arab terrorism, for this is also the fundamental motivation of the terrorist organization—destroy the Jewish State, annihilate the Jewish people. It is this bloodthirsty objective that has brought about the savage atrocities of El Fatah, Black September and other Arab murder groups. It is this bloodlust that made it possible for Algiers radio to state on 13 March 1973, after the slaughter of the three diplomats in Sudan’s capital:

“The *fedayeen* who carried out the Khartoum operations are honourable men; they are not murderers. Let Gaafar al-Nimeiry understand this.”

102. This is the attitude and these are the outrages that the Government of Israel and other responsible Governments have to cope with. No action to thwart such bestialities can be inappropriate. There is no principle superior to that of preservation of life.

103. Finally, I should like to rebut the attempts made again at this meeting to whitewash the sinister nature and motivations of Arab terrorism. The generally felt revulsion from Arab terrorism is due in large measure to its particular features. Firstly, the atrocities to which Jews in Israel and abroad have been subjected are conceived, initiated, organized and perpetrated as assaults on innocent civilians. The ambushing of school buses, the detonation of explosive charges in supermarkets crowded with women shoppers, or in universities, and the murder of athletes at Munich are all acts deliberately directed against defenceless civilians.

104. Secondly, these crimes are planned and executed in a manner in which the killing is indiscriminate. It does not matter to the assailants who the victims are. The blowing up of civil aircraft in flight, the slaughter of passengers who happen to be at an air terminal, are not concerned with the identity of the casualties. The aim is murder for murder’s sake. In fact, in the words of a leader of one of the terror organizations interviewed some time ago by the London *Daily Mail*, it is immaterial who the dead are “. . . so long as they are Jews”. This is one of the most revolting aspects of this terrorist campaign, for, in a way reminiscent of the Nazi atrocities against the Jews of Europe, Jewish people in various parts of the globe have been earmarked for physical destruction. In Israel, every Jew, whether man, woman or child, is considered a target for murder.

105. But the plague, as we know, has spread to other regions. As long ago as 1970 Arab terrorists had set fire to a Jewish home for the aged in Germany, killing seven of its

innocent elderly inhabitants. More recently, booby-trapped letters have been sent to a Jewish home for the aged in Frankfurt. A Jewish welfare organization in Rome has received similar letters. So have Jewish women in New York active in an organization devoted to medical assistance. Jewish businessmen in the United Kingdom have been showered with the deadly envelopes. Non-Jews, as well, have at times fallen victims to these assaults and, frequently, the terrorist groups direct their murderous attacks against Arabs themselves.

106. These characteristics of the campaign of atrocities conducted against Israel and the Jewish people, the fact that it is directed by premeditation against guiltless civilians, the fact that it aims at indiscriminate murder for murder’s sake and the fact that it regards Jews everywhere as targets for physical destruction are sufficient to make it a heinous onslaught on humanity requiring effective counter-measures of the kind taken by the Israel defence forces on 9 to 10 April.

107. The barbarism of this Arab onslaught is further deepened by its openly declared objective which, as I pointed out, is to destroy a State Member of the United Nations and to wrest from the Jewish people its right to self-determination, freedom and independence. This is the banner under which Jewish blood is being spilled. It is in the name of this savage goal that men, women and children are being slaughtered. It is a design to take the life of individual Jewish people so as to deprive the entire Jewish nation of the rights enjoyed by other nations.

108. As I indicated yesterday [1705th meeting], the Arab nation has secured these very rights for itself in 18 sovereign Arab States Members of the United Nations. The Arabs of Palestine have attained these rights within Jordan, a State which is Palestinian geographically and demographically. Yet the terrorist organizations supported by Arab Governments have unleashed a campaign that denies the Jewish people’s right to national existence and would like to destroy its sovereign State.

109. There is no objective that could be more despicable. Violence has rarely been put in the service of so criminal a cause. Not since the days of Hitler have Jews as Jews been the target of a campaign of premeditated slaughter. Not since Hitler have Governments praised the planned, indiscriminate murder of Jews, as some Governments, through their representatives, have done today. Not since the Nazi SS and their *Einsatz Kommandos* have organizations, acting with governmental blessing, gloated over the blood of innocent Jews—men, women and children—shed in bestial atrocities.

110. Arab terrorism is doing that again. Arab terrorist organizations are again engaged in such outrages. Again their Governments—Arab Governments—stand behind crimes which draw inspiration from the genocide of the Jewish people by the Hitlerite hordes. The historic and ideological affinity between the Nazi atrocities and Arab terrorism is well known. Only ignorance, gullibility or wilful malevolence will accept the propaganda distortion repeated today that Arab terrorism is the result of the refugee problem or of the 1967 hostilities. I have already

drawn attention to the fact that this reprehensible murder and bloodshed had its beginnings half a century earlier. The spiritual father and organizer of Arab terrorism is the notorious Haj Amin el-Husseini, mentioned by me yesterday, the former Mufti of Jerusalem, who initiated, in the 1920s, a campaign of violence and terror against the Jews of Palestine.

111. On 4 April 1920, Husseini launched an attack on the Jews of the old city of Jerusalem, massacring, burning and pillaging for four days. In the following year, 47 Jews were killed in terrorist attacks organized by him and his murder groups. Then came other assaults such as the massacre of the Jewish communities of Hebron and Safad in 1929, in which 133 defenceless Jewish men, women and children were slaughtered and 339 wounded. The campaign of terror and murder continued under the same leadership during the 1930s. Throughout that period, Husseini maintained close contact with the Hitler régime. When the Second World War broke out, he went to Berlin, where he acted as Hitler's and Eichmann's adviser in the annihilation of European Jewry. The Allies declared him a war criminal. He is still being sought by the Yugoslav Government. After the war, he was arrested but escaped and made his way back to the Middle East. This is the man who initiated Arab terrorism and conducted it for 20 years. This is the man who, though a war criminal on the Allied Powers' lists, including that of the Soviet Union, is free today in the Arab States to pursue his nefarious activities and to continue the incitement to shed Jewish blood. That is the true face of Arab terrorism.

112. Since Israel's independence in 1948, attacks have been used, through this method, during the periods of the continuing war against the Jewish State, when attack by a regular Arab army has appeared too hazardous. This is what happened in the 1950s and in the 1960s, and this is what is taking place today. The first terrorist hordes came from Sinai and Gaza. Their crimes were brought to an end in 1956, when Israel destroyed their bases in those regions. Terror warfare moved, however, to Israel's eastern and northern frontiers. El Fatah was established in the late 1950s and began its armed attacks in 1965 on the initiative of the Syrian Government. Indeed, the 1960s were years of growing armed forays by terrorist gangs from Jordan, and particularly from the Syrian Arab Republic directed against Israeli civilians in towns and villages, on the roads and in the field. This campaign of cruel violence and murder against the people of Israel was one of the factors that contributed to the outbreak of the 1967 hostilities.

113. Since 1967, frustrated in their effort to undermine the Jewish people's determination to defend its inalienable rights, taken aback by the refusal of the Arab inhabitants of Israeli-administered areas to co-operate with them, the terror organizations began to have recourse to increasingly barbaric methods, trying in this manner to earn at least international attention. Well, they have. Savage outrages have become their trademark. The world suddenly realized that no one, nowhere, was safe from the atrocities of Arab terrorists. Their crimes became a plague that is threatening to destroy the very fabric of international life, and the initiators and perpetrators of this campaign of terror have been trying to conceal its true nature, as we heard today,

behind a screen of borrowed slogans and misappropriated ideals. The objective of destroying the sole Jewish sovereignty is explained by them as "purification of the land" and "a struggle against aggression". An unabashed effort to deprive the Jewish people of Israel of its right to self-determination is presented as a war of liberation in the name of self-determination. Indiscriminate and cowardly murder of innocent Jewish civilians is hailed as "heroism". Gangs unrepresentative of the Arab population composed of paid assassins, foreign mercenaries and military personnel from regular Arab armies are depicted as champions of ideals and humane values.

114. The Nazi roots of Amin el-Husseini, the counsels of the Nazi propaganda advisers employed by Egypt and the Syrian Arab Republic are bearing fruit. The Nazis, too, killed Jews saying that they were purifying the land. They, too, shed Jewish blood under the pretext that they were liberating Germany and then Europe from the Jews. The Nazis, too, like the Arab States today, awarded the laurels of heroism to the slaughterers of Jewish women and children. No semantic contortions can remove the stigma of wanton, cruel bloodshed from the Arab terrorist campaign. Responsible Governments will combat it, not defend it as the three preceding speakers did.

115. Mr. ABDULLA (Sudan): Mr. President, it gives my delegation great pleasure to welcome you in the chair of the Security Council for the month of April. I had the pleasure of your close company and friendship during the Special Mission of the Security Council to Zambia last February, when I came to realize and appreciate your wisdom, your integrity and objectivity. I have no doubt that these qualities will enable you to conduct your presidency with every success.

116. Last month the Council was also fortunate to be presided over by yet another Latin American of distinguished qualities and long-standing experience in the affairs of state and the United Nations. I refer to Mr. Aquilino Boyd of the Republic of Panama. We owe him warm congratulations for the admirable manner in which he guided the Council during the discussions of the difficult Latin American questions, here in New York and at Panama City. We are also indebted to his Government and people for the kind hospitality and treatment extended to us during our stay in that beautiful city.

117. Until two months ago the whole world had been haunted and threatened by three dangerous issues, namely, Viet-Nam, Israeli aggressions, and the racist régimes in southern Africa. With the end of hostilities in Viet-Nam and the advent of peace in the area, South-East Asia has left behind a quarter of a century of unbelievable misery and suffering, and the whole world rejoices for the people of the area.

118. Yet for years Israel and the other racist régimes have continued to defy the world by conducting systematic campaigns of terror as part of a permanent policy. The use of force and the continuous threat of the use of force are not practised as a matter of expediency, but as part of a philosophy of intimidation and domination over others.

119. In the case of Israel one cannot fail to see that from the moment of its creation by the United Nations it has based the whole of its system on military settlements, on a huge military institution far beyond its financial capacity built on the old organs of terrorism, which account for the murder and assassination of hundreds of Arab Palestinians and others. The Haganah, the Irgun and the Stern gangs, that were responsible for barbarous murders before and after the creation of Israel, form the core of the Israeli Army, which is now playing havoc in and outside the region.

120. I need not go into the nature of Israel and its philosophy of Zionism, from which both Arabs and millions of innocent Jews suffer—under its intimidation and extortions. Its practised policy of military aggression and its expansionist policy of military force—before and after its creation—fill the annals of the United Nations. No Member of this Organization has a more eventful record of playing defendant before this Council than Israel. No other country but Israel, and for that matter the similar racist and colonialist régimes in southern Africa, has arrogantly and contemptuously defied this august Council.

121. Indeed, Mr. Tekoah has been candid enough to admit the guilt of his country in committing aggressions against sovereign States and claiming the blood of the innocent victims—those Palestinian Arabs for whose destitution and misery Israel has been responsible for the last quarter of a century. This admission is always wrapped up in all sorts of rationalization which no thinking person can accept. On various occasions we have listened to absurd distortions of history, of how the Arabs murdered Jews in 1947, when it is a well-known fact that the Arabs never attacked Jews nor destroyed Jewish property in the Israeli sector. On the contrary, it was the Israeli gangs which committed murders and destruction in the Arab sector. Another distortion of fact, which is repeatedly referred to, concerns the association of the Mufti of Palestine with Eichmann, whereas Eichmann himself denied any such association, except for a meeting at a reception. All those incidents of violence which Mr. Tekoah keeps citing, and for which he holds Lebanon responsible, are the very ultimate results of Israeli aggression and terrorism.

122. From the time of the inscription of the item on international violence and terrorism on the agenda of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly, my delegation warned that both Israel and the racist and colonial régimes in southern Africa would not hesitate to exploit a genuine and sincere movement in extending their policy of aggression and terrorism. Indeed, this was immediately confirmed by Mr. Aba Eban during the same General Assembly session, and by no less a person than Mrs. Golda Meir, who declared that the strong arm of Israel would reach the Palestinians everywhere in the world.¹ And we have more cases of murder and assassination in various countries committed by Israeli agents, including the death of 106 innocent men, women and children in the Libyan civil airliner, confirming the determination of Israel to create international terrorism. Mr. Tekoah, for the sake of

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2045th meeting.

truth, should have quoted the numerous cases of terrorism everywhere which Israel has committed indirectly or directly, and of which this latest aggression is but one glaring example. These digressions and rhetorical statements by Mr. Tekoah should not and cannot divert the attention and the grave concern of this Council from the very case under consideration.

123. The representatives of Lebanon and Saudi Arabia yesterday [1705th meeting] presented a specific case of premeditated aggression by Israel against peace-loving and peace-loving Lebanon and the heinous act of the bloody murder of innocent men and women in the early hours of the day and in their bedrooms. This is a deplorable criminal act of a dual nature where both a State and innocent people are involved. We know from Israel's declared policy itself, from the statements of Mr. Tekoah before this Council and from the oft-repeated rationalizations that these crimes against Lebanon and innocent people will be repeated. They will always be repeated in the name of the security of Israel, which threatens but was never threatened. We know that the ultimate aim of Israel is to exterminate the 2.5 million Arab Palestinians who claim their right to their homes in Palestine and their right to self-determination. We all know that a people, who are determined to struggle by all possible means for their inherent rights, cannot be scared by the force of arms or persuaded by a 1 per cent money bribe from Arab oil or elsewhere, as naively suggested by Mr. Tekoah, to give up their natural rights. Indeed, the Arab Palestinians can no longer be called refugees and continue to live on charity. To kill Palestinian politicians like El Najjai or Nassa or Adwan does not necessarily mean to kill the burning fires of nationalism in a people or to pacify the millions of young men and women whom Israel drove into destitution and bitterness.

124. It is not for Israel alone to ponder the impossibility of killing the urge for self-determination and independence. It is the duty of the United Nations to uphold the right of the Palestinian Arabs not as refugees but as a legitimate national liberation movement.

125. We strongly believe that these crimes repeatedly committed by Israel against Lebanon and other neighbouring countries and its premeditated acts of terrorism and their repercussions can only stop when Israel sincerely decides to live in peace and give up its policy of aggression and extermination of the Palestinian people and to withdraw within the borders assigned to it by the United Nations. We regret to say that every declaration or act by Israel indicates the contrary. As long as Israel is assured of the over-stocking of Phantoms, Skyhawks, sophisticated weapons and billions of dollars, it is unlikely that it will elect to live by methods other than force and violence. In that case, the Council will soon have to face yet another aggression by Israel on Lebanon or any other Arab State.

126. For the time being, the Israeli acts of aggression and piracy in Lebanon of 10 April should be condemned in the strongest terms, and Israel should be instructed forthwith to stop any premeditated aggression on Lebanon under any of the familiar Israeli pretexts. In view of the repeated aggressions, should Israel continue to take the law into its own hands and extend its terrorism on a world-wide scale,

making itself a promoter of international terrorism, this Council should seriously consider applying effective measures along the lines stipulated by the Charter. Should Israel repeat its criminal practices, my delegation would be quite disposed to suggest such lines of action to the Council.

127. Finally, I wish to state that we strongly believe that, as long as Israel is enabled to maintain its occupation of the lands of others by force of arms and to practise its policy of expansion against neighbouring States, depriving the people of Palestine of their legitimate rights, the situation in the Middle East will remain extremely dangerous. It remains the duty of this Council to resolve this situation, which poses a constant threat to international peace and security. Every delay in taking such a decision will lead to further aggravation of the situation.

128. I reserve my right to speak further on this subject.

129. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, it gives me particular pleasure to congratulate you on your assuming the presidency of the Council for the month of April in view of our warm and friendly personal relations, the co-operation between our two Missions in all the work of the United Nations and the friendly, substantial and growing relations between our two countries and Governments and their co-operation in bilateral and international fields. We are both guided by the growing feeling of a community of interests and proximity of views. You can always count on us to extend to you our full support in your arduous responsibility of steering the Council in pursuance of its tasks, a responsibility for which you are personally so eminently equipped.

130. In saying how much we were impressed by the manner and total dedication with which the representative of Panama, our good friend Aquilino Boyd, discharged his duties as President for the month of March, I avail myself of the opportunity once more to convey through him to the people and Government of Panama our warmest thanks for their hospitality and friendship during our meetings there.

131. It would be easy to succumb to a feeling of familiarity and routine when faced with yet another complaint by Lebanon about yet another aggressive attack by Israel and when participating in yet another meeting of the Security Council seized of the problem. But to permit that feeling to gain ground would not only be unjustified; it would be irresponsible and dangerous, and we, the whole international community, would do so at our collective peril.

132. There can be no sense of familiarity or simple repetition, no shrugging of shoulders, when we are faced, not only with acts of aggression and armed attacks against and on the territory of a sovereign State, a peaceful Member of the United Nations, but also and especially with a most dangerous escalation of that war-like policy based on the use of military force. The latest raid launched by Israel in darkness in Beirut, resulting *inter alia* in the death of a score of innocent civilians, is but the latest example of what that policy means and where it leads. The recent and

no less, if not more, grave bombing attacks by Israel against two refugee camps—one of them a camp of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East—which killed a large number of innocent civilians including women and children, should not be forgotten, although the Council did not meet to consider that gravest of attacks and in my opinion was remiss in not doing so. The downing of a civilian aircraft, a Libyan airliner, with the known catastrophic consequences—the death of more than 100 innocent civilians, again including children and women—was also a tragic event to be seen in the context of the policy of ready use of arrogant and naked force. That it was a civilian airliner and that it had turned to leave the airspace of occupied Sinai and was heading towards Cairo is now no longer disputed by anyone.

133. That policy, a policy of aggression, of intimidation by force, of territorial expansion, of keeping peoples under subjugation, has been condemned by my Government and also by the United Nations many times and there is no need for me today to repeat again everything we stated here in February, June, July and September of last year whenever we were considering a new act of aggression committed by Israel.

134. But what is particularly onerous in the latest case, as in so many previous ones, is that a superior, stronger, more numerous and better equipped force—the force of a State that defies the whole international community and officially proclaims its right to the arbitrary use of that force—is used against a smaller, weaker, peaceful country whose only protection is the United Nations, the international community and its collective interest in not permitting explicit or implicit, public or tacit licence for the use or threat of force as an instrument for the settlement of international disputes.

135. It is in that context that the Security Council has to react and must meet every time, without let-up, if only to reiterate that mankind is not about to acquiesce in the use of force, that no one can expect from us, by repetition or otherwise, to deaden our opposition to it, to lead us to the conclusion that it is useless to continue doing anything about it. The interests of any country, especially small and non-militaristic countries, make it imperative for us to act in whatever fashion we can.

136. This last attack, which is only the direct and most immediate cause of the Lebanese Government's complaint, provides perhaps the most concentrated example of that particular and most threatening kind of international terrorism, the terrorism of State, governmental terrorism, based on and employing all resources of a constituted State organization. It is quite inadmissible to link it and to equate it with, let alone to justify it by, individual, senseless terrorist activity by individual persons. It is no accident that, in its whole history, the position of the United Nations, when addressing itself to aggression by States, has been and is unmistakable and clear. The Charter is very firm and specific on this point, and that is why at its twenty-seventh session, the General Assembly, in formulating its agenda item on "measures to prevent international terrorism", found it overwhelmingly necessary to include

the "underlying causes of those forms of terrorism and acts of violence which lie in misery, frustration, grievance and despair". It is because of all the attempts, employed throughout history, to blacken the just struggle of peoples for freedom and independence, that the international community must always make clear that a distinction should be made between international terrorism and that liberation struggle.

137. We are against international, individual, senseless terrorism that causes deaths and hardship to innocent persons and which, whatever its real sources, is so often used to bring into question the inalienable right of peoples to resort to force in defending their very lives, existence, freedom, independence, territory and equality. Our views on the matter were clearly stated in last year's consideration of the issue of international terrorism in the General Assembly. Equally, my Government's position and reaction to individual terrorist acts, recent as well as earlier ones, which have taken place since the Second World War, is a matter of public record for all Governments to know. But let me repeat that nothing in our attitude towards individual acts of international terrorism can be construed or used in order to deny to peoples, including the Palestinian people, their right to fight for their just and true rights.

138. All that we are faced with today in the present discussions in the Council must be seen in the context and as a consequence of the still unsettled crisis in the Middle East and of the still existing hotbed of war, which represents a grave situation that erodes regional and international peace and security. The major, fundamental reason for that situation is the refusal of Israel to comply with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and all the other relevant resolutions of the Council, the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies. The main cause is its hold on the occupied Arab territories and its expansionist policy of annexation and its constant and brutal denial of the basic rights of the Palestinians.

139. It should therefore be generally clear and accepted that we cannot deal with the consequences before and without removing the causes. That remains the responsibility of the whole international community. That must be recognized by all, especially by those who are instrumental in preventing a peaceful solution on the basis of resolution 242 (1967), a solution founded on respect for the legitimate interests and rights of all States and peoples in the area. It is an undeniable fact that, whatever new steps were taken by responsible Arab Governments to facilitate the peaceful settlement on the aforementioned basis, whatever requests, proclaimed as allegedly fundamental and final ones, they satisfied, they were then always faced with yet new demands and new conditions that would amount to surrender.

140. The simplest and the first answer to the question of what we can do in response to Lebanon's complaint is that we cannot afford to do nothing, to lend a mute acceptance to the acts of aggression committed so far and to those which will, judging by the attitude taken by Israel, undoubtedly follow in the near future.

141. The United Nations has a firm, definite position on the Middle Eastern situation embodied in Council resolution 242 (1967) and all other United Nations resolutions, the last one being General Assembly resolution 2949 (XXVII). It is a noteworthy phenomenon that the ever-increasing number of positive votes, and the ever-decreasing number of negative votes or abstentions, are successively cast for resolutions that deplore the non-compliance of Israel with previous resolutions, declare the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by force and affirm that they must be restored; they call for the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the last conflict, and so forth. And that change in voting patterns is the result, not only of the increase in the membership of our Organization, but also of changes of attitudes by a growing number of countries, which indicates increasing opposition to the policy of force and occupation and to the policy of governmental terrorism.

142. The Security Council must stress that it is not ready to tolerate total disrespect and contempt for the whole international community, for the United Nations and for its decisions. We have to demonstrate that we are not about to become passive observers in escalating aggression. We must condemn the Israeli attack on Lebanese territory and the assassination of the Palestinian Liberation Movement members there.

143. We think it is high time for this organ of the United Nations, entrusted with the main responsibility for international peace and security, to review the whole Middle Eastern situation, which is continuously aggravated by the non-compliance with resolution 242 (1967), as well as other resolutions, to examine the reasons for the non-implementation of those resolutions and to see what should be done to make possible and ensure their final implementation.

144. In conclusion, let me only add that the Yugoslav delegation is convinced that the next summit meeting of the heads of State and Government of Non-Aligned Countries, to be held in Algiers in September this year, will give its full attention to all these matters and will constitute, as always, a direct help to the United Nations in its efforts to stop aggression and to bring a just peace to the Middle East.

145. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

146. Mr. KELANI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from French*): I apologize for speaking a second time, but the representative of Israel acted as if he were exercising his right of reply in order to refute the accusations against the authorities of his country with regard to their usurpationist, colonialist, aggressive terrorist activities, against the United Nations and in violation of the Charter. All he did in fact in his reply was to bear out his accusers. There were no references in his statement to resolutions of the United Nations or to the Palestinian people or respect for the sovereignty, the territorial integrity of Member States or to

the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force or to the series of colonial conquests. He did not even mention the genocide which the Zionist authorities are practicing. His statements were insults, defamations, distortions, theatrical gestures and digressions from fundamental truth. He is to be pardoned. After all, he can do nothing else. The acts of the Israeli authorities are, after all, too much soaked in blood for him to be able to defend them. As for the thesis advanced at length, whereby terrorism is perpetrated by the Arabs rather than the Zionists, I should like to refer the speaker whose hypocrisy is hidden behind a facade of eloquence to the book by his inspirer, Menachem Begin, who told history differently. As everyone agrees, he is a far more credible authority. This is the same man who came through New York in 1948. A welcoming committee was formed comprising many members of the Congress and United States Government officials. Nevertheless, having learnt of Begin's exploits, several of them dissociated themselves from the committee. Among them was a man who was to become the President of the United States in 1960. Senator John Kennedy, who indicated to the president of the Committee his desire to withdraw his name from the welcoming committee for Menachem Begin, the commander of the Irgun force. He said: "In accepting your invitation, I was not aware of the true nature of these activities, and I wish to dissociate myself from them completely."

147. The facts are more eloquent than the false protests of innocence and purity of the spokesmen of zionism which are a cover for hatred and racism.

148. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Saudi Arabia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

149. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I was somewhat astonished that after so many years the representative of Israel, none other than Mr. Tekoah, finally deigned to mention me and to refer to my statement of yesterday. He referred to the country I represent as one that still has slavery. I do not know whether he has any spies in Saudi Arabia who misinformed him, but the fact is that we abolished slavery quite some time ago. I do not know why he does not mention slavery in other countries. For example, there were countries, like the allies of Israel, that traded in slaves. They had a civil war here, I think, in 1860. Although that war was for the abolition of slavery, it had economic undertones between the North and South of the United States. But he does not mention slavery except in Saudi Arabia. I do not know why he should refer to slavery in Saudi Arabia. I know very well that slavery does not exist there. None other than a former Ambassador of the United States, Mr. Hart, made a speech to an organization of do-gooders here or in England; there are societies for the abolition of slavery all over the world. He said: "I did not see any slaves; there are no slaves any more in Saudi Arabia." That was some years ago. However, if I were to enter into what is done in certain countries in connexion with white slavery, the slavery of addiction to drugs and social ills in the world, I think I would spend more time than I should, and we are not here to deal with the social

ills that exist in many parts of the world, including no doubt Palestine, where the authorities of Mr. Tekoah seem to think that they have a model rule that everybody should copy.

150. And the Zionists arrogated to themselves the right to come from outside of Palestine and occupy it. That is the first point.

151. The second point is this: they arrogated to themselves the right to expel the Palestinians from their homes by expropriation. And Mr. Tekoah talks about slavery.

152. Thirdly, they arrogated to themselves the right to incarcerate 10,000 Palestinians. And they talk about slavery. The Zionist State arrogated to itself the right to subject 1 million Palestinians to the rule of Israel, which is tantamount to colonialism. And they talk about slavery.

153. They have occupied the Holy Places of Christians and Moslems; and some Christians and Moslems think that Israel has desecrated those Holy Places. And they talk of the social ills that exist in the Arab world.

154. Last, but not least, they have denied the people of Palestine the right to self-determination. And they talk of human rights and charge that the Arabs have trodden human rights underfoot, and allege that the Arabs—and, more specifically, the Palestinians—want to destroy the Jewish people, 17 or 18 million of them, dispersed over the world—mighty Jewish people.

155. And then we are told that the Arabs are aggressors. There is an Arabic proverb that says: "He hit me and was the first to cry". But Mr. Tekoah has forgotten the intramural or intra-religious—if I may use that term—discrimination that is prevalent in occupied Palestine: the oriental—Yemenite—Jews, if they are swarthy, if the colour of their faces is not pink, are looked down upon by the Ashkenazy Jew. I am quoting what we read sometimes by writers, not in Arab newspapers, but in the Jewish press. I did not bring cuttings here to quote chapter and verse from the Jewish press because I would be burdening the Council with too many details. And Mr. Tekoah speaks of international morality and uses syllogisms that are based on invalid logical premises, for the simple reason that Palestine was sold down the Thames by the British—that is the invalid premise—in 1917 by Mr. Balfour, as I mentioned the other day, because the British wanted to cling to a straw. They were sinking; the Germans were beating them; and had it not been for United States entry into the First World War in 1917, when the Soviet Union got out of the war due to the Revolution, the British would have been beaten by the Germans—not the Nazi Germans: there were no Nazis at that time—by the militarists, the Kaiser, with his mustaches. He was the tyrant they were fighting; the allies were fighting German militarism. And we all know that the allies, between France and England, had the biggest military and naval power. They were fighting German mercantilism, because the Germans, cooped up as they were in the continent of Europe, were more disciplined and were outselling the British in the British colonies and in Latin America, and everywhere; so the allies had to wage a war "to save the world for democracy". And there was less

democracy after the First World War than there was before it. This is not Baroody telling you this: this is British and French historians and scholars, who are objective.

156. And then the Zionists seized that opportunity: Russia was having a revolution; the United Kingdom was in a bad state; and the late Mr. Balfour forgot what he had promised the Arabs in 1916 that, if they would fight on his side, the 400 years of Turkish rule would be over. There were posters in the Arab world about the liberation of the Arab world from our brothers the Turks. That was the biggest mistake, that the Arabs fought on the side of the British; they should never have done it. They seized the opportunity, those Ashkenazies from Eastern Europe who had been converted to Judaism in the eighth century and who had never hailed from the area, in order to bring the United States into the First World War in 1917. Otherwise, if the United States had not come to the rescue of the Western allies, they would have lost the war. So the Zionists capitalized on it. As I said, they turned their backs on the Germans, because the Germans could not help them with the Turks. That is how they came to Palestine, those European political Zionists who had nothing to do with the area. And they called Palestine "our land". And Mr. Tekoah speaks of international morality. Okay—as the people of the host country would say. All right. So what? Finally, the United Nations, in 1947, voted for the partition of Palestine and, as I said yesterday, before the State Department knew about it, the late Mr. Truman recognized the State of Israel for political motives. Every politician has certain motives.

157. Why should the Palestinian people pay the price when at that time, as I said, in 1947, two thirds of the population consisted of the indigenous people of Palestine and one third of Zionists—or call them Jews because many were innocent Jews, Jews who were harassed, Jews who had fled from Europe because of the persecution by Hitler. They fled, and they were one third. What right had the United Nations to vote for the partition of Palestine when the majority consisted of the indigenous people of the land regardless of whether they were Arabs, or Chinese, or Indians, or what have you? What right? Just by way of a vote? The vote was invalid in so far as justice is concerned: it was valid by force. That is what happened.

158. Unfortunately, as I said yesterday, all the five permanent members of the Security Council—which should have known better—voted for the creation of Israel, no doubt for interests of their own because I do not think they cast their votes lightly. Anyway, the British motives in 1917 were recounted by Sir Ronald Storrs to a friend of mine who is 83 years old and now lives in Cape Cod. I can get you a written statement from him. Sir Ronald Storrs was an Arabist in the Arab Agency in Cairo when Egypt was a British Protectorate, and at the time he asked Lord Balfour "How can we justify this declaration?—the declaration which was later named after Balfour. Lord Balfour replied, "Oh, this will be a great experiment for the preservation of the British Empire." So it was not for the beauty of Jewish eyes that Balfour gave his Declaration. He thought that the British Empire, over which the sun never set, was to be perpetuated for ever. Where is the British

Empire now? Where are the other empires that tottered down because they were built on injustice?

159. And you Zionists were very clever. You seized opportunities; you railroaded the United States into the war. You took that opportunity of siding with the Western Allies, just as the Arabs were—if I may so call them—"suckers" and fought with the British against the Ottomans, and should never have done so. But this is hindsight now. And you speak of international morality? The whole basis on which the Zionist State was built was wrong, I submit. But when I spoke with the Zionists—when I was on speaking terms with them in London and elsewhere in the 1930s and early 1940s—I asked them: "Why do you not accept in a State a ratio of two thirds indigenous population and one third Jews?" Their spokesmen were always evasive, and some of them said: "Because this land was given to us by God". I did not know they had had a telephone conversation with God. How can God give land to people? And suppose there are people who do not believe that God gives land? What will you do?

160. I cited yesterday what King David said in the Psalms: "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof". You can take certain things out of context in any holy book—whether it is the Bible, the Koran or the New Testament—and build upon it what you want.

161. And many of us have been reasonable. Many of us say: "If you want to live in peace, all right, you were persecuted, come and live in peace amongst the Palestinians—whom you have chased out". And you talk of terrorism—because all this argument here revolves around terrorist acts. But these are only, shall I say, accessory parts of the question; they are not the core of the whole question.

162. Terrorism? Who does not deplore terrorism? We all know that if people are killed, whether they are Jews or Gentiles, it is something really to be deplored. Of course, the masses, whether they are Zionists or Palestinians, can be fomented and roused and made to shout in the streets that they should take vengeance. But if the leaders have that kind of an attitude, they should never be leaders, because we are all brothers under the skin, human beings. Forget your Jewishness, for Heaven's sake. There is nothing but Jewish *matzo's* and so on in the newspapers. "Eat this and eat that." You are entitled to it, but do not brandish it to such an extent that you separate yourselves so as to be the butt of discrimination by fanatics. That is what you are doing. You are making a world problem. How many Jews are there? Seventeen million? Out of which perhaps 500,000, if that many, are diehard political Zionists. They do not leave the Jews of the world alone. They keep after them. "You are the chosen people of God." In other words, if God chooses this people, we are second-class people, third-class people, depending on how you classify us—the *goyim*, as you call many of us.

163. You speak of social ills and of slavery when you set yourselves above other people. Whom do you think you are fooling, Mr. Tekoah? And have you forgotten Deir Yassin? You spoke about those Zionists who, unfortunately, were murdered, just as, unfortunately, the Palestinians were

murdered. Have you forgotten Count Bernadotte? Even the Europeans forgot him about two or three months after he was murdered. Why? Because you have permeated the whole Western world and now you are trying to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to release USSR citizens who happen to be of the Jewish faith. Why do you not take poor Lebanon, which you have encroached upon, as an example? It has all sects, and they are trying to live in peace. You go and bring pressure. Seventy-six Senators banded together in Washington to bring pressure on Mr. Nixon's administration to say that if the Soviet Union did not release Zionists they would not grant it the most-favoured-nation clause in trade. And you are a small, poor State? You are afraid the Arabs will push you into the sea. The Arabs cannot push a frog into the sea, you know that. It leaps by itself into the sea. Do not propagandize. I am telling you the truth here so that, if it does not go over to your authorities, you may convey it for what it is worth. And you think I come here to sermonize. I do not sermonize. I am not a preacher; I am not a Rabbi, nor a minister nor a religious sheikh. I am just telling you the truth as I see it, and I stand to be corrected. And you use your rhetorical phrases here.

164. You used the words, "the deterioration in the stature of the United Nations", "a parody of Jewish history", "sinister in its anti-Jewish overtones". These are your words, I have them here. "Stature of the United Nations". The United Nations is your mother. It created you and you are cursing your mother now. Twenty-two condemnations leveled against Israel by your mother. "Oh", you said, "of course it was rigged". What about the partitioning of Palestine? Was it not rigged? You had Palestine partitioned by pressure. You only have to read the second volume—do not buy the hardcover book; there is a paperback edition—of Mr. Truman's book to see how he was pestered and how he had to admit Mr. Weizmann through the back door because he did not know what to do. His former haberdashery partner, Jacobson, told Mr. Truman that those Zionists "are pestering me all the time; please do something for them". Jacobson was a Jew. He did not begin as a Zionist, but he ended up by being a Zionist. He went to plead with Mr. Truman. And you talk about international morality. The whole creation of Israel was artificial and a mistake. All right, we have to accept the mistake. There you are in the midst of the Arab world.

165. Do you not think about the long term, if you can survive—and I hope nobody will hurt you personally, or any human being, whether he is a Jew or a Gentile? Do you not think about the 120 million Arabs? Suppose you can ingather another 3 million or 4 million Jews. You cannot survive there by force of sheer numbers unless you perhaps pave the way for a holocaust. Then there would be a world war and it would not matter who survived. You are so drunk with power that you do not think of the future. Do you not realize that, in order to be able to survive, you have to come to terms with the Palestinian people? And who are those Palestinian people? They seem to be quite alive. Otherwise you would not be sending marauders to kill them. They are alive and kicking. But, as I said, they are not accountable to Arab countries and they make it very difficult for Arab countries to continue to rule, because the

young among the Arabs, fortunately or unfortunately—I try to be objective—happen to be with the Palestinian people. And what shall we do? Shall we kill our young or tell them, "You should not be with the Palestinian people?" Where is your cleverness? Why do you not apply the cleverness that you have in commerce, in banking and in other matters to the fact that the Arab youth is inflamed by the Palestinians and that many Governments know it. If they oppose the youth, they can become victims of the youth. You may say, "Never mind, let them become victims so that Israel can survive and flourish and prosper". Well, what human logic. No matter what you and your colleagues have said about governments in the past—that they are autocratic and that you are the only democracy—what kind of democracy is it that chases the people of Palestine outside their borders and incarcerates 10,000, which is indicative of the suppression of rebels who have to be punished because they are clamouring for their independence?

166. So might is right. Was it Nietzsche who said that? I do not know. Americans say it here; "Might is right". But they rebel against might here in this country. I believe that in 1776 they rebelled against the might of the British and there was the war of liberation.

167. But you also arrogate to yourself the right to go and chastise any Palestinians wherever they may be. And you consider yourselves as one of the most advanced States in the modern world. What do you think of France? Is not France perhaps one of the most beloved States for its culture, its art, its traditions and its humanism? In 1954 it fell to me to write a letter of complaint against France for staying in Algeria. There was a war and the French had half a million French troops there. It took a man of the stature of de Gaulle to put an end to that war. Where did the so-called rebels and terrorists, who were heroes to the Algerians, sometimes take refuge? In Tunisia and Morocco. Did the French chastise the Moroccans and the Tunisians? No, Sir; they did not. They never invaded Tunisia or Morocco or sent marauders there. That is to the honour of France. I remember that French writers sometimes criticized their own Government for not giving the Algerians their freedom. I had many confidential and secret talks with the then French Ambassador, none other than my friend Mr. Georges-Picot, about how to resolve that conflict. France never followed the terrorists, those whom they considered terrorists, but who were heroes to the Algerians, to the neighbouring countries. They did not send planes over Saudi Arabia. We supported the Algerian independence movement, not only morally, but materially, and France knew about it. They did not chastise us. To the honour of the French people and their thinkers, they wrote, against their own Government, that Algeria was not a part of France. I used to say that Algeria was not across the River Seine, and it could not be a department of France.

168. And you people, whether you are descendents of the Khazars converted to Judaism or whether you are Sephardic Jews, Oriental Jews, why do you not rise above petty national interests and consider the Palestinian people as the indigenous people of Palestine and that you should not rob them of their patrimony, of their homes, and try to find a way to let those who want to return to their homes

do so? You will have no chance in the long term if you keep this area in turmoil, because, as I said, the Arab youth are inflamed; rightly or wrongly, they are on the side of the Palestinians. What can we people of my generation do? Can we tell them: "To hell with you"? They will send us to hell. This is the truth. I do not engage in sermons. I am telling you the truth. I am from the area. I know what is happening. I go there every year. I have no grudge against you as Jews. That is something between you and your conscience, but do not brandish it all over the world—"We are Jews, we are Jews, we are Jews". People get tired of hearing about Jews or Gentiles in the end.

169. I do not want to conclude my intervention without addressing myself to some of the permanent members of the Council, the so-called great Powers. I believe that only our Creator is great, but anyway that is the way they are known. The great Powers—in other words, those who exercise world power.

170. I listened very carefully to what Mr. Malik said regarding resolution 242 (1967). At the time of its adoption I called it a knot in the carpenter's saw. I know that Lord Caradon participated in its drafting. Mr. Malik was not there; Mr. Federenko was. I made my views known in the Security Council. They are on record. I said it was equivocal, like the Balfour Declaration. It could be interpreted in different ways, and would not solve the problem. And it has not solved the problem. What is the alternative, then?

171. Rightly, Mr. Malik has said that the one seized of the situation is none other than Mr. Jarring, and he has his mandate from the Security Council and the General Assembly. But with all the skill and goodwill Mr. Jarring possesses, he has not so far succeeded. I am not going to say why, because if I did so and went into the facts it might be tantamount to Baroody accusing Israel. I will not say why, but the fact is that he did not succeed. From whom did he receive his mandate? Essentially, from the major Powers, because if the major Powers, the five permanent members of the Council, had not been in agreement concerning the wording of resolution 242 (1967) it would not have come into being.

172. Now let us face the facts. Nothing has resulted from resolution 242 (1967). Shall we keep Mr. Jarring carrying out his exercise in futility? That is why I addressed the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union last night.

173. You are not morally responsible, my good friend Mr. Scali—not you personally. Your Government is responsible—your successive Governments since Mr. Truman's decision—for doing the right thing, not the right thing by the Arabs but the right thing in this question.

174. Now, I gathered from what Mr. Malik said, without naming you—I know you are trading with each other now and are very polite; it is not like it used to be in the times of the late Mr. Krushchev, when you were calling each other names here and at Lake Success—that there was "a major Member that did not co-operate". He meant you. I say it for him; he was being polite. He meant you, the

United States. Try again. Do you not know the Boy Scouts of the United States say, "Never give up. Try and try again". Why do you not try again? It is not so easy. It is, you might say, a highly political question. And the Zionists are in the body politic and the body social of the United States Government. That is your business, not ours. Why should we pay for it? If you accept that, well, tell us that you cannot do anything. Once and for all, make it official so that the Arabs, if some of them are thick-headed, can understand that you are the victims of those Americans who perhaps play a big role in the formulation of your policy. I am not saying they do, but tell us why you cannot do anything; why, within an hour, your Government decided to participate with other Powers in the creation of the State of Israel. And for 25 years you seem to have been stymied, as though you were in a straitjacket, unable to do anything. You, the vital United States, cannot do anything because you have in your Government Zionists who perhaps play a bigger role than they should—or should not; it is none of my business. Why? Are you afraid of them? They are your compatriots.

175. You have only to look at the propaganda in the press to see how they all rally around those who are formulating the policy in favour of Israel. We do not want you to be against Israel. But do not proceed to the point where—you know what will happen?—we Governments will not be able to contain our people, my dear Sir. We shall not be able to contain our people.

176. And many of your Senators—I am not interfering in your domestic affairs; if they did not touch upon our area, it would be farthest from my intention to make these remarks—what do they do? They bring pressure on whom? On your Government. Pressure to continue aid in spite of the unfavourable balance of payments. And then you bring pressure—I do not like to use that word—you try in different ways to persuade the Soviet Union to allow thousands upon thousands of Soviet Union citizens of the Jewish faith to go—where? To Israel. It is in the newspapers.

177. I feel sorry for your Administration. It is under great pressure. But why should we pay? It takes someone like Baroody to bring this into the open in the Security Council. And that is why we say it is high time that you and the Soviet Union, which played a role in the creation of Israel, came and helped us resolve this situation.

178. It cannot continue like this. There will be anarchy in the Arab world. Perhaps not in my lifetime, perhaps tomorrow, perhaps 10 years from now. Who will benefit from anarchy? I would assure Mr. Tekoah that his authorities, the Jewish people, will be the first to suffer—because, as I have said, some day perhaps, and rightly or wrongly, the world will get fed up with this Zionist question and the Jewish people may be made a scapegoat, and the innocent among them will suffer as they did in Germany and elsewhere, which was very deplorable.

179. Why do you not do something about it? You just sit around this table, year in and year out, for 25 years going around in circles on this question. I hope Mr. Scali will

bring new breath to the Council. You sit in the Cabinet, Mr. Scali. Tell your colleagues—or perhaps they are not listening. Tell your illustrious President.

180. And you, my good friend Mr. Malik, you are no newcomer on the international scene. You are of my generation. You have seen a lot of things. Instead of us trading insults among ourselves and casting aspersions on each other, let us do something constructive. I cannot, but who can? I am pleading with you, representatives of the big nations, to do something lest things get out of our hands. If they do get out of our hands, developments may trigger a world conflict.

181. You know that in the Bible there is the parable of Samson, who, when he was blinded, said: "Let me die with my enemies". And his enemies were the Philistines, incidentally, who gave the land its name. They were from Crete; they were not Semites and you could have considered them as enemies in those days.

182. Otherwise tomorrow there will be a resolution and I can tell you the scenario of that resolution. Israel might be condemned. Some will say, "Do not put the word 'condemned' in, put in the word 'deplore'—a *jeu de mots*." Others will say "with consternation". There are many words that can be used. Then your colleague, Mr. Tekoah, will say, "Who is the United Nations"—I am paraphrasing, I am not as eloquent as he is—"to say that we did something wrong. We have to fend for ourselves. The whole United Nations not only has lost its stature, it has no value"—although the United Nations created Israel.

183. Most likely Mr. Scali and his colleagues in Washington would put their heads together, and they would tell him "veto". We have seen many vetoes. The United States has cast only a couple of vetoes, but we have seen vetoes cast by other members. So where will we be? We lose our self-respect as the United Nations. I, after 27 years of service here, would deplore that we should become the laughing-stock of people everywhere in the world. Is there no alternative to such a scenario or blueprint? Yes, something serious. Forget your power politics and check-board play of chess in the area—you and the Soviet Union in our area—and come to a gentlemen's agreement to do something for the Palestinian people based on the right of self-determination. Do not pressure Israel. You cannot pressure Israel because the Zionists will pressure you, but tell them: "It is high time you should be persuaded to find a solution on the basis of the self-determination of the Palestinian people".

184. Otherwise, what is the alternative? There will be another "chastisement" on the part of Israel, and who knows where the frustrated Palestinians will strike. They might strike here in New York City. Incidentally, they allegedly put a car with explosives—it was said in the newspapers—near the Israel Discount Bank and the entrance of my office is near that bank. I would be killed too, perhaps. Who knows? They do not care. They do not say, "Baroody is coming through here, he used to defend us". I do not know where they will strike. They do not tell us where they strike. They do not ask Mr. Ghorra or President

Franjeh where to strike. Take that out of your mind, Mr. Tekoah. They strike as you struck in Palestine in the twenties and the thirties and perpetrated so many tragedies through terrorism, and unfortunately they have thought: "Perchance we will succeed in regaining our homeland because the Zionists"—the Palestinians think that way—"resorted to terrorism and they have a State, so why do not we use it"?

185. Of course they are frustrated, and they cannot go and have pitched battles with you in Israel because you are stronger. It stands to reason. So they do what others do when they cannot fight open battles. That is nothing new.

186. I spoke about the Second World War. I referred to the Maquis, to the commandos of other nations. These are the facts, and I am not sermonizing here. They will strike anywhere and they will not tell us innocent people, Jew and Gentile alike, who will suffer. The word "gentile" means anyone who is not a Jew, not only Arabs. I know many Jews, and they talk to me over the phone. Some are from my part of the world and they deplore the situation. Incidentally, they speak to me in Arabic, not in Hebrew. If they deplore the situation, will you disown them? They have no interest in me personally and they are not trying to get anything out of me. Many Jews do not like what is happening in the world because they identify themselves with the country of their birth or adoption, and you want to in-gather them all in Palestine against the will of 110 million Arabs whose youth are against this movement. You cannot tell us any more: "God gave us Palestine". God gave the world to the human race. Put it that way.

187. So please, I am pleading across the table with you, with everybody, that an end should be put to that conflict lest it engulf us all in the future. This power politics game, this spheres-of-influence game at the expense of others should be decried. There should be some self-respect. Human rights should be observed and practised, not only observed.

188. So I am sure that the representatives of France and the United Kingdom will help you, and I am more than sure that an Asian representative, the representative of the People's Republic of China, will co-operate with you. Perhaps they will forget their differences. The major Powers all have their differences like the small Powers. But forget your differences and try to solve this problem and it will be to your honour and you really will be serving the United Nations. Otherwise, what will happen? The alternative is a babbling like that of the Tower of Babel—not a tower of Babel in the sense of tongues, but a tower of Babel in thoughts.

189. I ask forgiveness of any one of my colleagues if I have been a little personal. I would not have been personal had it not been that our contacts with those who formulate the policies of your Governments are through you. We cannot go to Mr. Nixon or to Mr. Brezhnev or to Mr. Mao Tse-tung. We are telling you, hoping that you will transmit our fears and our thoughts on the basis of justice and not on the basis of antiquated pronouncements full of rhetoric and polemics of which we are sick in this Council, because you are human like us and we need your humanity to help

us. When you are, as you have sometimes been during my tenure of office, in difficulties, we help you in our humble way. I do not have to cite examples because then it would be thought that we were asking tit for tat.

190. It is our duty to help one another here. Stop this slaughter, stop this misery, stop this tragedy and satisfy the people of Palestine on the basis of their right to self-

determination, with due regard to the right of the Jewish people, who happen to be there, to live in peace with those Palestinians who want to return. Do not bring pressure. Persuade and be firm. Perchance there will be results. If not, try again. Otherwise, the picture is gloomy and there will be very little hope, with nothing emerging on the horizon.

The meeting rose at 7.45.p.m.