

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

UN LIBRARY

SEP 24 1980

1709th MEETING: 18 APRIL 1973

UN/SA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1709)	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 NINTH MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 18 April 1973, at 10.30 a.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/1709)

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 11.5 a.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, Israel and Egypt to take places at the Council table.

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

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Again in accordance with the previous decisions of the Council [1705th, 1706th and 1708th meetings], I invite the representatives of Saudi Arabia, Algeria, the Syrian Arab Republic and Tunisia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that they will be invited to be seated at the Council table when they wish to make additional statements.

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

3. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya): Mr. President, allow me first to congratulate you most warmly and sincerely on your assuming the leadership of this Council during this month of April, and to assure you that, on the basis of the existing excellent relations between Kenya and your great country, Peru, my delegation will fully co-operate with you in ensuring the most speedy, equitable and businesslike despatch of the work of the Council during this month.

4. My congratulations go also to Mr. Aquilino Boyd of Panama, President of the Council for the month of March, for his democratic leadership during his tenure of office. My delegation sincerely thanks him, his Government and the people of Panama for the most warm hospitality extended to us during the Council meetings in Panama City. The memories we carried back with us will help consolidate the existing excellent relations between the people of Panama and Kenya.

5. I recognize with pleasure the presence in our midst of the Foreign Minister of Egypt, a person who was our colleague here at the United Nations, and whose ability as a diplomat has been aptly and positively demonstrated in this Council and in various other international forums.

6. May I end these introductory remarks by welcoming the newly appointed Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Schevchenko. My delegation will work closely with him to ensure that the functions and purposes of the Council are fulfilled.

7. Kenya is a small, non-aligned country, a country dedicated to peace, and, as we stated in Panama last month,

“... we must be partisans of peace and progress rather than enemies or allies of this or that country, ideology or philosophy. [We hold the view that] It is not sufficient to desire peace. To vindicate peace, we must work for it; we must pledge that those who are our adversaries today will, ultimately, be our friends and good neighbours in the years to come.” [1700th meeting, para. 23.]

We believe that, in order to contribute effectively to the vindication of international peace and security, our approach to international issues, such as the one before the Council, should be based on equity and on vigorous examination of the merits of the case before us. Justice and peace dictate that settlements should be reached based firmly on the basic principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

8. The item of which the Council is seized, namely the complaint by Lebanon contained in the letter dated 12

April 1973 from the representative of Lebanon [S/10913], regrettably shows a further worsening of the Middle East situation. During the last 25 years, the spiralling cycle of violence, fed by the lack of a basic solution to the Middle East problem, has compounded an already complex and dangerous situation. The untold human suffering in the area is almost taken for granted. This bleak situation has attracted the interplay of international intrigue, machinations and the rapacity of world imperialist forces. Within the last 25 years, this Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations have adopted numerous resolutions on the intractable Middle East problem, and almost all of them have remained unimplemented. We cannot but regret the human suffering that has ensued as a result of this situation. We thus strongly condemn all acts which aggravate the situation and all acts of terrorism and counter-terrorism; we passionately condemn these in the name of human dignity and in the name of peace. Terrorism is not a commodity for export.

9. To give an illustration of our total commitment to peace and the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, Kenya was amongst the foremost to condemn the cold-blooded murder of Israeli athletes in Munich last year. Equally, we did not hesitate to condemn in a forthright manner the almost unprecedented shooting down of the Libyan civil aircraft by the Israelis a few weeks ago which resulted in the unnecessary loss of over a hundred innocent civilian lives. The records of the ICAO meeting held here in New York a few months back will bear this out.

10. It is the view of my delegation that the complaint by Lebanon cannot be treated outside its basic Middle East context, because that would amount to the Council's trying to treat only the visible symptoms of a malignant cancer without recognizing the basic causes of the disease. The complaint by Lebanon cannot be isolated from the question of the basic human rights and future of the Palestinians; it cannot be treated in isolation from the question of the occupied Arab territories. It cannot be dealt with without taking into account the position of the State of Israel and the relations between the State of Israel and its Arab neighbours.

11. In the Middle East today the violation of the sovereignty of States is an everyday practice. This is counter to the precepts of the Charter, which we all declare we adhere to. My Foreign Minister, speaking in London last month, said:

"Kenya is also deeply committed to the principles of peaceful co-existence as set out in the Charter of the United Nations. More specifically, they require peaceful settlement of all disputes, non-use of force in inter-State relations, self-determination in colonized Territories, sovereign equality of States, non-interference in internal affairs of States, and fulfilment in the good faith of Charter obligations."

12. The Charter of the United Nations is the bed-rock on which a just, fair, stable and lasting peace can be built. We exhort all those who sit around this table, and other Members of the United Nations, to treat and use the Charter as their guide in the conduct of their relations with

other States. We can abandon the Charter only at grave risk to ourselves. My delegation repeats that it is opposed to acts of violation of the sovereignty of other States, whether that be through incursions such as the recent Israeli incursion into Lebanon, or through acts of subversion and incursions into other States by groups or individuals trained and encouraged by other States. Such acts of aggression and incursion, and interference with the sovereignty of other States, cannot be justified by any excuse whatsoever.

13. We have a sad and ugly situation on our hands. This Council cannot sit idly by while the Charter is daily violated and trampled upon. We could yet turn this dark hour in the Middle East to a positive use. My delegation has listened attentively to previous speakers and we sense a determination on the part of many here to try yet again to go to the root cause of the Middle East situation. The machinery is already there in the form of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). In the view of my delegation, the Council could help advance the cause of peace in the Middle East only by reactivating the whole machinery already set up by the Council. In order to ensure active involvement for peace, the Council must call upon the big Powers to ensure that the special representative of the Secretary-General is given a chance to bring the parties together in order to achieve peace in the Middle East.

14. Mr. SEN (India): Mr. President, we are glad that we have reverted to the customary calm and decorum of the Council debates, and it gives me great pleasure to begin this statement with our congratulations to you on your presidency this month. We extend to you our friendliest co-operation in your vital task, as I hope we did to your predecessor, Mr. Boyd, who did so much for the work of the Council, both here and in Panama, during the whole of March. We also offer to Mr. Shevchenko our felicitations on his new post and we are sure that he will be a great success.

15. The problem we are discussing is not new, but its manifestations have become more complicated and more dangerous. Israel exists. In 1947, when Palestine was partitioned and Israel established, many did not agree to this solution, as it appeared wrong to them in various ways and was particularly unfair to the Arabs inasmuch as they were made to pay the penalty for other people's crimes. However, the United Nations decided to create the State of Israel and it became a Member of this Organization.

16. We do not believe that anyone can seriously have the desire to disturb that decision after so many years and we recognize that Israel has the rights and obligations of a sovereign State exercising its jurisdiction within its territorial limits as determined by the United Nations. Therefore, it seems to us largely irrelevant and indeed undesirable to quote from different Arab and Israeli and other leaders on what they thought of Israel or its establishment during the last 25 years. Indeed, some speakers went further back into history and gave their own views on it. We doubt if these theories and dissertations, fascinating in themselves, are of much use for our present purpose.

17. I should like to mention and dispose of two points which several speakers took pains to elaborate. First, many speakers became eloquent on the duties and responsibilities

of the United Nations, and particularly of its Security Council. Many of the critics of the United Nations, ignoring the basic nature of this Organization and the various evolutions international politics have undergone during the last 27 years, emphasize none the less that this Organization is becoming ineffective, if not irresponsible, and is failing to do its duty—duty being defined, of course, according to the speaker's view of what solution a particular problem requires.

18. May I simply say that many of these critics belong to those groups who were elated by the creation of Israel, and one might ask them if this fact alone, the fact of Israel's birth, should not be a sufficient indication, at least in their eyes, of the great achievement of the United Nations and so command, at least from them, unflinching loyalty and unlimited support. Unfortunately, one does not see much evidence of these sentiments. Secondly, much has been said about cause and effect, but surely when we come to discuss concrete problems, it is nearly impossible to consider this chain of causation from any particular link, conveniently chosen by one protagonist or another.

19. We are therefore compelled to look at the picture as a whole. In June of last year I said before the Council:

"The problem of the Middle East, like many other problems of international concern, has to be viewed in its totality. It is not enough to cite the principle of self-defence, without at the same time taking into account the principle of non-admissibility of acquisition of territory by force of arms and the principle of the right of dispossessed people to be restored to their . . . lands."
[1649th meeting, para. 126.]

I have carefully listened to and read the statements made by the various delegations, including those made by the representative of Israel, but I did not see any mention of these latter principles in his analysis. I wonder why.

20. Israel naturally has the right, like all other sovereign States, to defend its own territory and its own citizens in its own State. But who is a citizen of Israel? How can anyone accept that a Jew, wherever he may be and to whatever country he may belong, is somehow or other a citizen of Israel or that Israel has any rights over him or legal duty towards him? If, however, a citizen of Israel, whether he is a Jew or a non-Jew, is put in jeopardy in a foreign country or by a foreign country, Israel has of course every right to seek redress for such a citizen through the usual process of bilateral arrangements or such international law as may apply in any particular instance. But does it have the right to protect its citizens in another country by force of arms or by similar violent methods?

21. It seems to us that any claim to such right or rights flatly contradicts both the Charter of the United Nations and the usual rule of international law. As we understand it, the Israeli case or policy is simply this: that terrorists—Palestine or Arab or whatever other description one may give them—are creating much trouble for Israel and, through their activities, taking innocent lives and damaging property and creating many other hazards. Israel charges that, in these activities, the Arab Governments are giving

them support, sustenance and sympathy in different degrees and in different ways. Therefore, to eradicate this terrorism, Israel thinks it is necessary to teach the guilty Arab States so bitter a lesson that they will not dare extend any co-operation to the terrorists and, as a consequence, their activities will cease and their movement collapse. All that Israel has done or wishes to do is to bring about this happy end.

22. On the other hand, the Arab representatives have repeatedly pointed out that what Israel describes as terrorism by the Palestinian people is directly due to their sense of injustice and frustration, and unless the basic cause—the illegal occupation of Arab lands by Israel—is removed and the refugees are allowed to enjoy their inalienable rights and return home in accordance with the United Nations resolutions, this mass movement cannot be suppressed and any attempt by anyone to suppress it will not only fail but will bring about greater tension and unforeseen and unforeseeable difficulties and complications. And if such attempts to suppress the Palestinians were to be made by any Arab Governments, they would be simply unable to do so as the sympathy of their people is with the Palestinians and they themselves—the Governments and the people alike—cannot indefinitely tolerate the occupation of their lands by Israel and suffer silently all the consequences which have followed from such occupation.

23. The Israeli policy, if logically followed, will lead to intolerable lawlessness and absurdities. The Arabs may consider, for instance, that there are States which support Israel to such an extent that it feels encouraged and strengthened enough to continue its illegal activities in occupying Arab lands and in increasing its control and domination over such lands. If the Arabs took such a view, as indeed they do, and followed Israeli logic—which fortunately they do not—they might feel justified in carrying out raids, killing people, innocent and guilty alike, destroying property and razing to the ground towns, cities and villages and undertaking any revengeful and malicious activities until the States friendly to Israel have publicly and privately, directly or indirectly, given up their support and sympathy for Israel. Surely, this is a totally indefensible doctrine of international lawlessness, and no one—least of all the Security Council—can brook it and far less accept it. It is irrelevant and, if not irrelevant, dangerous for our purpose, to take into account the fact that Arab countries do not have the resources and arms to carry out such a policy. Israel has these arms, or, more accurately, has been provided with them, and now uses them for executing its ill-conceived mission. This could not possibly be the intention of the donors, but it is how much of the help Israel has received is being utilized. In any event, if these arms and resources are basic to Israeli policy, then we must deny Israel their use. This is for immediate determination and consequent action by the Council.

24. We condemn and whole-heartedly deplore terrorism wherever it takes place and by whomsoever it is perpetrated. We do so not merely on humanitarian and moral grounds, but also because terrorist movements often forfeit much sympathy even in their worthy causes and make peaceful and just solutions to problems more difficult. At the same time, we realize that if these solutions are greatly

delayed, and if there is no progress, people suffering from injustice and frustration will fall back on desperate measures, which often mean death and injury to innocent victims. We do not condone even these desperate measures and we extend our fullest sympathy to their victims and to their friends and relatives.

25. But, if this vicious circle is to be avoided, the solution must surely lie in finding an equitable and just end to the problem. This is what was attempted in the Council's resolution 242 (1967) which unfortunately has not been implemented for reasons given earlier in Ambassador Jarring's report. We agree with the Foreign Minister of Egypt [1707th meeting] that the time has come to ask for a full report from the Secretary-General and his Special Representative. With oral and written presentations by them, the Council will be in a much better position to decide how progress can be made in carrying out resolution 242 (1967), what other efforts should be undertaken to solve the problem and the reasons for their failure and, lastly, but no less important, what future mechanism, if any, the Council should establish and what new decisions it should take to bring about a just solution in this turbulent area. Meanwhile, it would certainly be a welcome development if the permanent members could renew their discussion.

26. On the specific complaint of Lebanon before the Council, the representative of Israel said that Lebanon was the centre of many terrorist organizations and that the Lebanese authorities were in many ways involved in them. He said that on 12 April [1705th meeting]. The next day, 13 April [1706th meeting], he accused the Syrian Arab Republic of being the hotbed of terrorism with 9,000 terrorists out of 14,000—those are his calculations—being concentrated in the Syrian Arab Republic. On 16 April [1707th meeting], he described Egypt as the political centre of terrorism and implied that Libya was a principal financial backer of much of these terrorist activities. Are we to assume from those statements that Israel will raid and ravage all these countries until they behave in a manner satisfactory to Israel and that, if Lebanon has been chosen as the first place to strike in, it is simply because it is the weakest? Or, is it possible that, if Lebanon can be taught a lesson at a comparatively cheap price, the calculation is that the other neighbouring countries will have drawn their own conclusions and therefore the problem of "pacification" in other countries would to that extent be simplified? Whatever might be the calculations, these raids, deaths and destruction certainly do not betray any great desire on the part of Israel to live in peace and justice with the Arab countries. The raids on Lebanon or, rather, a succession of raids into that country, hardly open the way for such peaceful coexistence.

27. The representative of Israel, in explaining the death of many innocent civilians in the latest raids at Beirut and Sidon, said that this was incidental to punishing the criminals. There are, however, other statements which indicate that in future it may not be possible to confine action or punishment to those dubbed as criminals only. The time may come when the distinction between the criminal and the innocent will be overlooked and a kind of collective punitive action may be undertaken.

28. We have heard much about the evil of terrorism and the need for international action to prevent it. This is being studied separately, and we hope some solution to this problem, which unfortunately but at times inevitably has been a feature of many worthy struggles in the past, will be found. Meanwhile, I am not aware of any country which has called for outside help in order to eradicate this menace. Israel, like all other countries, has every right to suppress terrorism or any other kind of lawlessness inside its own State, but cannot exercise such a right outside it, and particularly to the detriment of the rights of other States.

29. The representative of Israel gave a long list of terrorist activities by the Palestinians. Similar lists of terrorist activities by the Government of Israel were forthcoming from the Arab delegations. I do not intend to examine all these instances cited by both sides for the simple reason that the facts in many cases are far from clear. Claims, counter-claims, the presence of *agents provocateurs* and many other factors confuse the picture. If Israel had come to the Council with specific complaints and on time, it would at least have received a good hearing before it decided to strike aggressively and brutally into Lebanon again and again.

30. I shall not take much notice of the various old quotations, sometimes from newspapers, with which the speakers have adorned and supported their case. In the tense and warlike atmosphere of the Middle East it is but natural that many statements have been made in response to events at a particular moment and in special circumstances. Nor can we assess if newspapers and editors always speak with official authority. In any event, digging into past reports and quotations will not help us move forward.

31. I hope, Mr. President, that I have kept in mind your appeal to speak on the agenda. I have indicated briefly our attitude towards any action the Council may contemplate taking. I may speak again. I have avoided noisy rhetoric, ancient history and false analogies. Many questions have been asked in the course of our debate and not all of them have been answered. This is perhaps just as well, for we have had enough exchanges on matters on which differing views continue to be held—always passionately but not infrequently without much respect for facts.

32. I cannot conclude this statement without expressing some doubt if New York is the right place for an objective debate on the problem of the Middle East. I need not elaborate, but one has simply to keep one's eyes and ears open both inside and outside the Council Chamber to realize to what extent the atmosphere is tilted and stilted in favour of Israel. We are therefore all the more grateful that the Foreign Minister of Egypt travelled a long distance in his search for a just solution to this problem, which has brought infinite sorrow and distress to the Arab lands and which has made 1.5 million Palestinians homeless, hopeless and perpetual victims to all possible horrors which human beings are heir to.

33. Mr. BOYD (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I have the greatest respect and admiration for my colleagues around the Security Council table, but may I

say that the greatest pleasure of all is to see you in the high office of President of the Security Council. You are a great Latin American and a distinguished son of Peru, with whose people and Government Panama maintains fraternal relations and your human qualities, your experience and your training give us the most complete guarantee of efficiency in the conduct of our debates.

34. My delegation wishes to welcome most cordially the new Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs, Mr. Arkady Shevchenko, and we offer him our enthusiastic co-operation in the discharge of his delicate functions.

35. Before going into the substance of the question before us, I should like to express my gratitude for the kind congratulations expressed by my colleagues for the way I conducted the debates during the month of March both in New York and in Panama. It has been a source of great satisfaction to us that the representatives on the Security Council paid tribute to my country and Government for the way it organized the meetings in Panama and also that they mentioned the hospitality and courtesy of my people during those meetings. On behalf of the Government and people of Panama, I wish to say once again to the members of the Council that it is we who are grateful to you, to the Secretary-General and to all those who laboured so hard both here and there for the success of that series of meetings away from Headquarters.

36. Without going into a political analysis of the results of that series of meetings, which we have done on other occasions, may I say in all sincerity that we are convinced that all of us who participated in the meetings in Panama gained valuable experience, that the United Nations enhanced its prestige in the world and that mankind now has greater faith in the United Nations.

37. We have been meeting since last week to consider the complaint of aggression presented by Lebanon against Israel [S/10913] of 12 April 1973.

38. In the course of the debate it has been established that, in the early hours of 10 April 1973, a group of Israelis, made up of some 60 commandos, attacked certain predetermined places in Beirut, the capital of Lebanon, causing the death of about 50 people, among them three well-known leaders of the Palestinian Liberation Organization. The Israelis themselves acknowledge that, for their part, their losses were two soldiers killed and another two wounded. The Israeli incursions against Lebanon on 10 April 1973 followed upon the attacks of an Arab group upon the residence of the Israel Ambassador in Cyprus and upon an El Al aircraft which was in the Nicosia airport on 9 April 1973, in which three of the Arab attackers were wounded.

39. It is obvious that Israel has connected these events and wishes to present its latest attack on Lebanon as a new reprisal because of what happened in Cyprus.

40. The Government of Panama is greatly concerned at the recurrence of these acts of violence in the last month, and we condemn them today as emphatically as we did yesterday.

41. Without going into the substance of the question in the study of cause and effect, it is very difficult to determine who are the patriots and who are the terrorists. In general terms, international terrorism is a scourge which afflicts all the world and which, in our opinion, deserves to be studied as a separate problem. What we have before us now is the specific complaint of Lebanon.

42. In our desire to be fair, we have been concerned that Israel has carried out its attacks against Lebanon in open violation of very clear standards of international law, such as respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a State Member of the United Nations. Since my country cannot condone such acts, we must pronounce ourselves categorically and unequivocally in favour of Lebanon, for we believe that its territorial integrity and political independence should be respected.

43. The argument of Israel that it proceeds in this manner because the Government of Lebanon has taken no measures against the terrorist organizations established on its territory to put an end to their activities does not seem to us to be sufficient justification for the action taken. Panama furthermore considers that it is deplorable that excessive action allegedly taken in self-defence has had as a consequence the loss of innocent human lives.

44. The Charter of the United Nations, in Article 51, recognizes the right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a State Member of the United Nations until the Security Council takes the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. However, the acts which we have been considering have every indication of being a punitive operation, and this is contrary to the precepts and principles of the Charter.

45. Once again we are confronted with regrettable incidents that have taken place between Israel and Lebanon, despite the fact that the Security Council has appealed on many occasions for peace in that region of the world.

46. The delegation of Panama would like to see a lasting peace established in the Middle East through strict compliance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967). But, at the same time, we wish to express our fear that, if these acts of violence which we condemn today continue, there may be another conflict in the region, once again with unforeseeable consequences for mankind.

47. For the reasons I have mentioned, my delegation will support any draft resolution which reaffirms respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and is aimed at bringing peace to the area.

48. Mr. de GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, permit me first of all to congratulate you on your accession to the presidency of the Council. There can be no doubt that, under your experienced leadership, our discussions will take place with all the necessary tranquillity and effectiveness. I should also like to congratulate your predecessor, the Ambassador of Panama, whose presidency was marked by a historic meeting of our Council, which was held in the capital of his country and over which he presided with talent and

authority. I should also like to bid welcome to our new Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Shevchenko, whom many of us know well. I am sure that he, like his predecessor, Mr. Kutakov—and I should like to say how much we regret his departure—will provide our Council with the most competent and effective assistance.

49. I now come to the subject of our discussion, the examination of the complaint by Lebanon following the raid carried out at Beirut on the morning of 10 April by Israeli commandos.

50. As my predecessors and I myself have repeatedly stated in recent years in the Council in such circumstances, France attaches particular importance to the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon, a small country that is more than usually devoted to peace, a country with which we have always enjoyed special bonds of friendship. As soon as it was informed of the attack of 10 April, the French Government hastened to express its complete sympathy with the Lebanese Government in this new time of trouble. I shall not go back over the circumstances of the raid. The representative of Lebanon has given us all the information we need about it. It was an inadmissible infringement of the sovereignty of the Lebanese State, a State making praiseworthy efforts to maintain a minimum of stability and equilibrium in an area which for so long has been the scene of such grave conflict. In an attempt to justify its act of aggression, Israel has declared that, in order to ensure its own security and that of its nationals, it must combat Palestinian terrorism, the most recent manifestations of which were the incidents of 1 March at Khartoum and, more recently, in Cyprus. We as much as any deplore and condemn all acts of violence, particularly the taking of hostages, which nothing can justify. I am thinking now of the Khartoum incident, the brutality and blindness and attendant circumstances of which revolted the conscience of mankind. I do not think the Palestinian cause gained anything from such an infringement of the most elementary human rights.

51. We should, however, draw a distinction between, on the one hand, Palestinian terrorism, which is the result of more or less uncontrollable elements, even if they do derive from openly avowed political movements, and, on the other hand, Israeli counter-terrorism organized and controlled by a State recognized by the international community, a Member of the United Nations and hence bound to respect the norms of international law and the rules of our Organization. No matter how effectively it is used, force can never resolve the problems of the Middle East. Never in the course of history has force been successful in putting down resistance movements which reflected authentic national aspirations. The well known reactions in the Arab world to the Israeli raid on Beirut are a convincing demonstration that the sympathy which exists towards the Palestinians will give their organizations increased weight with Governments, and it is really asking the impossible to expect that Lebanon, with its modest resources, should itself be able to control the legitimate aspirations of some 300,000 refugees it accepted into its territory as a result of the events of 1967.

52. The Beirut affair, following so many others, has widened even more the gulf between Israel and its Arab neighbours. Attacks such as this, which nothing can justify, can only jeopardize the efforts of all those who do not despair of seeing a just and lasting peace between the Arabs and the Israelis being established in that region.

53. Are we to believe that, in Israel's view, the maintenance of the *status quo* based on military supremacy in the final analysis constitutes a solution more acceptable than the difficult, precarious path of negotiation within the framework of resolution 242 (1967)? I do not think so.

54. In expressing his sympathy to Lebanon, the spokesman of the French Government, on 13 April, stated that the Middle East conflict and the chain of violence could only worsen if there was no progress towards a settlement in keeping with the resolutions of the United Nations that would take account of the situation of the Palestinian people. That declaration is in keeping with the decisions taken in 1967 and 1968 by the French Government to place a total embargo on the supply of arms to countries which participated in the 1967 conflict, which were for the purpose described as the "battlefield countries". We do feel that the supply of arms to any of the parties can only serve to delay the restoration of peace in the Middle East.

55. Nor can we accept the idea that the consolidation of a *de facto* situation makes less likely the hope for true peace based upon the principles of law and the resolutions of the United Nations. That true peace, to which all the peoples of the area aspire so much, will, we know, first of all require of the parties to the conflict firm determination to negotiate. It will also require that every party examine carefully the views of the adversary, that the Arab countries recognize the existence of Israel as an independent and sovereign State, and that Israel, for its part, concede that it cannot indefinitely remain in possession of territories which do not belong to it.

56. That is why we continue to believe that the principles contained in resolution 242 (1967) must finally be applied, and that is why we believe that the Secretary-General and Mr. Jarring should continue their efforts to that end no matter what difficulties have already been encountered and in spite of the difficulties that will surely arise in the future. That is why we feel that, if circumstances justified, meetings of the permanent members of the Security Council could be useful, and I wish to add that if it appeared possible, I should be prepared to call such a meeting. For the time being, I think we should reply to Lebanon's justified request and, as we have done on previous occasions, condemn the Israeli attack of which it has just been the victim. But it is in the light of the more general considerations I have just expressed that we shall finally take our stand on this case.

57. I very much hope that the efforts at present under way to draw up a draft resolution acceptable to all members of the Council will be concluded rapidly. If that is so, our unanimity will be proof that in this affair of the Middle East, which has been on the agenda for so long, the United Nations continues to play an important and even essential role.

58. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): If no member of the Council wishes to speak, I shall now make a statement as representative of PERU.

59. The Security Council is meeting to consider another complaint by Lebanon against Israel, this time concerning the expedition sent by the latter to Beirut to liquidate leaders of the Palestinian movement there. As we well know, the incursion has caused personal damage and loss of human lives even exceeding the political objectives of its authors. According to most information, the action was deliberate and premeditated.

60. The representative of Israel, furthermore, has not attempted to justify it; rather, he has told us that it does not require justification. This is a punitive act of reprisal, in keeping with the heedless, age old Mosaic Law of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, whereby it is sought to eliminate and eradicate the authors and instigators of the attempted attacks, which are certainly condemnable, in various parts of the world against Israelis and Israeli property, under the alleged inspiration and direction of Palestinian liberation movements.

61. On this occasion I should like to reiterate what was said some months ago in the general debate at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Peru, General de la Flor Valle.¹ The Minister clearly stated that Peru repudiated violence perpetrated both by individuals or agents of non-governmental organizations, and that committed by or on behalf of States Members of the international community. We condemn acts against innocent victims and, at the same time, arbitrary and unilateral reprisal, because both affect the legal order.

62. To put an end to violence we believe that what is needed is an international agreement, within a logical climate of serenity and with the essential purpose of not proposing palliatives but finding remedies which will take into account the causes of the evil, which in this case are, *inter alia*, the frustrated aspirations of a people.

63. It is not possible to separate the Beirut events from the context of the situation of the Middle East, which has given rise to those events. Indeed, their deeper roots are in the historical and political problems of the living together of the Arab States with the State of Israel and the Palestinian people in a tense area of the Levant. How can we ignore the plight of the people of Palestine which remains removed from its ancestral home, which lives in poverty and despair, a situation which can only lead to violence? The Security Council very justly perceived the indivisibility of this complex problem when, in resolution 242 (1967), it took an integral approach to the question of the Middle East, including the Palestine tragedy, and provided what continues to be the only possible framework for a just and lasting peace in the region. We were therefore very interested to hear the idea of reviewing the situation in the Middle East in its entirety, an idea which was initially presented by Yugoslavia [1706th meeting] and then later

put forward by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt [1707th meeting]—whom, as the representative of Peru, I welcome most warmly—and this I am sure could be done at a carefully considered opportunity.

64. But let us concentrate on the tragic incident which is the specific subject of our debate. Without isolating the incident from its background, we must consider that the expedition sent by Israel to Beirut has no element which could enable us to characterize it as an act of self-defence in the sense of Article 51 of the Charter. The Government of Israel itself has not tried to conceal that this was a carefully planned operation, and, as though that were not enough, high officers of the Israeli army declared alarmingly, after the attack on Beirut, that other expeditions would follow. We must therefore consider this matter and the persistence of Israel in this policy urgently and in the light of the norms which should govern the conduct of States within a civilized international community. While we condemn, as I have said, isolated acts of violence, we cannot fail to condemn the open violation by one country of the sovereignty of another. Lebanon had not used force against Israel, nor had it threatened to use it, so that the Government of Israel can adduce no other reason for its action than the discretionary use of force. Can mere material force give it the right to apply sanctions as it sees fit and ignore the mandatory character of the purposes, principles and rules of the Charter of the United Nations of which that State is not only a fruit but also a contracting party? This openly illegal action is, furthermore, counter-productive, if we observe that the result of similar actions by the Government of Israel has been the exacerbation of the Palestinian movement and its desperate recourse to ever more extremist methods.

65. Almost six years have elapsed since the adoption of resolution 242 (1967) and, in the meantime, many others have been adopted both here and in the General Assembly, but there is not a glimmer even of a real solution. The *status quo* is not the solution, not even a partial one, because it is neither just nor peaceful. What is needed, in a way, is a new type of cease-fire, and that is the decision which the Council must now take. We must, therefore, on a priority basis, urge Israel, a State Member of the United Nations, to refrain from actions such as those now being considered by the Council. Such restraint would be a positive step towards leaving the spiral of violence and would pave the way for more long-range measures which we hope will be taken in the near future.

66. Now, speaking again as PRESIDENT, I call on the representative of Egypt.

67. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): Mr. President, I have asked to speak, having heard all the members of this august Council, to thank you and to thank all the members of the Council, especially those who were so courteous and so kind as to mention my presence—indeed, to allow my presence—in this Council. I am grateful also because, having now heard the voices of the five continents, I am sure that those voices are being heard too by 35 million Egyptians and several more million Arabs, as well as inhabitants of the third world, and that they rejoice in knowing that, at least morally, no one is going to condone such actions as those which have brought us to the Council.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2054th meeting, para. 194.

68. I have come to the Council for two reasons. The first is to show how concerned and disturbed we are about this latest unique, unprecedented assault on Lebanon. The second is because we know that this is only a symptom and that the main problem of aggression and occupation, of expansion and colonization, must be treated by the Council. We thought that it should be prepared and that the members of the Council should have all the data, the reports and testimony, before them, and therefore we are going to ask for that at a future meeting. If the Council will have patience, after we finish this item, I will ask permission to make this request officially—tomorrow, I hope.

69. To return the courtesy of many of my colleagues, and in particular Sir Colin Crowe, I want just to make some remarks and humbly bring them to their attention. We have come here to consider a complaint by a Member State of the United Nations about a specific action which happened eight days ago, in which agents of a Government, its military forces and its gunboats, all made an assault to commit common-law crimes, to murder, to knock at doors—as I have heard the expression—at one o'clock in the morning and to greet the people opening their bedroom doors by gunning them down, gunning down their wives and gunning down their neighbours. That is what happened to Mrs. Morelli, the poor 64-year old Italian woman who had the bad luck to be an easy target for the people who assaulted Beirut on 10 April. This is the complaint. This is an operation prepared by a Government which declared that it had indeed done that, and for the purpose had forged passports of Sir Colin Crowe's own country, as well as of Belgium, which now is protesting against that forgery.

70. Can we now say that this must be compared to other acts of individual violence? These criminals who were sent to Beirut are known. This would be the first murder in history where the murderers are known and those who sent them are known by name and no one anywhere is even going to question them. On the contrary, they are being declared heroes about whom shining pages will be written. I quote Mrs. Meir: "Shining pages are going to be written about this act which was undertaken by our boys." There were a Mr. Gilbert Limbert or someone who went by that name, Andrew Witchlow, 47, with a British passport, George Elder, 31 years old, with a British passport, and Andrew Maisy, also with a British passport. These persons must have some real existence, if these are false names, and it is known who sent them. Who is going to punish them? Who is going to ask that they be hanged? In other cases—although I do not accept that there is any parallel—there were cries from capitals like Washington that persons must be hanged. Who is going to ask that these persons be hanged now and who is going to hang them? What are the rules of the game? As a Foreign Minister, I think it is my duty to find out the rules of the game.

71. Is there an international body that cannot be confused and conducted into a maze of comparisons, with the question of violence being brought up? In this case—and I am grateful to the representative of India, because he has also put his finger on a very important point—we have declarations, we hear them, we understand them. We are not as dumb as we might look. The capital of terrorism is

Beirut; the capital of terrorism is Damascus; the capital of terrorism is Cairo; the capital of terrorism is Tripoli! Therefore what was good for Beirut is good for Cairo! Moreover, I think I have seen an intelligent leader writing in *Ma'arif* that they have already gone away from the so-called gentleman's agreement that persons would not be killed. From now on Israel has decided that persons also can be murdered. That is how we understand it.

72. As we are only a developing country, we should like to ask Sir Colin Crowe what the morals of a big, advanced country are. Should we now create another Ghadabo Allah organization in Egypt, another "Wrath of God", or whatever it may be called? Are those the rules of the game? There are no morals in politics. If those are the rules of the game, let us know. If they are not, let us know that there is some international order. Therefore, when you try to confuse the question of actions committed by individuals with questions of state actions undertaken as a foreign policy, we should like to know what is going to be our own foreign policy and yours, distinguished members of the Council. If we really want to make a comparison between actions at Khartoum and other things of the kind, there is no lack. We can see what was the organization of the persons who killed Kanafani in Beirut. When he opened the door of his car he was blown up. We should like to know who was the person who killed Hamshari in Paris with that novel electronic device. You answer your telephone and you are blown up immediately. Many experts have told me that there are very few persons in the world who can make the device by which Hamshari was killed. Those persons are available somewhere. This is the conventional way in which people worked before. Governments would wash their hands and would declare that they had nothing to do with it, and you cannot really make accusations until you can lay your hands on some proof, which is always elusive. If you want to have comparisons, compare what happened in Khartoum with what happened to Mr. Hamshari in Paris. There are other cases. I do not want to go into them, because I do not want to get away from the subject at hand, that is, the assault on Beirut.

73. If we want to discuss also this question of violence in the future, we must bring here those who are accused. The representative of Tunisia suggested yesterday [*1708th meeting*] that the Palestinians be brought here. Why not? After all, the United Nations divided Palestine into two parts, and therefore it considers that Palestinians have a country. You can invite here people from a country that is not a Member of the United Nations. They will come here. They will be polite. They will not bang on the table with their pipes. They will give the Council their point of view. So this is something that can be dealt with separately, if the Council desires. But what we have here before the Council is the specific assault which was prepared, executed and praised by the Government of a Member State of the United Nations. We should like to know—all of us should like to know—what the rules of the game are.

74. The second point—and I should like to ask indulgence for a few minutes tomorrow to enable me to put it before the Council for consideration—is this. I think that the time has now come to tell you not only that 33 months have elapsed since the cease-fire, which perhaps is a matter of

rejoicing for some countries but not a matter of rejoicing for us—those 33 months of occupation, protected and perpetuated. We will tell you that there have been not only 33 months of occupation and cease-fire, but also six years of occupation which now can be described very modestly as simply intolerable—and it will not be tolerated.

75. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next name on my list is that of the representative of Israel, on whom I now call.

76. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): At our meeting on 16 April [1707th meeting] I said that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt had flown across oceans and continents to tell the world that Egypt supported international terrorism, that Egypt backed the savage outrages of Arab murder gangs. We heard this today, with specific names of assassins, of murderers, of people who organized the Munich killings, the Lod massacre, the slaughter of diplomats at Khartoum, all being defended as heroes.

77. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt went further: he once again asked the Security Council to give approval to the continuation of the campaign of these savage outrages that is being carried on by Arab terrorist organizations.

78. I do not think it is the duty of the Security Council to assist Egypt or any other Arab Governments supporting Arab terror in their policies or in their condemnable attitude. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt has shown concern about the facts submitted by me to the Security Council regarding the role played by his capital, Cairo, by Beirut and by Damascus in the barbaric campaign of atrocities that is being waged by Arab terrorist organizations against innocent civilians—men, women and children—in Israel and in all parts of the world. He is right in showing that concern. It is contrary to international law and a flagrant breach of the Charter of the United Nations to harbour and assist murder groups engaged in such criminal activities. It is also dangerous to allow them the use of one's territory. As I pointed out yesterday, it is dangerous because the presence of those terrorist organizations at Cairo, at Beirut or at Damascus might bring the house down upon those who live there.

79. If one wants peace and if one wants tranquillity in the area, one should act in accordance with the interests of peace and tranquillity. One should remove, one should eliminate, definitely and finally, the terrorist bases which continue to exist on Lebanese soil and on Syrian territory and the political centres and training camps which still remain in Egypt.

80. The representative of India expressed displeasure at our meeting here at United Nations Headquarters. He is apparently not happy with the atmosphere in New York: it seems to be too enlightened to suit his liking; it is too critical of Arab barbarism; it is too understanding of Israel's struggle to protect its people from continuous murderous attacks. I should like to assure the representative of India that our case is clear and strong enough to be aired at Cairo. I wonder whether the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt would invite us there, together with the Security Council.

81. I listened attentively to the Indian representative's views on history and on the United Nations and its activities. I should like to make only one observation regarding his odd theory about Israel's birth. According to him, and to some other speakers, it was a United Nations resolution that gave birth to Israel. Now, come, come: I am certain that the representative of India is better versed in historic movements and developments than to believe that bizarre idea. Israel's independence and sovereignty is no more due to a United Nations resolution than the liberty and sovereignty of other States, of Asia, Africa and Latin America, that have attained their independence in recent decades in developments accompanied by debates and resolutions in this Organization. Israel's restored freedom was born from centuries of struggle, of longing, of resistance to persecution, of perseverance, of preservation of Jewish national identity, of an endless strife for equality and human rights in the lands of dispersion, of a struggle carried on in the Jewish people's homeland when it was still under foreign administration. And nothing could better illustrate the double standard resorted to by, unfortunately, a significant number of speakers than the references by the Indian representative to Israel's action on 10 April against the terrorist bases in the Beirut area.

82. Now, the Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, in a speech made at Bonn on 11 November 1971, stated: "Indian security is more important than other people's irritation." In the Indian Prime Minister's words I shall answer her representative in the Security Council: Israel's security also is more important than other people's irritation.

83. I have not commented thus far on statements made by representatives of African nations, but have listened to them attentively and with great respect. I should like on this occasion to say to them and to other friends in Africa: take heed of Arab propaganda; it has tried to make Africa forget the role played by the Arab world in spreading the scourge of slavery throughout your continent; it has tried to make Africa forget the Arab conquest of the continent's northern part and the subjugation of the indigenous population. Today, Arab propaganda is trying to portray Arab outrages directed against the people of Israel as a struggle for liberty. It is a struggle against liberty, against the right to freedom and independence of the Jewish people.

84. Indeed, as you know, the Jewish people's struggle for freedom and equality, and Israel's emergence to independence, has inspired and strengthened the struggle for independence of the African nations. The founder of the world Zionist movement, Theodor Herzl, wrote more than 70 years ago in his book on Israel's rebirth:

"There is still one problem of racial misfortune unsolved. Only a Jew can fathom the depths of this problem in all its horror. I refer to the African problem. Now that I have lived to see the restoration of the Jews, I should like to pave the way for the restoration of the black people."

85. The resurrection of Israel, of the Jewish people, has inspired other national liberation movements. William

Dubois, the inspirer of the Pan-African Movement, had this to say on this matter: "The African movement has for us the same essence as the Zionist movement has for the Jews". And George Padmore, well-known to all of us here, the theoretician of Pan-Africanism, states in his book *Pan-Africanism or Communism*:

"A self-evident parallel exists between Zionism and the Pan-African movement. At the outset each has sought the restoration of the dignity of individual freedom, of Jews and blacks, on the way to focusing their political aims to gain national independence and sovereignty."

86. At yesterday's meeting several representatives referred to the obligations of Arab States under the Charter and on the United Nations resolutions to prevent terrorist operations on and from within their borders. Today I should like to draw the Security Council's attention to a number of resolutions and statements adopted by various international organs on the problem of Arab terrorism.

87. On 23 October 1972, the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe adopted a resolution which stated, *inter alia*:

"The Assembly,

"1. Denouncing the increase in Europe and throughout the world of terrorist activities, of which the Munich tragedy is a particularly horrifying example;

"2. Noting that such acts, which are in utter conflict with the traditions and practices governing international relations, raise, in entirely new terms the question of the responsibility of governments to put an end to them;

"...

"6. Deploping the fact that the political and material support of a certain number of governments and organisations permits, or facilitates directly or indirectly, the preparation of terrorist outbreaks, or offers refuge to their authors or instigators;

"7. Recommends that the Committee of Ministers:

"...

(c) invite the governments of member States to use all their political and economic influence to dissuade the States concerned from pursuing a policy which allows terrorists to prepare their acts or to reside or find asylum on their territory."²

88. The sixtieth Inter-Parliamentary Conference, held at Rome between 21 and 29 September 1972, appealed to parliaments of all nations to exert influence on their Governments, to take all appropriate measures within their jurisdiction to deter and prevent hijacking, terrorism, and kidnapping, including measures to deal with those who

² See Council of Europe, Consultative Assembly, twenty-fourth ordinary session (Second Part), 17-24 October 1972, *Working Papers*, vol. VI, document 3201.

commit such acts, to fulfil in particular the duty States have undertaken under the Charter of the United Nations to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in acts of civil strife or terrorist acts or reprisals against populations or innocent persons in another State, or acquiescing in organized activities within their own territory directed towards the commission of such acts.

89. On 3 November 1972, the following statement was issued by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions:

"In a cable addressed to the United Nations today, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions gave notice that Governments which failed to prosecute aircraft hijackers or to tackle the letter-bomb menace would face international trade union action. Otto Kirsten, the ICFTU General Secretary, who is conferring with the International Transport Workers Federation and the Postal Telegraph and Telephone International, has sent the following cable to the United Nations Secretary-General, Kurt Waldheim: 'Dismayed at the state of hijacking and letter-bomb outrages, ICFTU urges you to insist on immediate ratification and implementation of international agreement against air piracy by all United Nations Member States and on measures to halt mailing of letter bombs. These cowardly acts, which cannot be tolerated, endanger innocent lives and threaten in the first place aircraft personnel and postal workers. The United Nations should insist that all Governments undertake more effective measures to protect the public and the workers. International Free Trade Union Movement is planning action against Governments which condone such acts or fail to prosecute their perpetrators'."

90. On 13 December 1972, the Political Affairs Committee of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe adopted a declaration stating, *inter alia*:

"The Political Affairs Committee of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, meeting in Paris on 13 December 1972, took note with disappointment of the resolution passed two days earlier by the Legal Committee of the United Nations General Assembly concerning international terrorism. It deeply regrets that the initiative taken by the Secretary-General of the United Nations has resulted merely in a text which makes no provision for any concerted, concrete and effective measure at intergovernmental level."

91. This statement was one of many expressions of concern with the manner in which the problem of Arab terrorism was being dealt with in the United Nations. As far back as May 1970 hundreds of Christian leaders, Protestant and Catholic, including Bishops and other high clergy, editors, scholars, educators, published a statement entitled "A Christian Response to Arab Terrorism". It said:

"We note with sorrow that the United Nations are regrettably quick to censure Israel for retaliatory acts while remaining conspicuously silent about Arab violence which has claimed many innocent victims. Little has been said about holding the Arab nations responsible for the acts of terrorist groups they harbour, nurture and finance.

One is reminded of the Reverend Dr. Martin Niemöller's searing judgement about the Christian guilt in the rise of Nazi madness: 'In Germany they first came for the Communists, and I did not speak up because I was not a Communist. Then they came for the Jews, and I did not speak up because I was not a Jew. Then they came for the trade unionists. Then they came after me—and by that time there was no one left to speak up.'

92. The world expects the Security Council to speak up on Arab terrorism as clearly and firmly as other international organs have. The world press has left no doubt what enlightened public opinion thinks of Arab atrocities and Israel's defence against them, such as the action taken by the Israeli defence forces on 10 April against terrorist bases in the Beirut area.

93. An editorial of 12 April in the *Gorkhapatra*, the largest Nepal daily—a neutral State, a neutral newspaper—states:

"The murder of innocent sportsmen at the Munich Olympic Games and the previous as well as subsequent attacks by Palestinians in several capitals of the world, including London, Bangkok and Khartoum, have sufficiently alerted Israel and in addition brought about a decline in the world's sympathy for the Arab terrorists. The latest incident in Lebanon may inspire the Arabs to review their plans for terrorist operations."

94. The Copenhagen daily, *Politiken*, wrote in an editorial of 12 April:

"The action of the Israelis in Beirut shows how they have been forced to fight the Palestinian terrorists in their headquarters in the Arabic States. In nine out of ten cases in Western European countries the police chose to banish caught terrorists. Therefore, one must also allow the Israelis the right to defend their national interests. Israel has no other way left but to fight the terrorists in their Arab bases. This is war."

95. The London *Daily Telegraph* commented, on 11 April, that:

"The Israeli answer to the charge that they are violating Lebanon's sovereignty is that sovereignty cannot be honoured since Lebanon affords complete freedom in its territory for the terrorists to operate their bases and command structure. From these bases and through this command the terrorists organize and carry out their attacks on a world-wide basis. This is a harsh dictum, but it is hard to fault the Israeli logic. The various terrorist groups operating under El Fatah leadership are no respecters of sovereignty. The tragedy and pathos of the whole business is that the terrorists are quite unrepresentative of the Arab peoples as a whole."

96. *The Herald* of Canberra stated on 11 April:

"The bungled Arab guerrilla attack on Israelis in Cyprus drew a classic Israeli commando raid that used hostile Beirut as coldly and cleverly as if it were a training ground. A Beirut crowd shouting for vengeance may reflect that, when it comes to 'an eye for an eye' and 'a tooth for a tooth', the Israelis can more than hold their

own. The fate of the Arab leaders who lived by proudly proclaimed violence was also covered by ancient writ. And this will probably go on for as long as a realistic political settlement is refused and Arab Governments condone a campaign of indiscriminate violence fomented in refugee camps."

97. The *Melbourne Age* of 16 April writes:

"There can be no end to this guerrilla warfare with Israel's neighbouring Arab States unless they adopt the tough tactics of King Hussein of Jordan and turn against their troublesome guests. In the United Nations the tedious arguments resume after each incident."

98. The Austrian *Salzburger Nachrichten*, of 11 April, wrote:

"Whatever the reasons may be, only a small minority of Palestinian Arabs listens to their militarily unsuccessful leaders politically discredited by the civilized world. Israel's answer is consequently not wanton terror but a selective strike against the leading brains, an act of well-aimed and offensive protection of its own vital interests."

99. *Le Figaro* of Paris wrote in an editorial of 11 April about Israel's action on the preceding day:

"It demonstrates that terror is a double-edged sword and that this sword is more effective when it is its victim that decides to use it."

100. The following is a quotation from the editorial of the prestigious Panama City daily, *Matutino*, on 11 April:

"While helpless women, innocent children, nurses and civilians were mowed down by machine-guns fired by Arab terrorists in the fields, in hospitals, in schools, theatres and supermarkets, the leaders of great Powers were keeping irresponsible indifference. As soon as the blind wave of violence affected the interests of the international community, only then rose world public opinion in indignation, only then were voiced the most violent epithets against the assassins, against the criminals, against the terrorists, who only a short while before were known in those countries as the 'guerrillas' and the 'freedom-fighters'. Never has an Israeli bullet been aimed at a woman or child or a civil functionary, against a diplomat of the hostile countries. The blow of the Jewish commandos has been dealt at those who have committed, as it has been proven without shadow of a doubt, the most atrocious crimes, the most horrible assaults, the most savage offences committed against innocent people. This is the only defence against terrorism and this is the great difference between the right of Israeli self-defence and the blind fanaticism of the criminal Palestinian gangsters."

101. In an editorial of 12 April, *The Washington Post* writes:

"The Arab efforts in Cyprus on Monday were close to the worst. The intended victims were diplomats and

civilians. The Israeli raid into Lebanon was close to the best. The intended and actual victims, though not all the victims, were Palestinian officials, including those associated with Black September. And this is the group which took credit for the murder of the American diplomats at Khartoum and the massacres at Munich and Lod airport. No one seriously pretends any more that Black September is anything other than a covert operational arm of other supposedly moderate Palestinian groups.”

102. *The New York Times* of 11 April said:

“The latest guerrilla fiascos, like the June 1967 disasters in Sinai and on the Golan Heights, should prompt at least some Arabs, certainly the hapless Lebanese, whose Premier has just resigned, to question the fanatical terrorist leadership that heaps successive humiliations upon them.”

103. Some representatives have referred to concepts of international law. I have already stressed in previous statements that principles of international law must apply to all States alike, that the Arab Governments are duty bound, just like anyone else, to prevent the criminal activities of terrorist organizations on their soil, in their capitals, in their towns and villages. Israel is entitled, just like any other nation, to defend itself against armed attack, especially in view of the barbaric character of such attacks which are aimed against innocent civilians and in view of the absence of effective United Nations action to curb these attacks.

104. A renowned authority on international law, Professor A. L. Goodhart, has written the following on this question:

“The claim made by the Arabs that they have the right to support the guerrillas and at the same time to repudiate all responsibility for them is an astonishing one. Israel is entitled to take the necessary counter-measures for its self-preservation.”

105. On this point L. Oppenheim and H. Lauterpacht stated the law thus:

“When, to give an example, a State is informed that a body of armed men is being organised on neighbouring territory for the purpose of a raid into its territory, and when the danger can be removed through an appeal to the authorities of the neighbouring country, no case of necessity has arisen. But if such an appeal is fruitless or not possible, or if there is danger in delay, a case of necessity arises, and the threatened State is justified in invading the neighbouring country and disarming the intending raiders.”³

106. It is well known that there is no greater authority on international law than the works of Oppenheim and Lauterpacht. They serve as basic sources in all countries represented in the Security Council, including I think the countries of the socialist world. How great the distance

³ L. Oppenheim, *International Law: a treatise*, 8th ed., H. Lauterpacht, ed. (London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1955), vol. 1, part V, p. 298.

between, on the one hand, these fundamental precepts of international law, the resolutions and declarations adopted by international bodies and groups as quoted by me today, how great the distance between public opinion which justifies Israel's position and, on the other hand, some of the statements delivered today, yesterday and at previous meetings!

107. The question is inevitable: can the deliberations of the Security Council be divorced from law and public opinion? Can international law, can the Charter of the United Nations, can the principle of self-defence enshrined in the Charter be interpreted arbitrarily according to the political whims of Governments which happen to be sitting around this table? Can public opinion, outraged at the Lod massacre, the Munich murders and the Khartoum slaughter be simply ignored or brushed aside? Only a specific and unequivocal condemnation of Arab terrorist organizations and a call on Arab Governments to terminate them can be an adequate response to the threat to all mankind posed by the Arab campaign of savage murder directed against innocent civilians.

108. 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 his statement.

109. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I do not have any prefabricated replies like those prepared by Mr. Tekoah and his aides. However, I feel constrained to refute certain arguments just adduced by Mr. Tekoah that are not based on logic or historical facts.

110. Mr. Tekoah spoke of the national liberation movement and went back to the time when there were two small tiny States in Palestine, none other than Judaea and Israel. But he forgot to mention that the original Jews, the Hebrews, originated in Ur of the Chaldees, which is today Western Iraq. Palestine was populated by the Canaanites before the Jews, our Jews, came to that region. However, the mere fact that some time in history there were what we call two Jewish States inside the borders of Palestine—and that was between 2,000 and 3,000 years ago—does not give the right to the promoters of the political Zionist movement which started in eastern and central Europe to claim Palestine on the grounds that 2,000 years ago there were Jews there.

111. Mr. Tekoah spoke of human rights and said that the Jews had always been in the vanguard not only of observing but also of disseminating and promoting human rights. There are 6 million Jews here in this host country, and before Christopher Columbus came to this country it was populated by what are known as the Red Indians. Why do not you, Mr. Tekoah, mobilize the 6 million Jews in this country to wrest this land from the United States and return it to the Red Indians—we hear of them now in Wounded Knee, in Iowa or some distant place? Why do you not do that on a premise similar to your other premise, which is false, that at one time the Hebrews displaced the Canaanites and existed in Palestine under the name of Israel and Judaea 3,000 years ago? The Red Indians have been here since time immemorial. Why, since you are such a

promoter of human rights talking for the Jews, do you not try to restore the right of the Red Indians to the American continent? Come, now, this argument of yours is fallacious.

112. The second point which really surprised me was that the United Nations had nothing to do with the creation of Israel. I am paraphrasing. Mr. Tekoah said that this struggle had continued before Israel came into being for many many years, since the Jews were expelled by the Romans. I mentioned the other day the Babylonian Diaspora, or the exile into Babylon.

113. Today I shall not dwell at length on this subject, but I do want to recall to Mr. Tekoah the Roman Diaspora or dispersal. Who left Palestine after the destruction of the Temple? The wealthy and influential among the Jews. Many were afraid, no doubt, and left, but the bulk of the population remained there. And, as I have mentioned time and again, later many of them embraced Christianity, and subsequently some embraced Islam. And for your information, Arabism is not racial. There is no such thing as Arab blood, inasmuch as there is no such thing as Jewish blood. There are Arab peoples and there are Jewish peoples, in the plural. You know very well, Mr. Tekoah—I suppose you are a learned man—that a lot of the North African Arabs ethnologically at one time were Berbers. They embraced Arabism and they became Arabs. A State in Africa, none other than the Sudan, is made up of black people, but they are Arabs because they adopted Arab culture and the Arab way of life.

114. You cannot say that the Americans here are a race. But there is what we call an American culture and an American way of life. There are common interests among the various strains of population. And you tell us that the Jews are one people on account of religion. That is a very dangerous concept for the Jews themselves who do not want to identify themselves with your political movement.

115. Let us set the record straight. Mr. Tekoah said that it has been a war of liberation for 2,000 years and the United Nations had nothing to do with it. But I shall tell you the genesis of Israel. It started with the Balfour Declaration. Secondly, the movement was intensified by the deplorable persecution of the Jews by Hitler. Thirdly, there was the political, economic and other mobilization by the Zionists all over western Europe and, in fact, everywhere, through the mass information media, propaganda and indoctrination of Jews themselves, of Jews who did not want to be Zionists. Fourthly and last, but not least, there was force and conquest. Those are the four factors that contributed to the creation of Israel. But who put the stamp on it? The United Nations. Where were you in 1947? I was there. I saw the machinations concerning what happened. Now you say that the United Nations had nothing to do with your creation. And you try to quote our African brothers and colleagues here.

116. You mentioned the late Theodor Herzl as the architect of political zionism. But you have forgotten that at one time those early Zionists wanted to establish a homeland for the Jews in Uganda. They wanted it anywhere, but then they needed a motivation. They wanted

to go back to Palestine in order to have the motivation for their movement—because “we were there 3,000 years ago”. All right, there were people there before you, the Canaanites, who were your brothers and your cousins. They were not your brothers, Mr. Tekoah; I always consider you a European. You are a Jew by religion. As I have said the British were converted to Christianity in the sixth century A.D. by St. Augustin, Christianity is a Semitic religion, like Islam and like Judaism, but that does not make of my friend, Sir Colin Crowe, a Semite, and you are no more a Semite, except that you want to force people to claim that they are Semites. Why do you want to go there? It is in order to be at the crossroad of three continents—not you personally, but those behind you—and to exploit Asia, Europe and Africa. You are clever and you have skills. There is nothing wrong. You would have succeeded had you come quietly and not raised the flag beforehand. These are the facts and you should know them. I come from the region there. You come from a different region and you go by hearsay and read out reams of quotations of what a certain Catholic or Protestant Minister has said against nazism. All right, many of us were against nazism—not only the Europeans. But that is no argument.

117. It was not the United Nations alone which paved the way for your creation; the Zionists resorted to all kinds of methods—subterfuge, pressure, cajoling, persuasion, bribery. You might say that everything is fair in love and war and that that was a war which you waged in order to establish yourself in that part of the world. Now you want to equate the so-called terrorist acts of frustrated people with what you allege to be connivance inside Arab lands with the Palestinians who are frustrated to try to overthrow Israel. Have you forgotten that you resorted to terrorism throughout your history there? We do not condone either your terrorism or Palestinian terrorism, because, as has been said unanimously and repeatedly, innocent lives become the victims of terrorism. But, unfortunately, when people cannot fight pitched battles they resort to all sorts of methods to try to regain their homeland.

118. And let me tell you one thing: your whole argument is based on the premise that, wherever there may be Palestinians, the secret agents of Arab States should worm themselves into the Palestinians' communities and go into their homes to find out what they are doing, whether or not they are conspiring to overthrow Israel, or whether they even have a hostile attitude towards Israel, and you want those Arab Governments, basing their policies on the information they get from secret agents, to crush those Palestinians.

119. I have told you time and again that there will be rebellion and anarchy if the Arab Governments resort to such clandestine methods to find out what every Palestinian, inside the Arab world or outside it, is doing. And I repeat that the new generation is on the side of the Palestinians—whether we like it or not, whether you like it or not. “Never mind. Let all those Arab Governments be brought down so that we may live.” We tell you that is not the way, because then those who support you will stand to lose, and then they may turn about and some of those who now support you may make a scapegoat of you. That would not be the first time the Jews had been made a

scapegoat. You have mentioned how, throughout history, the Jews have been maltreated. We tell you that we consider you human beings and do not want you to be hurt. And I tell you that your policy, misguided as it is, seems to be blind, and you do not take into account how the youth of 18 Arab countries—and I dare say of many Moslem countries and of non-Moslem countries, Asian and African, which are neither Moslem nor Arab—are on the side of the Palestinian people and their right to self-determination.

120. Yesterday my colleague from Lebanon mentioned something I think was very fair. He said let there be a Passover of the 300,000 Palestinians; let them go, and they will go not with white handkerchiefs but with flowers, saying, "Take us back to our homeland". Do you dare do that? And you say that you are against racial discrimination. Why do you not take them in? There is a custodian for their assets, for their bank accounts, for their orchards, for their homes. You might say it is not practical because many of their homes were destroyed in the war and others are now in possession of those orange groves and homes. Well, I think Palestine has space enough to take in those 300,000, or those among them who would like to leave—we do not want to coerce anyone into returning to his homeland if he does not want to leave. But how can you talk about racial discrimination and human rights when you discriminate against the Palestinians and do not allow them to go back to their homeland? As I have said, if you dig back into history you will find that many of those Palestinians were the original Jews.

121. Then there is something my colleagues here should take into account. You want all Jews all over the world to be Zionists and to emigrate to Israel. I do not know how many Jews there are—some say 16 million, some 20 million. I hope you will proliferate further; maybe larger numbers will end your frustration as a minority in the world. You have the challenge of being a minority in the world. Why not increase? Maybe your complex concerning being exclusive will fade out if your numbers increase. Why do you not think of the fears of the Arab peoples surrounding Palestine, which you now claim is the land of Israel—and it is, by dint of force. And you are a Member State of the United Nations, though you now deny that the United Nations had anything to do with your being a Member State.

122. Why should the neighbouring Arab States and other Arabs not be afraid that if you succeed—and I am sure you will not—in ingathering 80 per cent of the Jews, you will want to expand? With 80 per cent of the Jews in Palestine, you will want to expand and say "Ah, Abraham, the patriarch of the Jews, came from as far north as Iraq, and Moses traversed Sinai, and at one time we were in Egypt". And therefore parts of Egypt may perhaps be sanctified by some Jewish theorist, saying "Well, we were there for so long, and it should be part of Israel". Then you might say "Before and after the Diaspora some merchants settled in Khayber in Saudi Arabia, and therefore Saudi Arabia should be part of the State of Israel". This expansion becomes an *ipso facto* occurrence if you use power and might.

123. And those who support you—have they not in their statement said that they are supplying you with the most sophisticated weapons? I have heard that some NATO members are now jealous of you, because you are receiving more sophisticated weapons than are the members of NATO from a major State—I shall not use the term "super-Power" because it has been a bone of contention here; I shall say a major State, a highly industrialized State.

124. You claim that the Arab neighbours of Israel are supplying the *fedayeen*, the commandos, the terrorists—call them what you will—with arms and money, encouraging them to break up Israel. But why do you not see what a great Power is doing—giving you the latest aircraft, giving you aid. Through propaganda you are enlisting material aid through the floating of bonds and I know not what other instrumentalities. And we should keep silent, say nothing, not be afraid of expansionism, not be afraid that one day you will be the masters not of the region but of the whole of Western Asia, building up a military-industrial complex in the Middle East, making of Jerusalem—a Holy City for the three sects—the capital of that military-industrial-complex State, Palestine becoming a banking clearing-house for the continents of Asia, Africa, Europe, expanding far beyond the Atlantic to the New World?

125. That is your scheme. You want every Jew everywhere to become a Zionist and citizen of the usurping State of Israel. And you wonder why the Arab people are afraid. Now, bear in mind that there will be no peace in the Arab world, in the Middle East or in the world at large as long as you blind yourself to basic facts.

126. You cannot live for ever in a fortress. Any peace that may be made between you and your neighbours which is not based on the satisfaction of the Palestinian people will be like a peace built on sand; it will totter and fall, to the sorrow of all of us, including you as human beings. Satisfy the Palestinian people. Let the major Powers not bring pressure but persuade you of what I am saying: that there will be no peace unless the Palestinian people are given their right of self-determination. How? We will not go into details at this stage. But it can be done. But you are afraid if you do that that there will be many Palestinians and then you are perhaps afraid of intermarriage and that you will be assimilated. So what? Let there be assimilation one way or the other. These are the facts that you, Mr. Tekoah, should bear in mind with your Government.

127. God is our witness. We do not want anyone to suffer—Jew or Gentile. You are human beings: We want peace in the area; not peace on terms emanating from force and power, but peace based on justice, a justice that should be recognized by those Powers, member States of the Security Council, peace and justice that should be the aim of the Council. Otherwise, there will be turmoil and conflict which may end in a world war.

128. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Egypt.

129. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, it is with great hesitation that I speak at this late hour in exercise of my right of reply, but I am sure you will realize why I am impelled to speak now.

130. The representative of Israel, with his customarily cynical, arrogant attitude, suggested that the Security Council meet in Cairo after Addis Ababa and Panama. I need hardly tell you that the people of Egypt and the Arab peoples and, indeed, the peoples of the entire world, are following our deliberations with the utmost attention. Cairo is and will for ever remain a political, cultural and intellectual centre for a very large number of countries. Cairo, too, gives a welcome to all liberation movements, without distinction, and we are proud of this, however distasteful it may be to the representative of Israel.

131. The representative of Israel made so bold as to speak about international law and order in international relations and about legal rules. He dares to speak about the Charter of the United Nations when we all know that he respects neither international order nor the Charter nor the rules of international conduct. Perhaps his memory is short-lived. He must know that there is a Palestinian people and that that Palestinian people, whether he likes it or not, does exist. That people will wage its legitimate battle and it will be assured of our complete support. And it is not only the representative of Egypt who so declares. This is also heard from the voices in the United Nations which, in the General Assembly and here, yesterday and today, have declared that the Palestinians have a legitimate and sacred right. The representative of Israel must heed those voices even if they sting his ears.

132. Let us see how he tries to falsify the facts. He tries to avoid the very substance of the problem and to divert the attention of the Council to other subjects. This falsification of facts is certainly nothing new to us. It is exactly this falsification which we found in the forgery of British, Belgian and German passports. Today I have seen that the Government of Belgium has published a communiqué. Allow me to read the contents of the communiqué:

“The Secretary-General of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Belgium has declared that the Government of Belgium considers that such falsification of passports is incompatible with international rules to which the Government of Belgium is attached. Thus it requests the Government of Israel to give it an assurance that this will not be repeated.”

This is observance for international law and international rules which the representative of Israel tries to indicate to us. The representative of Israel is obsessed with talking about everything except the core of the problem. If he wishes to talk about the crimes in Beirut, we shall talk about the crimes in Beirut. If he wants to talk about terrorism, we are prepared to talk about terrorism even though the Council is not seized with the item of international terrorism, as has been frequently stated. His country has one of the most brilliant records in the annals of terrorism. It has been mentioned here, day after day, that on 9 April 1948 the Dir Yassin massacre occurred. Well, Dir Yassin was preceded and has been followed by other massacres and other acts of terrorism.

133. I shall read a list which I believe to be very significant of examples of terrorism outside Palestine carried out by the Israelis.

134. On 6 November 1944 Lord Moyne was assassinated in Cairo. On 1 October 1946 the British Embassy in Rome was dynamited.

[The speaker continued in English]

On 31 October 1946 British ambulances were mined in Palestine. Hostages were whipped in public on 29 December 1946 in Tel-Aviv, and British soldiers were victims. British were again taken as civilian hostages on 27 January 1947. Letter bombs were used outside Palestine in June 1947, and the victims were British. There was the murder of hostages on 12 June 1947 in Tel-Aviv, and the victims were British. There was the dynamiting of village houses with their inhabitants in Safad district in December 1947. There was the mortaring of urban quarters on 20 February 1948 in Haifa, in which Palestinian Arabs were victims. There was the blowing up of apartment blocks with residents on 3 March 1948 in Haifa, and Palestinian Arabs were victims. There was the deliberate psychological warfare to induce a civilian exodus from February to May 1948, and the Palestinian Arabs were victims. There was the infamous Dir Yassin massacre on 9 April 1948, and Palestinian Arabs were the victims. There was the looting of cities in April and May 1948, including Jaffa, and Palestinian Arabs were the victims. There was the assassination of United Nations personnel on 17 September 1948 in Jerusalem. On that day Count Bernadotte was assassinated. There was the mass expulsion of its own citizens from villages on 5 November 1948. That occurred in Galilee in the village of Iqrit, which was later completely destroyed by the Israelis. There was the mass expropriation of refugee and absentee property from 1948, and the Palestinian Arabs were the victims. There was the machine-gunning of tribal communities and their herds and their mass expulsion from the country, and the Palestinian Arabs were the victims. There was the deliberate blowing up of schools across the border, which occurred in the Qibya incident on 15 October 1953. There was the bombing of Western concerns in Arab countries, outside Palestine, and there was the Lavon affair which happened in Egypt in 1954, in which United States and British consulates and concerns were the victims. There was the mass execution of its own civilians during curfew in Kafr Kasseem, Israel. There was the use of napalm against hospitals in Jerusalem on 6 June 1967. Even the crops have not been spared. There was the punitive destruction of crops with chemical defoliant at Akraba, West Bank of Jordan, on 28 April 1972.

[The speaker resumed in French]

135. Those are only some of the cases. I have the full report in this book, but I think I do not need to present it to the members of the Security Council. If the representative of Israel wants to speak about terrorism, it would be better for him to think twice before bringing it before this Council. I apologize for having taken the floor, but I think it will be fully understood why I have done so.

136. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya): In the course of his statement, the representative of Israel, Mr. Tekoah, advised African nations to beware of Arab propaganda. In the course of the same statement he quoted the late George Padmore, the author of the book on Pan-Africanism. He

also mentioned that the Arabs or the Arab nations were responsible for slave trade. I should like the record to be put right, because in the first place the slave trade was an international tragedy and crime for which Arabs alone cannot be held responsible. I am sure the representative knows that there were many other participants in the international slave trade. I am sure he knows that among the participants were gangsters from a number of Western European nations. I think it is absolutely unfair to mention the Arabs in this context, falsifying the historical facts. I am sure Mr. Tekoah knows that there is ample evidence in this country to point to the fact that thousands and thousands of black Africans from mother Africa were imported into this hemisphere not by Arabs but by other nations, by other slave traders.

137. If this distortion of historical facts was calculated to cause animosity between Africans and the Arab nations, I should like to advise Mr. Tekoah to put his oratory—he is a good orator, and we admire him for his oratorical capacity—to a better use. If the objective of this historical distortion was to cause ill-will between the Arabs and the Africans, he must know that we Africans are capable of speaking for ourselves. We do not invite or want self-appointed speakers like the Ambassador of Israel to speak for us. We are capable of speaking for ourselves and defending ourselves and determining our own objectives. We are capable of making friends for ourselves. We do not want other people to make friends and enemies for us.

138. The representative of Israel quoted from the book written by the late George Padmore on Pan-Africanism and mentioned a paragraph in which the author drew a parallel or an analogy between Pan-Africanism and zionism. But Ambassador Tekoah ignored the fact that in his introduction to the book the late George Padmore took all pains to demonstrate and to illustrate how different the Pan-African movement was from any other movement, including zionism. The late George Padmore made it clear that the Pan-African movement was a movement of the world's underdog, the world's discriminated-against black people—which the Zionists are not. The author made it quite clear that the movement was one of a people that had a certain perspective arising from the fact that over the years it had been oppressed, enslaved and colonized. There is very little parallel between zionism and Pan-Africanism.

139. I should like to say again that we are capable of judging things for ourselves and of making friends; we do not want others to appoint themselves as our spokesmen, particularly in a Council like this.

140. Mr. SEN (India): The representative of Israel paid some special attention to me and made three comments on my statements, and I want to dispose of those three comments.

141. First, he found the atmosphere of New York enlightening and enlightened. I am not surprised. I find it dark and gloomy, as far as Middle East problems are concerned, and I would say that most people who are as much in need of enlightenment as I am, would find that my views were correct.

142. Secondly, he mentioned some statement which our Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi, was supposed to have made on 11 November 1971. I have here a book containing Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's speech delivered at the German Society for Foreign Policy in Bonn on 11 November 1971. She had been asked a question the purport of which was that some people had been irritated by certain speeches our Defence Minister had made; and to that she gave a reply covering close to 50 printed lines, including that sentence in which she said, "Indian security is more important than other people's irritation". I accept the Israeli view that Israel's security is more important than other people's irritation. But there is a great difference between irritation and invading other people's lands.

143. Thirdly, he said, "Come, come: you are more knowledgeable than that; you should realize that Israel was born in the hearts of men 6,000 years ago." I do not know what was in the hearts of men. All I can say is this. Just as he said, "Come, come, you are more knowledgeable", I will say: "Go, go: look up your records and see what your friends said when the resolution on Israel was adopted". And I would also say, in conclusion, that, in spite of that dream in the hearts of many millions for 6,000 years, many people do not seem to have gone back home. It seems they are more interested in enlightenment.

The meeting rose at 1.45 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
