

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

1708th MEETING: 17 APRIL 1973

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1708)	1
Expression of welcome to Mr. Arkady Shevchenko, Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs	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 EIGHTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 17 April 1973, at 10.45 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/1708)

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 11.15 a.m.

Expression of welcome to Mr. Arkady Shevchenko, Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before we proceed to the adoption of the agenda, may I avail myself of this opportunity to extend a very cordial welcome to Mr. Arkady Shevchenko on behalf of the Security Council. He has recently been appointed to the high post of Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs. I should like to emphasize that Mr. Shevchenko has, over a number of years, held important and delicate posts as a member of the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations and also been a member of that country's delegation to several sessions of the General Assembly. We also know that Mr. Shevchenko has held important posts in the Department of International Organizations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of his country. Recently, he was Adviser to the Minister for Foreign Affairs with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. During his brilliant diplomatic career, Mr. Shevchenko has acquired a wealth of experience and knowledge in the work of this Organization, and particularly in the work of the Security Council.

2. I am sure that I am expressing the unanimous feeling of the Security Council in welcoming Mr. Shevchenko to his new and important post. On behalf of the Council I should like to say that we are completely confident that we shall have his valuable and fruitful co-operation in carrying out the delicate tasks of this Council.

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)

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with a previous decision of 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.

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

At the invitation of the President, Mr. J. Baroodi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. A. Rahal (Algeria) and Mr. H. Kelani (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them in the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In a letter dated 16 April 1973, the representative of Tunisia has asked to be allowed to participate, without the right to vote, in the Council's consideration of the item on its agenda. In accordance with the established practice, and with the consent of the Council, I shall invite the representative of Tunisia to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber, on the understanding that he will be invited to take a place at the Council table when he wishes to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. R. Driss (Tunisia) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

6. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): Mr. President, since this is the first occasion I have had to speak in the Council under your presidency, may I congratulate you upon your accession to this high office, inform you of the

pleasure it gives us and assure you that we shall do our best to co-operate with you in your very difficult task.

7. Also, may I perhaps take the opportunity to congratulate our new Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Shevchenko, and join in the warm welcome that you have already accorded him.

8. Apart, however, from the pleasure of congratulating you, Mr. President, I must confess that it is in a spirit of profound depression that I take part in this debate. It is depressing that, as the years go by, far from moving forward we only go backwards. Far from peace and counsels of moderation prevailing, we witness ever-increasing violence—a vicious circle of reprisal and counter-reprisal with the scene dominated increasingly by extremists and extreme counsels. The arguments that we hear are too often dominated by the past, when we should be looking to the present and the future. I must also confess that I am further depressed by the prolonged exchanges to which we have been subjected on matters totally unconnected with the agenda, and I hope that the appeal that you, Mr. President, made yesterday will not go unheeded.

9. My Government has consistently deplored all acts of violence and terrorism in the Middle East, wherever and by whomsoever they have been committed. To take only the incidents of recent weeks, we deplore, and we must all deplore, the tragedy of Khartoum and the senseless terrorist activities in Nicosia. We deeply sympathize with the cause and the fate of the Palestine refugees who have been the subject of endless debates and resolutions in the United Nations which seem to have no influence on their lot. As they sit in their camps, often almost in sight of their former homes, it is not surprising that bitterness and hatred should grow in their hearts and that, in despair, some of them should turn to violence and extremism. But this is not the way to win sympathy for their cause. The international community cannot tolerate the killing of innocent people, the murder of diplomats and the disruption of communications that has been caused. Not only must the Palestinian leaders exercise restraint but also all the Governments concerned in the area must exert themselves to control this violence. They must not permit the wild men to disrupt international order. We have all given our endorsement to the Declaration on Friendly Relations [*General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), annex*] and we are all committed to the Charter principles which it embodies. It is surely time for all of us to respond whole-heartedly to the appeal with which the Declaration ends—that is, its appeal to all States to be guided by these principles in their international conduct and to develop their mutual relations on the basis of their strict observance.

10. But to deplore the acts of violence of the terrorist organizations is in no way to condone the action of the Israeli Government in its attacks on Lebanon, which are the occasion for the present meeting. Those too must be condemned. That was a Government-organized operation into the territory of another sovereign State, an act of official violence which can, under no circumstances, be justified under the Charter. For the international community to accept such action as tolerable would be, not a return to the jungle as some speakers have said, because in

many respects the jungle has its own natural laws, it would be rather to revert to a state of international anarchy. The representative of Israel has stated here that, because the action in Beirut was directed against terrorists, it needed no justification. In the view of my delegation, every act of violence needs justification. Where the violence is international, the United Nations is legitimately concerned with it. The object of the United Nations is to try to establish order and peace in international relations. Recent events have cut at everything for which the United Nations stands.

11. But I said earlier that what we must do is to look towards the future. We must try to break out of this horrifying spiral of violence, counter-violence and further violence. As I said to the Assembly last December,¹ while my Government cannot accept that terrorism is in any circumstances justified, we are not blind to the need to eradicate its root causes and to deal with the problems underlying it. We must show the hundreds of thousands of refugees in Jordan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Lebanon, Gaza and elsewhere that the world has not forgotten them. We must take note of, and we must take action on, their legitimate aspirations which must not be overlooked in any final settlement. In short we must once more give them a reason for living and hope for the future.

12. The debate here these last days has ranged widely from the subject which is on our agenda, the Israeli attacks on Lebanon on 9 and 10 April. But while we must focus on that event, we cannot close our minds to the wider issues of the Middle East situation as a whole. Until we grapple with those issues, we can have little hope that incidents like this will cease. This situation has been at the heart of many of the statements we have heard, notably that from the Foreign Minister of Egypt [*1707th meeting*], whom we are delighted to see back here in the Council, though I only wish that we were seeing him for some other less melancholy occasion. As he said, all efforts to work towards a solution have been at a standstill for many months now and it is the duty of us all to do what we can to get things moving. We have watched with sympathy the efforts made, for example, by the United States and we are particularly encouraged when President Nixon said that the Middle East would have for him "a high priority" in his second term.

13. But it is also the duty of the Council to play its part. Thus my delegation would be glad to see the Council call upon the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, Mr. Jarring, to renew their efforts to promote agreement on the basis of resolution 242 (1967) and we stand ready to help them in any way we can. In the past, we have participated in talks on the Middle East between the permanent members of the Security Council and we remain ready to do so again.

14. Something must be done and it must be done urgently. The danger to peace in the Middle East region is such that none of us can afford to allow the present deadlock to persist indefinitely. We must all of us bend

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2114th meeting.

every effort to try to find a settlement. It is to this objective that my Government will remain dedicated.

15. Mr. ANWAR SANI (Indonesia): Mr. President, allow me first of all, on behalf of my delegation, to join previous speakers in congratulating you on assuming the presidency of the Council. Having had the privilege of working closely together with you on the Council's mission to Zambia, I am personally very much gratified to see you in the chair when the Council is discussing the difficult and delicate question now on our agenda. I am convinced that the conduct of our deliberations is safe in your most competent hands.

16. My delegation also wishes to thank the outgoing President and to express our high appreciation to our colleague and good friend, Mr. Aquilino Boyd of Panama, who acquitted himself most admirably of his duties as Council President for the month of March. He managed to finalize successfully in record time the discussion on the report of the mission to Zambia. Mr. Boyd did an excellent job with regard to his duties when the Council enjoyed the lavish hospitality of his country during its meetings at Panama City while, at the same time, being the perfect host to his colleagues and friends. My delegation would like to express once more its profound gratitude to the Government and people of Panama.

17. With your permission, Mr. President, my delegation would like to join you in congratulating Mr. Shevchenko upon his assumption of the office of Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs. I am sure that he will be a worthy successor to his predecessor, Mr. Kutakov, from whom my delegation has always received the fullest assistance and co-operation. My delegation looks forward to continuing this relationship with Mr. Shevchenko.

18. The Council is once again convened to discuss the Middle East question. My delegation has listened most attentively to the statements made by the speakers, and especially by the representatives of the parties directly concerned. In the opinion of my delegation, the issue that has been brought this time to the attention of the Council is quite clear: the military incursion by Israel, a Member of the United Nations, on the territory of Lebanon, another Member of the United Nations, to execute the pre-meditated murder of leaders of the Palestinian liberation movement as part of the official policy of the Government of Israel. In this murder other innocent persons have fallen victim.

19. I do not want to dwell at length on the issue of terrorism; others have done it already with more eloquence than I could. My delegation would like to express its considered view that the problem of terrorism and counter-terrorism, as the result of the Middle East question, cannot be considered apart from its root causes. These root causes are mainly twofold. The first is the injustice which has for so long been inflicted upon the Palestinians, who are the indigenous inhabitants of what is today called Israel. Thousands of these people have been driven from their homes and forced to live in foreign countries, dependent upon the meagre charity of strangers, and eating the bitter

bread of exile. These conditions have continued to exist for 25 years, and the number of refugees has been swelled by the repeated aggression of Israel upon the homeland of the Palestinians.

20. The second root cause is the continued occupation by force of arms by Israel of territories belonging to three neighbouring Arab countries. Efforts to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967) have not succeeded in eliminating this second root cause.

21. Taking these facts into consideration, it is difficult for my delegation to understand how the representative of Israel can appear before the Council and tell this august body that he did not come to the Council to justify the murderous actions of his Government but that he had in fact come "to accuse". To accuse whom and of what? To accuse the people whom Israel had driven away from their homeland for taking their rights in their own hands after 25 years of frustration and desperation? It should be clear that the Palestinians cannot be expected just to sit idly by and watch with folded hands how the Israeli usurpers secure the occupation of the land that rightfully belongs to the Palestinians.

22. So long as the Palestinians are deprived of their land and their homes and so long as Israel insists on clinging to the fallacy of having the right to occupy the land that rightfully belongs to others, it would be illusory to imagine that acts of violence born of political despair and frustration will cease, however much we may deplore those acts when innocents become their victims. If Israel were to discontinue its policy of aggression and its intransigency in opposing a just settlement in the Middle East and if that country were more responsive to the resolutions that have been adopted by the United Nations and the Security Council, such as, for instance, resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, there would be no reason to hold these meetings of the Council.

23. In the circumstances, we can only express our strong condemnation of the open Israeli aggression upon its neighbour, Lebanon, and our abhorrence for the murder committed by the Israeli Government. In the light of the fact that Lebanon has always pursued a policy of peace, the Israeli aggression becomes even more reprehensible and, indeed, deserving of the strongest censure. So long as such acts of aggression and terrorism continue to be a characteristic of the official Israeli policy, there can be no realistic prospect of a lasting peace in the area.

24. The Council is now confronted with a very grave problem because the latest acts of terrorism wantonly perpetrated by Israel have clearly demonstrated to the world that terrorism has become the official policy of one of the Members of the United Nations. This cannot and must not be tolerated because it constitutes a very serious violation of the principles of the Charter and leads to lawlessness in international relations. The representative of Israel had referred to Beirut as the capital of international terrorism and tried to substantiate this claim by contending that the various acts of terrorism that have taken place in the world in the last few years originated in Lebanon. My

delegation regrets that he did not mention the fact that there are 300,000 refugees in Lebanon who were driven from their homeland by Israel. These Palestinian refugees have found temporary shelter in Lebanon and entertain only one desire and that is to return to their own land. The Israeli representative cannot profess ignorance of the fact that it is this desire, this determination, coupled with the misery, the frustration, the desperation and the humiliation that Israel has imposed upon these Palestinian refugees that lead them to commit acts of terrorism and violence.

25. Indonesia, like many other countries, cannot condone senseless acts of violence and wanton terrorism. But we do not view the acts of violence committed by desperate and frustrated people, deprived of their rights and chased away by violence from their homeland, in the same light as the acts of terrorism committed by a Government as its official policy to enable that Government to continue its unlawful occupation of other people's land and territory. The violence committed by the Palestinians, which the world has witnessed and which will no doubt occur again if the root causes are not soon redressed, is an expression of the legitimate aspirations of a people who have been unlawfully deprived of their rights, their homes and their land. We cannot just view these acts of violence as mere terrorism, separate from their root causes. On the contrary, they have to be considered within the whole framework of the grave problems that have beset the Middle East for a long time and for which a solution still remains elusive. If we do not address ourselves to the very origin of these problems, and redress the wrongs that have been committed, a recurrence of similar violence will continue and may demand ever greater sacrifices in human lives and material loss. From the Palestinian side, these acts are carried out by a desperate and frustrated people; it is the despair, the frustration and the yearning to return to their homeland which drive these people to commit acts of violence that demand such a heavy toll. The world has seen similar acts committed by peoples with the same purpose in mind, namely to reclaim their land, illegally occupied by others through aggression or colonialism. It becomes a completely different matter, however, when a Government raises terrorism, killings and violence to the level of an official policy, to be executed by its armed forces, as is now the case with Israel. As I said earlier, such a policy cannot and must not be tolerated by the international community. And I repeat again that we must go down to the root causes of the Middle East problem and try to solve them, if we want to break the vicious circle of terrorism and counter-terrorism, of violence and counter-violence.

26. The question to which we must turn now is the course of action the Security Council will take in the present crisis. Shall we once again pass a resolution, when we have passed so many before and have seen them wither impotently away? Shall we again condemn Israel, knowing for sure that the Council's condemnations are going to be shrugged away by Israel, as has happened so many times before? Shall we ignore the mounting violence that Israel has inflicted upon Lebanon, so that Israel can continue engaging itself in similar acts with impunity? The level of violence has now reached a pitch which we cannot afford to ignore. I quote from the statement of the representative of

Lebanon before this Council when he said on Thursday last week:

"With the attack by Israeli commandos on the International Airport of Beirut on 28 December 1968, Israel set in motion a cycle of violence which has persistently intensified since then . . . hundreds of innocent people, including women and children, have been murdered or wounded; several hundred homes and buildings have been destroyed; the peace of the country has been disturbed."
[1705th meeting, para. 18.]

27. The attacks of Israel upon Lebanon have included assaults on the refugee camps in northern Lebanon last February, in which dozens of Palestinians were indiscriminately murdered. The Security Council has already condemned Israel on numerous occasions and has warned that country that such flagrant violations of the peace must not be repeated. This was clearly expressed in Security Council resolution 280 (1970), in which the Council warned Israel that such armed attacks could "no longer be tolerated" and that if Israel were to persist in launching such incursions into the territory of its neighbours the Council would find it necessary to consider "taking adequate and effective steps or measures in accordance with the relevant Articles of the Charter to implement its resolutions".

28. The Indonesian delegation is of the opinion that the time has come to take those "adequate and effective steps" referred to in resolution 280 (1970) and to implement fully the decisions the Council has taken in the past. The urgency of the situation demands that this Council take, in the words of the Foreign Minister of Egypt yesterday, "more meaningful and effective" steps. As far as Indonesia is concerned, we shall continue to support the struggle of the Arab peoples for the just cause of the Palestinian people who have been chased away by force from their homeland and for the liberation of Arab territories which have been forcefully occupied by Israel.

29. We are, of course, aware that any action by the Security Council, to be effective, can only be taken with the concurrence and co-operation of the permanent members of the Council. Without such co-operation, without the necessary common political will, any proposed action will be no more effective than the numerous resolutions which have so far, regrettably, remained unimplemented. The time has come to take the necessary steps with the full co-operation of all the members of the Security Council, in particular of its permanent members because of their special responsibility, to end the dangerous situation in the Middle East which has disturbed world peace for a quarter of a century.

30. My delegation does not want to go into recriminations. We only want to appeal to the permanent members to co-operate with one another, to take the necessary action, not only with regard to the issue of the moment, very serious though it may be, but also and in the first place with regard to the root causes of the Middle East problem. We do not want to spell out who is more right or less right, who is more wrong or less wrong among the permanent members. We consider it a matter of urgency, however, that

they jointly as well as separately make use of their power of persuasion and exercise their vast influence to help solve the question of the Middle East, before the wind that has been sown by violating the fundamental rights of the Palestinians will force us to reap the whirlwind of renewed fighting, death and destruction.

31. Mrs. Jeanne Martin CISSE (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): Representing an African country tied to Latin America by a similar past dominated by foreign occupation, injustice and arbitrary rule and also by a fierce resistance struggle against that domination and for national liberation, I am happy, Mr. President, at a time when the Council is examining once again the tragic events which have once again plunged Lebanon into mourning, to see in the Chair a distinguished and worthy diplomat from Latin America. Your distinguished professional and personal qualities, which everyone who knows you is pleased to note, are a certain guarantee of the success of our deliberations. On behalf of my delegation, I should like to congratulate you and to assure you of our complete co-operation during the month of your presidency. I should like to take this opportunity also to congratulate your predecessor, Mr. Boyd, on the effective manner in which he presided over our deliberations in Panama, and to thank him for the warm welcome accorded to us by his people and Government. Permit me to associate myself with you in bidding welcome to Mr. Shevchenko and to take the opportunity to pay tribute to his predecessor, Mr. Kutakov, whose effective co-operation we highly appreciated when my country presided over this Council.

32. The Security Council once again has before it a complaint from Lebanon against Israel, following a new act of aggression. Lebanon, once again, has become the theatre of bloody incidents which have cost the lives of dozens of people. As the Council has learnt, on 11 April, in the early hours of the morning, terrorists disembarked on the coast of El-Ouzai and, taking advantage of the surprise element, like bandits, broke into homes and, in cold blood, murdered Youssef El-Najjar and the poet and intellectual, Kamal Nasser, spokesman of the Palestine Liberation Organization. While the Council still had in mind the cynical bombardment carried out by Israel against the Palestinian refugee camps, valiant fighters for freedom and justice were falling under a treacherous hail of bullets while fighting to reconquer their native soil.

33. History has taught us that it is not by assassinating the leaders of a movement that one puts an end to a struggle for liberation. On the contrary, such acts of violence give new impetus to the struggle which revives. The examples of the cowardly assassinations of Mondlane and Cabral prove that. The liberation movements of Guinea (Bissau), Cape Verde and Mozambique, being strengthened, should bring a speedy conclusion to Portuguese colonialism. Every day, heavy losses are inflicted on the enemy.

34. These facts from the recent past make it certain that the brave Palestinian people will succeed in exercising its inalienable right to self-determination and reconquering of its national territory.

35. The item on our agenda is very familiar to Members of the United Nations and has become so to the international community; it is a matter of grave concern. Many resolutions adopted both by the General Assembly and by this Council have unfortunately remained dead letters. This distressing item on the agenda of the United Nations, as it has been for almost a quarter century, assumes different forms and has many different implications, the most recent repercussions of which go from the Munich incident to the tragedy which affected the Libyan civilian aircraft, which cost the lives of more than a hundred innocent victims, including women and children, as well as the cynical elimination of the Palestine national leaders.

36. This, in its essence, is a fundamental problem—the problem of the right of people to their lives, the inalienable right of the Palestine people to a home so that they can put an end to their wanderings, which have lasted almost a quarter of a century. The people of Palestine today claim justice from an international community which arbitrarily has expropriated its motherland in the name of a principle whose logic escapes us.

37. For four years we have witnessed a dangerous escalation of tension on the part of the Israeli Government. Methodically Israel has been intensifying its expansionist policy, which constitutes a permanent threat to the peace and security, both of the region and of the world. By its persistent refusal to comply with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and other relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and other organs of the United Nations, Israel is continuing to defy the international community. Assured of the unreserved support of certain great Powers, and hence sure of its impunity, Israel is now stepping up its escalations against Lebanon and other Arab countries.

38. The Council will remember the concern expressed by my delegation in September 1972, in the course of the consideration of a similar complaint on the part of Lebanon and Syria, when, by its negative vote, one of the permanent members of the Security Council caused the rejection of the draft resolution in document S/10784, although that draft resolution was supported by the majority of members, who called for the condemnation of Israel for the barbarous act committed against victims, most of them women and children.

39. My delegation at that time expressed its profound regret at that vote which we hoped would not be interpreted by Israel as a victory permitting it to undertake new attacks and intensify its acts of aggression against its Arab neighbours. We hoped at the time:

“... that the rejection of our draft resolution calling for the re-establishment of peace in the Middle East will not be exploited by Israel as a victory that allows it freedom to embark on new escalations and the commission of new acts of aggression against the peaceful territory of Lebanon and Syria.” [1662nd meeting, para. 169.]

40. In order to maintain a state of confusion and to give a pretext for its policy of aggression, Israel now talks of terrorism. It pleads guilty; it presents itself as a small,

defenceless nation, persecuted by the Arab countries and struggling in self-defence to preserve the rights of its citizens threatened by Palestine and the Arabs.

41. Unfortunately, we know the facts, and the sad reality is there to show us every day the power of Israel, which is multiplying its acts of reprisal—acts that remind us of the methods employed in the dark age of Hitler.

42. Apart from military reprisals, Israel wants to constrain the Arab States and Lebanon to put an end to the activities of the Palestine nationalists. It therefore becomes imperative to seek an equitable solution to the crisis raging in the Middle East. The time has now come when the international community must undo its error. As we were told in Panama by the Head of the Government there, General Torrijos, it is more useful to remedy an error than to perpetuate an injustice. We feel that responsibility rests with the great Powers.

43. Are we to continue deliberately to tolerate from a Member State of our Organization acts of aggression against other, weaker States—aggression which constitutes a threat to international peace and security? Are we to allow a Government to go on acting with impunity—a Government which no longer complies with the provisions of the Charter, Article 4, paragraph 1, of which provides that:

“Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations.”?

44. That, in our view, constitutes the complicity of the great Powers, which, yielding to the pressure of international Zionism, artificially created Israel and put it in the place of the age-old Palestine, the people of which have ever since led the life of wanderers, hunted even in their most remote refuges. They no longer have any choice. They react according to whether their pain and distress are more or less intense—according to whether they cherish any hope or are desperate. That is the lot of the Palestine people which has been persecuted and is struggling to survive—a people with its organizations which have no other alternative but recourse to legitimate violence engendered by frustration.

45. We turn with hope once again towards the Powers which more than any other Members of the Organization hold the key to solution of the Palestinian tragedy, because it was they who created this problem, and we think that they are morally bound to provide a solution which is by now more than urgent.

46. We would address ourselves particularly to the Government of the United States, which provides Israel with considerable financial and military assistance, to settle this question by making Israel comply unconditionally with the provisions of the resolutions adopted on this subject, particularly the provisions of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and General Assembly resolution 2949 (XXVII).

47. The efforts of the international community since 1967 to bring about a just and lasting settlement of the Middle East crisis leave no room for doubt. The Organization of African Unity, in its peace mission, encountered an attitude on the part of Israel which can be explained only by the support it receives from the United States. But recent events have shown that Africa has learned all the lessons that it should have learned from the arrogance and scorn of a State that had had so many African friends which are now beginning to leave it more and more in isolation.

48. In the United Nations what remains to be done is to evaluate the other peace mission, that entrusted to Mr. Gunnar Jarring. In this regard, we agree entirely with the Foreign Minister of Egypt that there should be an evaluation of the attempts made so far to make the aggressor see reason.

49. It is high time for the United Nations to act effectively to put a stop to the slaughter in the Middle East. Like most previous speakers, my delegation once again turns with hope to the great Powers, because, as I said, they created the Palestine problem and they have the moral duty to find a solution for it—and it is now a matter of urgency.

50. My delegation listened with great attention to the statement of the Foreign Minister of Egypt, and we reaffirm that the international community must redouble its efforts to bring about a just and lasting settlement of the Middle East crisis.

51. Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria): Mr. President, allow me first of all to express the delight and satisfaction of the Austrian delegation at seeing you occupy the chair of President of the Security Council for the month of April. It may perhaps be slightly inappropriate for a colleague who is both junior in years and experience to you to join other representatives in the praise of your high diplomatic talents and skill and list the many stations of a most distinguished career, of which Vienna has narrowly failed to be one. But it is certainly not inappropriate to express our feelings of respect and esteem to the representative of a friendly country with whom Austria shares much more than the red and white colours of our flags. In expressing confidence in the success of your mission as our President, I do so out of the highly gratifying personal experience of someone who had the privilege of working with you in another mission entrusted to you by the Security Council, which gave me ample opportunity, Mr. President, to appreciate your great sense of political responsibility and dedication.

52. Allow me also to address a few words of gratitude to our President for the month of March, Mr. Aquilino Boyd, who was the host of the Security Council during its first meeting, now a part of history, in Latin America, and who was at the same time an extremely skilled and untiring President of the Council during a number of difficult moments. May I ask Mr. Boyd, in accepting these expressions of thanks, to transmit the renewed token of gratitude of my delegation to the Government and people of Panama for the warm and generous welcome which will remain in our memories for a very long time.

53. Let me also add a word of welcome of my own to the newly appointed Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs, Mr. Shevchenko, who occupies, for the first time, the chair to the President's left. He is not new, however, to this chamber as he has served a number of years with his country's delegation on the Security Council and, as the President stated at the beginning of this meeting, we all look forward to close and fruitful co-operation with Mr. Shevchenko, whose contributions to the work of the Security Council, thanks to his previous experience and thanks to his personal qualifications and capabilities, will surely be most valuable ones.

54. Once again this Council is faced with a chain of events which have caused a widespread wave of death and bloodshed, events which have resulted in a dangerous new upsurge of hatred and tension. Once again this Council—as so often when it deals with matters concerning the crisis in the Middle East—is faced with a debate characterized by much bitterness and recrimination and a growing sense of frustration. This is hardly the climate in which the Council can fulfil its primary task defined by the Charter. This is hardly the climate in which the Council can make a contribution to an easing of tension, to create the necessary prerequisites for peace and security in a conflict which has not ceased to preoccupy the United Nations since its very founding years.

55. Much of the debate so far has been taken up by the description of a wave of violence whose origins are as much in controversy as the responsibility of its authors. The debate has centered on a wide array of facts, many of them of the very recent past, which lead to one principal conclusion: that we have reached a dangerous phase of escalation of violence in an area which, more than any other, has always shown extreme sensibility to events of this kind. The events before us are so dangerous in nature, the evil dynamism they unleash so obvious, that we find it impossible to react in any manner other than by stressing once again what has always been the clear position of the Austrian Government in the face of international violence, wherever found, in whatever circumstances and by whom-ever committed. We can only repeat what the Austrian Federal Government, expressing the deep feelings of the Austrian people, has invariably affirmed: the clear and unequivocal condemnation of all acts of violence as justifiable neither by exceptional circumstances nor for any other reason. We say this not only out of a firm dedication to the principle of peaceful solution of conflicts but also out of a deep respect for human life.

56. This attitude of principle is the only one a peaceful nation which pursues a policy of permanent neutrality—a policy of permanent rejection of war as a means of international politics—as its guideline in international affairs can adopt. As a consequence, we find it impossible to differentiate between acts of violence, to justify one and condemn the other. It is for this reason that our approach to the events which have led to the present series of meetings of the Council, the Israeli raids against Palestinian leaders in Beirut, can be no other than our absolute rejection of the killing by terrorists of diplomats in Khartoum, bomb attacks in Cyprus, or other outbreaks of violence of the recent past.

57. Confronted with these events, we share with all delegations in this Council an extreme sense of urgency in seeking appropriate action. Council action, in our mind, should be directed against the continuation of violence, against the new escalation of hatred and bitterness with all its unforeseeable consequences. It is clear from our position stated earlier that, in our opinion rejection and condemnation of violence by the Council can only achieve its objective if it is directed against all forms and all sources of violence and if it appeals, in the strongest terms possible, to all sides to act with a sense of responsibility and restraint. No purpose can be served by trying to stamp out violence in one place when it is so obvious that the nature of the conflict is liable to produce violence in so many quarters.

58. We are fully aware that acts of violence and terror are only the symptoms of deep-rooted evils; and nowhere should this be more obvious than in the crisis in the Middle East. Eradicating violence from the political scene in the Middle East, and thus from other regions into which violence has spread in a dramatic way over the last years, can only be one step in an effort to which this Organization has already dedicated so much of its time and energy. It is the absence of a solution in the Middle East and it is the passage of time which explain, to a high degree, the growing sense of frustration and impatience which has bred so much unrest and tension. This applies particularly to the large group of Palestinians whose plight and frustration has never failed to win the sympathy and understanding of my Government and people, never insensible to the problem of refugees. Nobody disputes the existence of this political crisis in the Middle East; nobody disputes the extreme urgency of a peaceful solution. There is much less agreement, however, on the ways and means to attain this goal or even on the preliminary steps which could promote a new climate of détente and thus bridge the gap of misunderstanding and distrust between the parties.

59. In view of this growing sense of confusion and controversy, we should not lose sight of the fact that a widely recognized basis for a solution exists. It is Security Council resolution 242 (1967), adopted unanimously on 22 November 1967, which contains all the elements to bring about peace with justice and security for all nations in the Middle East, including a just settlement of the refugee problem. This resolution demonstrates that the United Nations, with the assistance of all concerned and especially with the active co-operation of the permanent members of the Council, is not incapable of devising the platform for a solution.

60. But it is perhaps no less useful to remember that resolution 242 (1967) also provides machinery and procedures to facilitate progress towards that goal. It is undoubtedly for those engaged in the conflict to choose, amongst the peaceful means available for the solution of their differences, those they consider most appropriate. Despite this indisputable right, my delegation feels that, in the present situation, no possibility should be left unexplored and none of the existing platforms—and, as I said earlier, there are very few indeed—should remain unused.

61. It was precisely in this spirit, incidentally, that the Austrian Federal Government, at the preparatory talks for a

European security conference in Helsinki, proposed the study of the question in which way Europe might contribute to a *détente* in the Middle East.

62. What is required, then, is a renewed and concerted search by all concerned for ways and means to reopen the road towards a peaceful settlement, and it is the firm belief of my delegation that, in such an effort, the United Nations can and should play a prominent part.

63. Mr. SCALI (United States of America): Mr. President, I wish to join other representatives on the Council in welcoming your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. Although I am a newcomer, I have already had the opportunity to benefit from your wise counsel and to note the calm, dignified and objective manner in which you are presiding at these meetings.

64. As we are meeting here today, I think it is important that we recognize that we are confronting a new and more dangerous turn in the long and frustrating search for peace in the Middle East. The cycle of violence in this part of the world not only is continuing but has also taken on newer and uglier dimensions. To the shame of all mankind, acts of violence and terror, often striking down innocent people, are on the verge of becoming a routine foot-note to the tragic and unresolved Arab-Israeli conflict.

65. In focusing attention on violence, I do not ask that we lose sight of the human and political problems which have already defied solution for a generation. Rather, I wish to place in perspective a phenomenon that is both inherently important and important as a barrier to further efforts to bring real peace and security to the Middle East.

66. In the past few months hundreds have been killed—innocent men, women and children, diplomats, tourists and bystanders alike. If we are to do anything about this, it is important that we understand that this new turn may be more than a temporary phenomenon in the history of mankind. It can become an accepted way of life.

67. We are living today at a time when a knock on the door may signal the visit of an assassin armed with a machine-gun or a fire bomb. It is intolerable that our fears have now reached the stage that at thousands of airports around the world innocent civilians must submit to complex security searches before boarding their planes and then pray that their flights will be safe. It is intolerable that innocent civilians cannot enter their automobiles without fear that they have been converted into instruments of death. It is intolerable that opening the morning mail may trigger an explosion. It is intolerable that the innocent cannot regard even the family apartment, the social gathering, the Olympic sporting field or the quiet streets as an abode of peace. And it is intolerable that diplomats must conduct their tasks with concern for what may happen to them or their families in the future and with grief over what has already transpired. Everywhere life, the life of the innocent bystander, has been made tragically cheap.

68. Are these acts of terror and counter-terror to become accepted as the new rules of engagement to a tragic

unresolved war? Are these acts, which demonstrate a grisly contempt for life, to become normal—deeds to be emulated more and more throughout the world? Is this the heritage that we, the members of a civilized society, wish to leave behind?

69. In the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the United Nations affirmed the right of every human being to life, liberty and the security of person. Is this Declaration now to be forgotten?

70. So that there will be no misunderstanding, let me make it emphatically clear that the United States opposes violence and terror from whatever source and of whatever kind. We do not and will not condone violations of the sovereignty of one State by another State. Neither, however, do we condone murders in violation of basic human rights by individuals or groups. Such individuals and groups depend on the support or on the acquiescence of Governments on whose territory they exist and from which they plan and direct their operations. That support and acquiescence is clearly contrary to the General Assembly's Declaration on friendly relations as well as to general principles of international law.

71. While we are aware of the political realities which are usually cited to excuse action or inaction on the part of certain Governments, it is the duty of each State not to condone or abet or close its eyes to these acts of terrorism. Indeed, it is the duty of every State actively to prevent the organization or instigation of such acts on its territory, whether they are directed against its own citizens or against the citizens of other countries.

72. The question now in the Middle East is not who started what but how this vicious cycle is to be broken. This is our real problem. States must not export violence. Private groups must not export violence. At this moment, assessing blame is secondary to the purpose of ending the misery and suffering on both sides. The overriding task of the Council is to seize the present opportunity and move to put an end to violence so that the political process will have a chance to operate.

73. The meaning of the Declaration on friendly relations [*General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), annex*] is clear. It says:

“Every State has the duty to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in acts of civil strife or terrorist acts in another State or acquiescing in organized activities within its territory directed towards the commission of such acts, when the acts referred to in the present paragraph involve a threat or use of force.”

74. The cycle of violence will not be broken by drawing distinctions between violence by conventional forces and violence by individuals and groups. Violence by conventional forces and violence by terrorists are to be condemned equally. One is as ugly as the other. The time has come to recognize that we must be equally stern in dealing with all forms of international violence.

75. The United Nations must leave no doubt as to the disapproval of the international community of unwarranted and unnecessary loss of innocent lives from acts of international terrorism and military responses to it. Action and co-operation by all States is required. No Member State should attack another. Any such action only breeds further violence. Neither should any State allow its territory to be used for the launching of terrorist attacks outside its territory. No State should harbour elements which attack other States, or nationals of that State, wherever they may be.

76. We have heard many statements here condemning one side or the other, trying to assess blame. We believe this is an essentially sterile approach to the problem. These arguments will not lead to an end to the present agony, for it is in the nature of a vicious circle that cause and effect become impossible to distinguish.

77. The time has come, indeed it is already overdue, when there must be a halt to all acts of terror by all sides. Even as there is a truce on the ground which has stopped the major hostilities for 32 months, so, too, there must be an end to this grisly exchange of violence and counterviolence which extends the battlefield to areas where innocent people inevitably become its victims. All of us, regardless of our sympathies, have a duty to act now, and not by one-sided condemnations or by demands for unequal punishment which ignore the real world.

78. Instead, let us move carefully, avoiding the temptation for the short-term propaganda advantage which inflames rather than heals. Let us not vie with one another in cataloguing our grievances and sufferings. It is not enough to look backward. It is time to look forward. My Government is prepared to do so, as we continue our search for a better understanding among these temporary foes, who one day must be friends. Let us facilitate the change from violence to peace. An instrument for this lies at hand. Let us use it; let us use the already existing framework for an over-all settlement. I refer to resolution 242 (1967), which points the way to the goal of a lasting peace through which all the peoples of the Middle East can achieve security and justice. Resolution 242 (1967) calls for a just settlement of the refugee problem. The United States recognizes that peace in the Middle East can only be achieved by taking into full account the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinians.

79. Unless the Council can move from recrimination to even-handed condemnation of all forms of violence, there will be no progress towards peace. Therefore, we ask for an end to both cross-border attacks and individual acts of violence. If the Council will call for this, it will create an atmosphere in which we can move on from the assessment of blame to the making of peace. Let us move ahead urgently to encourage negotiations for a peaceful settlement. I appeal to the members of this Council to act in such a way that this meeting can contribute to the goal of a lasting peace in the Middle East.

80. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Tunisia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to address the Council.

81. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like to congratulate you and, at the same time, to express my warmest wishes for your success as President of the Security Council, an office which you are exercising with dignity and competence. I should also like to thank you, and the members of the Council, for allowing me to participate in your deliberations. Thanks to the established tradition, it is permissible for a country such as mine, which, because of the strict application of the rules of rotation and of quotas, is not a member of the Council, to be able to come before you nevertheless to express its views on an event of extreme seriousness, which is once again a case of intentional Israeli aggression against Lebanon. We can now reaffirm our position with respect to two basic problems which we cannot ignore: the problem of the Palestinian people and that of the Middle East in general.

82. I hope that I shall not abuse the time of the Council. If we could solve these problems by using arguments only, I would then insist on occupying this seat for long hours. But, alas, this is the twenty-sixth year of speeches, arguments and counterarguments. The archives of the United Nations overflow and it is time to say to the Security Council and to the world that we have had enough. The positions are clear. Israel established itself, strengthens itself, extends itself and appears in the midst of the Middle East as a real Power. Perhaps tomorrow it will even be a nuclear Power. Who can prevent it? The Palestinian people, the victims of injustice, chased from their homeland, have nevertheless not lost their faith. Like other peoples before them, they have taken the road of battle and of sacrifice to recover their right to their homeland. Who can turn them away from this? Surely not Israel, which has jumped 5,000 years back into history to seek justification for its right to the land of Palestine. The Arabs all around, who have lost a part of their territory, suffer humiliation and domination and remain exposed to repeated aggressions, have no other choice than to fight for their survival and dignity.

83. Peace is ardently desired, but it is so far removed and, like a mirage, it will continue to reflect illusions as long as men of goodwill have not won the cause and as long as the profound aspirations of the peoples of the Middle East, particularly those of Palestine, have not been satisfied. All this indicates that we run the risk of having to remain powerless for a long time to come before a situation which is fluid, but explosive, and which threatens to become permanent and, at the same time, intolerable, because of the victims which multiply, the rancour which develops and the anger which underlies it all. An assessment of the losses and benefits of both sides during the 25 years would be interesting. What are the losses of the Arabs? Much of their territory. And the benefits? Practically none. Even the hopes born at the end of the colonial era and at the time of the independence of 18 Arab States are now somewhat dissipated. Today, a well orchestrated propaganda tends to present the image of the Arab as an assassin who is to be avoided at all costs. On the other hand, the Israelis have gained much territory—I should say many territories. But the image of small Israel threatened on all sides by Arab States has disappeared, to give way to the image of an invincible Israel. But, paradoxically and at the same time,

another event has occurred: the awakening of the Palestinian national conscience which, in turn, has placed the Israelis on an alert and has plunged them back into a permanent fear which is, in a way, of their own creation.

84. Like all that Israel does, this Beirut affair will sooner or later have a boomerang effect. It is thought the Palestine Liberation Front is decapitated by the killing of a few leaders, but in fact that gives birth to new leaders who are younger and therefore more intractable. Terrorism is a reality of our days. We condemn it; we endeavour to do away with it. But it is there. It is used by individuals and by one State as a means of action, the effectiveness of which is questionable but which gives the authors a certain satisfaction. However, Israel will not succeed in silencing the Palestinians by attacks and incursions in Lebanon and elsewhere. The Palestinians will surely not recover their rights because of the sole fact of terrorism, we may be told. But their struggle is just and cannot fade into oblivion.

85. Furthermore, we must realize that the problem no longer concerns only the Arabs and Jews of Palestine. The problem is of concern to the entire international community. Is the problem ripe for the international community to guide States towards an equitable solution? On what does the ripeness of the problem depend other than the exact assessment of all and the attitude of equity of the Powers concerned in the conflict between antagonists?

86. In 1947, when the United Nations decided on the partition of Palestine, the only concern of the international community was to satisfy the Zionists, and hence to take advantage of Hitler's holocaust and of the feelings of justified compassion he aroused for the Jews of the world. With rare exceptions, the Arabs were then still under foreign domination. In many regions of the Arab world, the struggle against colonialism had not yet reached its apogee. Instead of accepting the part of Palestine that had been given them by the resolution on partition, the Arabs of Palestine preferred to reject partition. They were then suddenly chased from their homes through the back doors of neighbouring Arab countries and, finally, they are now refused the right to exist in their own country and even elsewhere, since they are chased everywhere, while, on the contrary, the great Powers recognize Israel's existence and its right to expansion to boot! The rights of the Palestinians are ignored. What is more, it would seem that the policy of certain countries, on the pretext of the struggle against terrorism, is intended to chase the Palestinians wherever they exist in the vain and illusory hope of safeguarding peace and tranquillity in the region and making sure that Israel will be perennial.

87. Resolution 242 (1967) does not refer to the Palestinians except as refugees, whereas the problem of their national rights is paramount in any settlement in the Middle East. Where, then, is the right of all peoples to self-determination? Where is the principle of the integrity of all States, of a just and equitable policy, of an over-all settlement that will ensure lasting peace based on justice? Many arguments were advanced in the course of the debates of the Security Council leading to the adoption of resolution 242 (1967). Since then—and this is 1973, six years after the six-day war—withdrawal from the occupied

territories has not taken place. On the contrary, we are witnessing their *de facto* annexation. The Government of Israel designs and implements a policy intended to introduce profound changes in the occupied territories, thus betraying its intention to make its presence there eternal. We are told that, at best, one must expect permanent occupation of Jerusalem, of Sharm el-Sheikh and of the Golan Heights. By frequent acts of aggression Israel affirms its will to annihilate the Palestinian people and to play the role of implementing justice in the region.

88. We might be carried away by despair and conclude that we shall never see reason prevail in the Middle East, were other factors not to intervene in our analysis. Those factors are the following. First, while ignoring the Palestinian people the Israelis actually live in fear—and it is the Palestinian people they fear, because that people really exists and profoundly believes in its inalienable rights. Secondly, there has been an evolution of thought in Israel, above all among the young, who are beginning to become aware of the injustice committed against the Palestinians and can no longer bear belonging to a country which in fact follows a colonial policy, despoiling Arab lands and occupying territories that belong to other States. Thirdly, international public opinion shows increasingly widespread reprobation for acts of aggression of Israel such as its extraordinary attack on the Libyan aircraft in Sinai and its numerous punitive expeditions against Lebanon.

89. But all those factors have not yet attained sufficient force to influence the course of events. The list of acts of violence that has been presented by the delegation of Israel since the first day of this debate, to which we must not forget to add the acts of aggression perpetrated by the Government of Israel, is certainly edifying. It is no longer classical terrorism. It is a continuation of the conflict in a new form, with acts of spying and counter-spying, frequent assassinations, bombings and armed incursions. This is grave; this is serious. And here developments are far from reassuring. The cease-fire is precarious. Israel has made no effort to change its Zionist and expansionist character. Yet it is evident that, had Israel accepted implementation of United Nations resolutions concerning the refugees [*General Assembly resolution 194 (III)*] and withdrawal from the occupied territories [*Security Council resolution 242 (1967)*], a better situation would have been created in the Middle East. All efforts at mediation have, unfortunately, failed—the getting together of the great Powers, the Jarring Mission, the good offices of wise Africans, the many efforts of numerous Governments.

90. The prospects of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East seem remote to us. Are we to wait until the situation deteriorates further before we act to promote just and equitable solutions as necessary? Is it not time for all of us, small and large nations alike, to become aware of our responsibility and require respect for the Charter of the United Nations and the resolutions of our Organization? Has not the time come to take up this problem with new methods and a more realistic and positive spirit, and to grant the Middle East absolute priority in our concerns? What is needed is a general mobilization of our efforts for an over-all solution that will provide universal recognition for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and

withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories, enabling Jerusalem once more to become the symbol of peace and brotherhood.

91. With our sensitivity, which we never wish to shed because it shows us the road of justice, and with our usual concern to appeal to reason, which shows us the path of truth, we submit to the Security Council a series of thoughts. We have tried to project, unchanged, on the international screen which this Security Council is, our vision of the situation in the Middle East. In fact, this is not the first time this august Council has heard statements recalling the monumental injustice committed more than a quarter of a century ago against a small people in the Middle East and retracing the 26 tragic years which that small people has suffered. How many times have voices been raised here to pose the crucial question whether one can deny the Palestinian people its right to its homeland? Of all the representatives of States seated around this table—super-Powers, Powers small or large, weak or strong—is there a single one that in all conscience believes that the people of Palestine does not have the right to its homeland?

92. And yet the leaders of the Palestinian people, the leaders of a liberation movement, have been assassinated in Beirut by a group acting on the orders of a Government, and that group later, after its crime, was publicly congratulated by the Prime Minister of a State Member of the United Nations. That is the first fact; it is grave and exceptional.

93. Yet what is now obvious—and the present debate of the Security Council bears witness to this—is that the problem of Palestine is before the Security Council. From this I shall draw two conclusions. Before demanding of the Palestinians that they respect international law, the international community should, first of all, take action so that international law respects the Palestinian people. It is not logical to place them beyond the pale of the law and then designate them as outlaws. But we must say that, for ourselves and for the Palestinians, morality must prevail. The second conclusion, which is rather more of a question is: Why should not the Security Council hear the representatives of the Palestinian people?

94. The second fact is no less grave: The Government of Israel sent a group of armed men to the capital of an independent and sovereign State to carry out an operation including acts of sabotage and political assassination, and this in defiance of all laws except one—that of the jungle. Israel has permitted itself such audacity, first because it knows that it is armed to the teeth and because Lebanon, a peaceful country, has practically no army, and secondly because in Tel-Aviv there was a conviction that the international community would not react positively.

95. We now see the Security Council hearing speeches. Will it take the necessary decision or will it once again hesitate because of the fear of a veto? What are we to think of that? Must the small countries draw the conclusion that, to protect themselves from aggression, it is their duty to arm themselves as much as or more than their neighbours? Then why is there such a flood of declarations of the United Nations on the strengthening of international

security? Then why does everyone talk about disarmament in New York, Geneva and elsewhere? Then why do we have the Security Council, which lives with the obsession of the veto and which has often been paralysed by the veto? Why do we have the United Nations, the Charter, resolution 242 (1967) and the Jarring mission? Why indeed are we here?

96. We are far from being pessimistic. Nor would we affirm that the United Nations no longer represents anything and that one must therefore resign oneself to the idea that sooner or later it will meet the fate of the League of Nations. On the contrary, we are one of the small countries which are devoted to the Organization and attached to its ideals, and our devotion to it is only equalled by our discontent and protest because of the now increasingly numerous acts and excessively persistent policy of certain States. We must not forget that South Africa and Portugal are among the States which paralyse the Organization, discredit it and, finally, act as though they would wish to condemn it to a slow death.

97. We are among those who believe that the responsibility of the great Powers is decisive in the Middle East; that of the super-Powers is even more decisive. But we also believe that the small and medium-sized countries, including the Arab countries, not only have something to say but could, by concerted effort, design a well-studied strategy and decide on intelligent and bold action, and thus lead the great Powers of this world to a more just assessment of the situation and lead them to take more vigorous action against the many evils which are, alas, too numerous in this century, which is reputed to be one of progress and justice but which yet sees so much racism, colonialism and foreign domination in all forms—and I cannot forget the underdevelopment and the poverty suffered in the third world and against which we must unite our efforts.

98. It is this direction which has always guided us in the United Nations, and particularly in our actions with other delegations during the twenty-seventh session which led to the adoption, by 123 votes, of General Assembly resolution 2991 (XXVII), in which the Assembly:

“2. *Calls upon* Member States to ensure the strict application of the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations;

“3. *Appeals to* Member States which have not yet expressed their views on ways and means of enhancing the effectiveness of the Security Council in accordance with the principles and provisions of the Charter to do so by 30 June 1973 at the latest.”

99. I should also like to recall that the delegation of Tunisia—which comes from a country that has a well-known experience, since for eight years there was a war of national liberation raging in a neighbouring country—has, for a long time, foreseen the development of events in the Middle East. That is why we had reservations when the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [General Assembly resolution 2734 (XXV)] was adopted

on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations. We then spoke about the right of "hot pursuit" and we foresaw that that which occurred on the Algerian-Tunisian frontier between 1954 and 1962 might recur on other frontiers. The latest aggression of Israel against Lebanon, with which the Security Council is seized, is in that category and even surpasses the kind of military events which occurred on the Tunisian frontier—doubtless unbeknownst to the French Government in most cases. But here there is an act organized by a responsible Government of a State Member of the United Nations against a State Member of the United Nations.

100. On behalf of the people and the Government of Tunisia, on behalf of President Bourguiba, I should like to place on record before the Council the total solidarity of Tunisia with Lebanon, to which justice must be given by the application of the provisions of the Charter.

101. This latest aggression of Israel against Lebanon is after all, however grave, an incident among many others more or less serious and more or less deadly. And all these incidents are a source of concern and profound anxiety. We believe that we now face a particularly dangerous situation in the Middle East. It is the duty of the Council to confront the situation and to take the required measures. What has just occurred in Beirut and the events of the last months are really alarming. It is the duty of all of us to put an end to the escalation.

102. We have said so before the General Assembly and we repeat it today before the Security Council: the problem of the Middle East should have high priority in our concerns and in the concerns of our Governments.

103. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): Mr. President, let me first of all express my great pleasure in joining other members of the Council in welcoming you to the presidential Chair in which you can be sure of the fullest co-operation and goodwill of the Australian delegation.

104. I should also like once again to convey our appreciation and our congratulations to our other colleague from Latin America, Mr. Boyd of Panama, on his felicitous handling of the presidency in the month of March, during which we held our momentous meetings in his own country.

105. I am glad also to join in welcoming our new Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Shevchenko, and to extend to him our good wishes and encouragement in the tasks and responsibilities that lie ahead of him.

106. My delegation has listened with close attention to the statements made in the past few days on the matter that is now before the Council. If I say that we have listened without enjoyment, I mean to cast no reflection on the sincerity underlying the strong feelings which have been expressed in the course of this debate and which we can fully understand. These strong feelings are of course not unfamiliar to this Council. But they seem, on this occasion, to reveal, perhaps more clearly than ever before, the symptoms of the pattern of escalation of violence and

terror that is threatening to endanger innocent human lives in every corner of the world.

107. My delegation is not alone in finding the continuing spectacle of violence followed by violent reprisal and further violence on a mounting and increasingly world-wide scale not only saddening but gravely disturbing. None of it can be condoned; it must all be deplored, whatever the degree of provocation offered from either side. And it must be brought to an end, or the sympathy, patience and understanding which exists throughout the world and which extends particularly to the Palestine refugees may come to be tried beyond endurance to the point where the Security Council will find itself being pressed to take decisions that will be unwelcome to all the disputing parties in the Middle East.

108. We have listened in these past few days to a constant ebb and flow of intense recrimination. In this emotional atmosphere of charge and countercharge of aggression, or complicity or acquiescence in aggression, it is perhaps too much to hope that either side can bring itself, at any rate in this Council, to show any understanding of, and to make the slightest concession to, the problems, the fears and the motivations of the other side. But it is this complete polarization of attitudes that have become frozen over the years that helps to aggravate the already difficult task of the United Nations and particularly of this Council.

109. In the context of the agenda for this meeting the Council is called on by the representative of Lebanon to take into serious consideration, against a background of earlier aggressive acts charged against Israel, "the new Israeli blatant act of aggression against Lebanon" [S/10911].

110. This would suggest that we are not expected to take account of all other retaliatory acts of violence and terror or of their underlying causes. Investigation of the underlying causes is to be the task of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on International Terrorism established by the General Assembly under its resolution 3034 (XXVII). But for the fundamental underlying cause we do not of course need to look beyond the persistent failure of the search for a settlement of the dispute between Israel and its Arab neighbour States.

111. I am happy to say that the Government and people of Australia enjoy good relations with the principal countries concerned and no country is more anxious than mine to see a just, secure and lasting peace established as soon as possible in the Middle East. And in the view of my delegation the first, and we believe the most positive and helpful step in that direction, might be to break the cycle of aggression and reprisal and thus to turn back the wave of murderous violence and terror that has spread outwards from the Middle East across the world.

112. If we are right in this belief, there seems to be little point in our considering the latest Israeli act in isolation from the rest of the horrifying matrix of recent international violence and terror. This debate seems to have thrown up a new expression, "state terrorism", and there can be no doubt that what happened in Beirut on the night of 9 to 10 April was murder planned, directed and acknowledged

by the Government of Israel, and a deplorable intrusion upon the sovereignty of another State Member of the United Nations. As such it must demand censure.

113. But whether it is to be regarded as an act of aggression or retaliation or precaution or self-defence, it is only one of a succession of acts of violence in respect of some of which some of Israel's neighbouring Governments can scarcely escape charges of complicity or at least acquiescence. In other words "the new Israeli blatant act of aggression against Lebanon", to quote again from the letter of the representative of Lebanon in document S/10911, is part of a vicious circle and cannot be separated from its surrounding pattern of violence if this Council is to generate a new momentum in its efforts to bring about a just, secure and lasting peace in the Middle East. If the United Nations fails to put an end to the further escalation and proliferation of international terrorism, it is liable to have matters taken out of its hands.

114. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Lebanon.

115. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): I should like to express the thanks of my delegation to the representatives around this table who have spoken rightly and openly, have shown the solidarity of their countries with Lebanon in these trying times and have joined in exposing and condemning the acts of aggression conducted by Israel against Lebanon.

116. I should like to call the attention of the Council to a very important fact. Here in document S/Agenda/1708 dated 16 April 1973, which was adopted at the beginning of this meeting, there is one item entitled: "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)". We are facing one particular aspect of the situation in the Middle East dealt with in that particular letter, which is a definite complaint by Lebanon about a definite, precise and specific act of aggression conducted by Israel on the morning of 10 April 1973 against my country. I do not see in that document any item called "terrorism", nor do I see another item called: "Review of the Middle East situation in general in connexion with resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967".

117. As far as the second point is concerned, yesterday the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt apprised the Council [1707th meeting] of his desire, after the conclusion of the debate on the Lebanese complaint, to seize the Council with a new request. That is his privilege and we shall await his action and be here to support him and to show the same spirit of solidarity towards Egypt and the other Arab countries victims of Israeli aggression that Egypt has shown today in participating in the debate on this particular and specific item.

118. As far as concerns the question of terrorism, acts of violence and attacks on diplomats and civil aircraft, the Council is free to discuss it at any time under any item. Members of the Council have the full privilege of seizing the Council of a specific item on terrorism or acts of terrorism, and naturally we have no objection to that, but, when the

Council is dealing with the complaint of Lebanon, we are not to be made the scapegoat and we categorically reject any attempts by anyone to make Lebanon responsible for acts which are conducted outside its territory or acts conducted by individual Palestinians.

119. I have listened with great attention and consideration to the statements made today by the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States. I agree with Mr. Scali that we are not here to apportion or assess responsibility, but I must call the attention of the Council to the fact that a certain emphasis has been placed on one aspect of the problem, terrorist acts, a subject which is not before the Council, more than on the specific question we are dealing with. There has been a reference to the Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly during its twenty-fifth session [*resolution 2625 (XXV), Annex*]. A quotation was given from that Declaration. I hope that the inference will not be drawn that Lebanon is the particular State that is organizing, instigating, assisting and participating in acts of violence and so on. I should like to remind members of the Council of other portions of the same Declaration and I should like them to be clearly put in the record. The Declaration solemnly proclaims the following principles.

"Every State has the duty to refrain in its international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. Such a threat or use of force constitutes a violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations and shall never be employed as a means of settling international issues.

"...

"A war of aggression constitutes a crime against the peace, for which there is responsibility under international law.

"...

"Every State has the duty to refrain from the threat or use of force to violate the existing international boundaries of another State or as a means of solving international disputes, including territorial disputes ...".

There are other provisions in this Declaration—which I am not going to quote, since the question is not before us—relating to the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. We shall come to that at a later stage.

120. There is always a certain attempt to speak of balance and of fairness: an attempt to equate acts with other acts. I have made it clear before in my statements to the Council, and I should like to make it clear again, that in dealing with a specific complaint by Lebanon we are not here to equate acts of violence carried out by individuals—by anybody anywhere in the world against anyone—with a precise act of aggression carried out by Israel against Lebanon. This is not the first such act. This Council has condemned Israel several

times before because of its aggressions against my country. It is already an established pattern. Lebanon has always been considered a moderate, peaceful country. We have been pushed constantly into a most difficult situation, while the international community and some Members of the United Nations, who have the responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security, are not acting effectively in order to bring about a solution of the problem of the Middle East. Those acts of violence committed by individuals do not in any way justify the open, naked and premeditated acts of aggression committed by Israel against Lebanon. When we speak about terrorism we should also speak about terrorism organized by a State. Why do we put emphasis only on terrorism conducted by individuals? What about the terrorism conceived, planned and executed by a State? Why do we not speak about those reactions and over-reactions of Israel against Lebanon every time there is an act of violence somewhere in the world?

121. I should like here to remind the Council of an opinion that a former Foreign Minister of Israel, Mr. Moshe Sharett, once expressed. In a lecture he gave in 1957 he opined that:

"A people should not consider, when military reactions outstrip in their severity the events that caused them, that these actions do not produce grave processes and set in motion these grave processes which widen the gulf and thrust our neighbours into extremism."

122. Well, that is the precise action that Israel is conducting against peaceful, moderate Lebanon in order constantly to push it and its people into a most difficult situation; and, unfortunately, we are at the present time facing a situation where we have to carry a certain portion of the assessment of the blame. To try to apportion responsibility for incidents and outrages perpetrated every now and then, here and there, is to divert attention from the real responsibility. Israel was and remains the party principally responsible for the tragedy of the Palestinian people and for its resulting consequences. The Zionist and Israeli terrorism before, during and after 1947 and 1948, and as a result of the 1967 war, has driven over a million and a half people out of their ancestral homeland into exile; their lands, their homes and property have been taken by foreigners ingathered in Arab Palestine.

123. This historic, factual responsibility should not be clouded in the minds of people and the arguments of present-day realism should take into serious consideration this basic element when there are attempts at apportioning responsibility. Singular acts, no matter what their magnitude may be and whatever the impact they may have on public opinion, should not blind people to the fundamental truth about the tragedy of the Palestinian people brought about by Israel. Nor can the United Nations absolve itself of its cardinal responsibility.

124. It is not my intention to recall all the facts about the role played by the United Nations in the creation of the Palestinian problem; but are we not justified in reminding the Council and the international community at large that the United Nations has permitted the problem of the Palestinian refugees to last for a quarter of a century, and

that it has shown no signs of doing anything to solve it? It may be argued that the United Nations provides relief assistance to the refugees. That is true and praiseworthy; but it is not enough to maintain them in misery, in a state of vegetation, while the usurpers of their homeland enjoy growing military and economic power, thanks to substantial and generous aid, grants, loans and armaments pumped steadily through the pipeline of assistance to Israel.

125. My delegation is raising these arguments at this stage to bring back into correct focus the dramatic events which are still flowing out of the original and capital sin—that of the spoliation of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. To freeze the Palestinian problem at its present level, to neglect to find a solution to it, to avoid dealing with it courageously, fairly and squarely, to yield, wittingly or unwittingly, to Israel's systematic and obstinate refusal to settle it, is tantamount to a deliberate invitation by the United Nations for additional tragic events to rock the world. It also means that the United Nations is allowing itself, by its inaction or refusal to act, to wander away from facing the realities of the situation and to evade shouldering its fullest responsibility.

126. Those who are concerned about the growing acts of violence—and we share their concern—must step out of the stalemate of this quiet and lethargy which is prevailing in international affairs and hit at the roots of the problem. It has been sufficiently repeated that violence begets violence. There is the stark reality of the existence of one and a half million Palestinian refugees who are still living in deplorable, miserable and frustrating conditions after 25 years. As long as the international community does not address itself to finding a just solution to their problem, the cycle of violence in which the Middle East is gripped today will not be broken and cannot but go on spiralling.

127. Israel seems to enjoy, in the opinion of experts, not a balance of military power with the Arab States but a net superiority over them. Israel is using that superiority right and left, and we are its victims. Israel uses it not for defence, as its leaders pretend, but to maintain an offensive campaign of terror and intimidation against the neighbouring Arab States. But that superiority cannot last for ever. Great Powers and empires have risen and crumbled in the course of history; no amount of military superiority and power has saved them. But nations which built their existence on solid moral and human foundations were able to withstand the calamities of time and survived.

128. Regarding the Arab world, we must remember the historical truth that Israel and its supporters must reckon with; it is an historical as well as a present-day and future reality. A Jewish man with great vision, Professor Judas Magnus, a founder and first President of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, saw it a long time ago when he spoke of "... the permanent truth of the presence of the Arab world, with which all nations have had to reckon, and so must Israel. The Israelis are no exceptions; they only enjoy a temporary superiority". Mr. Magnus also said, with chilling prescience: "The day we lick the Arabs, that is the day, I think, when we shall be sowing the seeds of an eternal hatred of such dimensions that Jews will not be able to live in Palestine for centuries to come."

129. Is that the peace Israel wants? Is the kind of peace Israel wants a peace achieved by building walls of hatred around itself, by building hedges of violence around its borders?

130. On this day of Passover I invite the Jews of the world to think about peace—and to think about it sincerely. I agree with Mr. Scali and Sir Colin Crowe regarding the peace and prospects of peace that we should look forward to. We should act for peace; that is our aim. It has been the aim of the Arab Governments and peoples for a long time. They have, as I mentioned before, a great stake in peace, for in peace alone can they achieve their national goals of educational, economic and social progress and political stability.

131. President Sadat of Egypt, in an article published by the quarterly *Foreign Affairs* in its issue of October 1972, emphasized the importance of peace to his country. He said that Egypt had no interest in the wars of the Middle East. He added:

“They are tremendous obstacles on her road to progress. The cause of peace will not be furthered if the victor is allowed to dictate his terms and to exact the fruits of his victory. The future we and the other Arab nations dream of is one of justice and of peace in co-operation with all those who wish to assist our progress towards those goals.”

132. Egypt made positive moves towards achieving peace in February 1970. It was commended by the United Nations in various resolutions and by international public opinion. Perhaps I should remind the Council here that Mr. Richard Nixon, the President of the United States, described the Egyptian attitude best when he said that “Egypt was forthcoming more than expected”.

133. Why should we all feel powerless in the face of Israel in our search to achieve a just and durable peace? Why is Israel allowed to perpetuate a stalemate and, consequently, to further the deterioration of the situation we are all complaining about? Mr. President, I would like to assure you and members of the Council that there are countries which are attached to peace and to the prevalence of peace in the world. But allow me to say that there is no country in the world which is attached to peace more than Lebanon.

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

135. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): We have heard in the course of the present debate a great deal about peaceful, innocent Lebanon. By now the world is fully acquainted with how peaceful and how innocent Lebanon and its capital, Beirut, are. Lebanon is like the house owner who consorts with murderers, who permits criminals the use of his home and then, when the neighbours strike back, complains that the house is being damaged or affected.

136. To the Government of Lebanon I would give a piece of very simple advice. Get rid of the murderers in your

midst. Chase them out of your house before they bring that house down upon you. I was amazed to listen to the representative of Lebanon refer to the principles contained in the Declaration on friendly relations and co-operation between States. The principles cited by him are precisely those that the Arab States have torn to pieces in their relations with Israel. Who is responsible for 25 years of continuous war? Who is responsible for the aggression that started with the Arab invasion of Israel in 1948 and still continues through periods of truce, armistice and cease-fire—but still continues, by various methods, including, today, the bestial method of bloodshed through outrages and atrocities?

137. The representative of Lebanon, however, did not refer to and did not read out to us the principle that I and other representatives have cited in the course of this debate, contained in the same Declaration, and I should like to repeat it:

“Every State has the duty to refrain from organizing or encouraging the organization of irregular forces or armed bands, including mercenaries, for incursion into the territory of another State.

“Every State has the duty to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in acts of civil strife or terrorist acts in another State or acquiescing in organized activities within its territory directed towards the commission of such acts, when the acts referred to in the present paragraph involve a threat or use of force.”

138. The representative of Lebanon asked whether the references to this particular obligation implied that Lebanon and its Government were considered to be responsible for violating this obligation. The answer is clearly yes. The Government of Lebanon acquiesces in the presence of armed bands on its territory. It encourages them by its attitude; it fosters and gives added strength, by the kind of statements to which the Security Council has been treated in the course of this debate, to the terrorist groups active on its territory.

139. It is time for the Government of Lebanon not to be selective in its references to international obligations, to Charter principles, to declarations, especially those adopted unanimously by all Member States of the United Nations. Either there is one law for all or there is really no sense at all in our discussing the application of international principles of law and morality. Indeed, any one of us, or of the onlookers and listeners that have been following our deliberations thus far, must have been troubled by a number of questions.

140. Is not the Charter of the United Nations based on the sovereign equality of all its Member States? Why then is one Arab representative after another permitted, as they have been again today, to come before the highest organ of the United Nations and openly reject Israel's right to independence? Why are they permitted to claim here that all peoples in the world have a right to national identity, to freedom and self-determination, but not the Jewish people? Why are Arab representatives allowed to turn the Security Council Chamber into a forum where slander and

falsehood are constantly trotted out, where truth and history are turned into mockery and where law and equity are cynically distorted? Is it not a travesty of elementary justice when the Jewish people's age-long struggle to restore its independence in its ancient homeland is calumniated and dismissed, while the descendants of Arab conquerors of this land and people, the great majority of whom had emigrated into Palestine from abroad in the same years the Jews returned to it, are referred to as indigenous, as they were by some representatives again at the present meeting?

141. How long will the United Nations have to hear what the world knows to be a total untruth: that the problem of a million Palestinian refugees, out of more than 40 million refugees in all parts of the globe who were resettled a long time ago, is the source of Arab terrorism, which began long before there was a single Palestinian refugee in the world?

142. Those who have been listening to the statements made in the Council today and yesterday must have been pondering and wondering over a number of questions. Does not international law, do not United Nations resolutions, prohibit the organization and the support of terrorist acts from the territory of one State against another, as provided for, for instance, in the Declaration I cited? Why then does not the Security Council do something about the maintenance of terrorist bases and the initiation of terrorist acts on the territory of Lebanon and other Arab States? Why does the Council listen passively to Arab Governments justifying their identification with terror atrocities and demanding a licence for continuing in this criminal attitude?

143. Is there or is there not a fundamental Charter principle recognizing the right of every State Member of the United Nations to self-defence, a right transcending all other principles and obligations? Why then is there criticism of Israel's action against the terrorist bases from which savage attacks have been launched against its territory and its citizens? Is it merely because this action was carried out by Israel? Does not the principle of self-defence apply to Israel as it does to other countries? Is not the entire enlightened world engaged today in combatting international terrorism? Why does not the Security Council do something about it?

144. What is the advice that we hear at the Council table? From Arab representatives it is simple: disappear from the world and then there will be peace. Well, the Jewish people has rejected such advice for several millenia; it does not intend to heed it now, especially when it comes from such paragons of international law as Arab representatives or the representative of Indonesia, which State thought nothing of massacring half a million Chinese citizens only a few years ago. Where was the Security Council then?

145. What alternatives do those who have expressed dissatisfaction with Israel's action against the terrorist bases have to offer to us? Address ourselves to the United Nations? Has not our Organization proved helpless to take effective action against terrorism? Have we forgotten what happened only a few months ago at the General Assembly session? Turn to the Security Council? How many times is

it necessary to do so in order to prove that the Council, because of its structure, its composition, its voting procedures, is unable to take an equitable stand on Middle Eastern questions? How many more meetings of the Security Council are necessary to remind the world that in its entire history this organ has not adopted a single resolution—not a single resolution—condemning the murder of Israeli citizens, and that time and again such resolutions have been voted down or vetoed?

146. Have we already forgotten how, when in 1967 Egypt chased out the United Nations Emergency Force from Sinai and Gaza, imposed a war blockade in the Straits of Tiran, massed its forces for attack along Israel's borders and began shelling Israeli villages, the Council found itself in a mire of polemics, incapable of taking any action?

147. What is then the course of action against the barbaric campaign of Arab terrorism that is being proposed to us here? Nothing, nothing at all. Since the beginning of the El Fatah-Black September atrocities in 1970, 80 Arab terrorists have been caught in Western countries—some of them in States represented in this Council, including States whose representatives have spoken today. All of these terrorists—all of them—have been released. Now, is this the way to combat terrorism? Is this the example set for Israel? In another country, Yugoslavia, only a few days ago, an Israel table-tennis team participating in an international tournament was compelled by the Yugoslav authorities to leave because those authorities gave in to the threats of Arab terrorist organizations to attack the Israeli sportsmen. Now is this a policy to be emulated? Do nothing? Surrender to the menace of savage bloodshed? Release criminals engaged in it?

148. A Jewish citizen of the USSR recently wrote a letter to the Secretary-General, explaining his suffering, his despair and his longing to live as a free man in Israel. Recalling Jewish history—the inquisition, the pogroms, the Nazi holocaust—he wrote: "In the heart of every Jew there is a cemetery." Yes, we have not forgotten and we shall not forget. We have not forgotten the 6 million barbarically butchered, the 2 million Jewish children led to gas chambers and crematoria, while the world stood by in silence. We have not forgotten how, in those dark years of persecution and murder, we were being told that there were principles of sovereignty, of domestic jurisdiction, of vital State interests which prevented intervention, which prevented effective action to save 6 million Jews. The advice given us today—sit still, do nothing about the murder of Jews in our times because there are questions such as those of sovereignty—cannot but bring back the echoes of the past.

149. The problem before the Security Council is clear. Egypt and Lebanon and their supporters are asking for a licence to continue international terrorism. Israel submits to the Council that, in the absence of any readiness by Arab Governments to abide by their obligations and put an end to the use of their territory for murder operations, in the absence of any effective measures by the United Nations to curb international terrorism, Israel has no choice but to protect its people with its own means. The cycle of violence is not of Israel's making. When Arab violence ceases and

when Arab terrorism ends, there will be no need for Israeli counter-measures and an effort towards understanding and agreement can be made.

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

151. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): I promise that I shall be extremely brief. In the light of the statement we just heard by the representative of Israel in which he very clearly expressed a warning to Lebanon by saying, "before they bring that house down upon you", I wish to draw the attention of the Council to the threat that was made following the attack on Beirut by the Minister of Defense of Israel, Moishe Dayan, who said that in the future Israel would not act against individual terrorists alone, but would strike against the neighbouring Arab countries, and there was a direct threat against Lebanon. That is the kind of threat that we are facing every day. It was not sufficient that Israel committed an abhorrent and abominable act of aggression on 10 April. Its spokesmen had to follow that act by making further threats against our lives, our sovereignty and our territorial integrity.

152. Again we hear the rhetoric of Mr. Tekoah about the 6 million Jews. I think he has used that argument enough in the Council. We are not responsible for that act, and we never participated in it. We have been the victim of the holocaust.

153. Israel wants to live in peace? Well, it can. The Jews of Israel can live in peace and harmony with their neighbours. The Jews of Lebanon live in peace and harmony with us. We value them, I take this opportunity here today solemnly to address to them my congratulations on this holy day. I have many friends among them, and I value their friendship. We have no hatred against the Jews or against the Israelis. We have hatred against acts of violence and of aggression. If Mr. Tekoah and his people really wish to live in peace, in a spirit of conciliation, of peace and justice, I invite him and his people to allow the Palestinian people, on this day of Passover, to begin to pass over the borders and to reintegrate in their ancestral home. This is the invitation that I make to Israel: for the people of Palestine to reintegrate in their home and to live in peace. I assure Mr. Tekoah that if the Palestinians are allowed to go back to their homes and if justice is done to them, they will

cross over without any arms, but only with flowers, the flowers of peace.

154. Mr. ANWAR SANI (Indonesia): I shall be very brief. The representative of Israel referred to my delegation when he was exercising his right of reply. He mentioned the murder of 500,000 Chinese in Indonesia a few years ago. As we are not discussing the internal affairs of Indonesia in this Council, I should like only to request him to study his facts better, as neither the number nor the nationality of the victims, as stated by him, is correct.

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

156. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I have asked to speak simply to make one point. It is not the first time and it is not the first of his statements in which the representative of Lebanon has resorted to utter distortion, even of words pronounced a few minutes before his own statement. I at no time in my remarks said that Israel threatened Lebanon in any manner. My statement was that the Lebanese Government should eliminate the terrorist gangs from its territory before they bring the house down upon Lebanon.

157. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before adjourning the meeting, I am pleased to call on Mr. Arkady Shevchenko, Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council affairs, who wishes to make a statement.

158. Mr. SHEVCHENKO (Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs) (*translation from Russian*): I have spent considerable time within these walls and I have always striven in the past and shall continue to strive in the future in my new capacity to do everything in my power to ensure that the tasks set out in the Charter of the United Nations are accomplished. I am sure that the United Nations Secretariat, under the leadership of the Secretary-General, will do everything necessary to carry out those tasks.

159. I should like sincerely to thank you, Mr. President, all the members of the Security Council and all my old friends and colleagues for the warm words of welcome which they addressed to me.

The meeting rose at 1.50 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.
