



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-NINTH YEAR

1767th MEETING: 16 APRIL 1974

NEW YORK

UN LIBRARY

JAN 29 1981

UN/SA COLLECTION

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1767)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 13 April 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11264)	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 SIXTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 16 April 1974, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Talib EL-SHIBIB (Iraq).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Austria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Costa Rica, France, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Mauritania, Peru, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon and the United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1767)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 13 April 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11264)

The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 13 April 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11264)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken by the Council at its 1766th meeting, and with the consent of the Council, I propose to invite the representatives of Lebanon and Israel, under the relevant Articles of the Charter and in accordance with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure, to participate in the Council's discussion without the right to vote.

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

2. The PRFIDENT: In addition, in accordance with the decision also taken at the same meeting, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Egypt, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and the Syrian Arab Republic to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion, under the relevant Articles of the Charter and in accordance with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure. I would request the representatives mentioned to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on

the understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table at the appropriate moment.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. I. Fahmy (Egypt), Mr. F. Al-Sayegh (Kuwait), Mr. J. Baroodi (Saudi Arabia) and Mr. H. Kelani (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

3. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): With the work of the special session of the General Assembly in full swing, the Security Council has been convened at the initiative of the non-aligned and developing countries to consider some important questions; it is again compelled to examine the question of the latest act of aggression by Israel against the peace-loving State of Lebanon. It is clear from the statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lebanon [1766th meeting], and from the letter from the representative of Lebanon that during the night of 12/13 April 1974 Israeli armed forces made a new incursion into Lebanese territory. Under cover of darkness, with their usual furtiveness, armed detachments of Israeli troops, on the orders of their Government and their High Command, deliberately invaded the territory of the sovereign State of Lebanon, killed and wounded several Lebanese civilians, destroyed 31 dwellings in six peaceful Lebanese villages, seized 13 Lebanese and abducted them to Israel.

4. This criminal act of the Israeli aggressors is yet another link in the chain of the crimes they have already committed and continue to commit. The Israeli extremists are striving, by means of terrorism elevated to the level of State policy and by means of intimidation and aggression, to carry out their predatory plans for the annexation and appropriation of foreign lands and the Israelization of the Arab territories they seized in 1967. All this is a flagrant violation of the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by means of war or the use of force, a principle organized and affirmed by the United Nations.

5. During the past six years the Security Council has already considered questions relating to Israel's acts of aggression against Lebanon more than 10 times. Today, in its consideration of this new act of international banditry committed by Israel, the Council cannot but take into account the long list of Israel's crimes of aggression against Lebanon, which it has considered in the past.

6. In recent years the Council has warned Israel many times that, if its acts of aggression against Lebanon continue, the Council will consider the question of adopting adequate, effective measures, in accordance with the

relevant provisions of the Charter, to ensure that its resolutions are carried out. However, the Government of Israel, as can be seen from the fact that it officially sanctioned this latest armed incursion into Lebanese territory, is continuing to defy the Council and violate its decisions, counting on the assistance and support of its protectors in the Council.

7. As the representative of Lebanon rightly stressed in his letter and his statement, the repeated criminal acts of the Israeli militarists in Lebanon are carried out as part of the Israeli Government's policy of intimidation and State terrorism towards Lebanon.

8. We cannot overlook the fact that this latest nocturnal, gangster-like operation carried out by the Israeli annexationists against Lebanon, which caused loss of life and the destruction of dwellings, is commended in every possible way by the Israeli Government, as if it were a "heroic action". Attempts are made to cover up and justify this act of international banditry by references to so-called "retaliatory measures". Attention has already been drawn here to the statement, unprecedented in its cynicism, made on 13 April by Moshe Dayan, the Israeli Minister of Defence, in which on behalf of the Israeli Government he threatened to continue the acts of aggression against Lebanon. In this statement Dayan, on behalf of the Israeli Government, threatened Lebanon—an independent, sovereign State, a Member of the United Nations—with the destruction and devastation of the whole of the southern part of the country. Frightful and monstrous is the barbarity of the second half of the twentieth century.

9. Such statements and the armed attacks of the Israeli militarists call to mind the worst times of the domination of the Hitlerites over the foreign territories which they had temporarily occupied during the Second World War. They pursued a scorched earth policy and sought the total destruction of a peaceful population on the pretext of "retaliatory measures" against the activities of patriots.

10. Such actions and statements on the part of the Israeli Government are all the more intolerable and inadmissible since, as has been convincingly shown in the letter dated 12 April from the representative of Lebanon [S/11263], Lebanon bears no responsibility for the events which took place on 11 April in the Israeli settlement of Kiryat Shmona. In his letter the representative of Lebanon indicates how unfounded and futile are the assertions by Israel that the persons who committed the act of terrorism in Kiryat Shmona had penetrated into Israel from Lebanon; he rightly stressed that "Neither the Lebanese Government nor the Lebanese people could be held responsible for the actions of non-Lebanese operating outside Lebanon, whether in Israel or anywhere else" [*ibid.*, para. 4].

11. The position of the Soviet Union with regard to acts of international terrorism is well known. It has been stated repeatedly both in the Council and in other United Nations organs. We are most decisively opposed to international terrorism. The Soviet Union argues from a position of principle against acts of terrorism, which disrupt the diplomatic activities of States and of their representatives, transport communications among States and the normal

course of international contacts and meetings, and against acts of violence, which serve no positive purpose and bring about the deaths of innocent people. In an equally firm and decisive manner, we oppose any attempts to influence the policy of States by means of inhuman acts of terrorism.

12. The Soviet Union is equally decisive in its opposition to the idea that acts of a terrorist nature committed by certain factions or irresponsible individuals can be used by an aggressor State to justify the policy of aggression and the terrorism pursued by Israel as part of its State policy. We condemn in the most categorical manner the barbarous and piratical incursions and attacks inflicted by one State on a neighbouring State under any pretext, for no pretexts can serve to justify attacks, arbitrary actions and banditry committed by one State against another. We strongly oppose the "law of the jungle" in relations among States. Thus we strongly condemn the terrorist methods used by Israel in its international policy and its elevation of terrorism to the level of State policy.

13. The Israeli Government's assertions that the piratical incursion of Israeli troops into Lebanese territory, the murder and abduction of Lebanese citizens and the destruction of peaceful Lebanese villages were carried out as "retaliatory measures" against the activities of a Palestinian organization provide no justification and do not stand up to critical analysis. The Council, as we all remember, has decisively condemned any attempts by Israel to cover up and justify this aggression and any other attacks on other States by references to what it calls "reprisals". In this connexion we must note in particular that in resolution 270 (1969) of 26 August 1969, which indeed is concerned with Israel's acts of aggression against Lebanon at that time, the Council decisively condemned and rejected military reprisals. A similar statement concerning the intolerability and inadmissibility of military reprisals on the part of Israel against another Arab country—Jordan—appears in resolution 248 (1968) adopted in March 1968. Thus the Council has clearly and specifically condemned Israel for the military crimes, which Israel has gone to any lengths to justify, with its references to what it calls "retaliatory measures".

14. The root of the evil and of the continuing threat to the cause of peace in the Middle East is twofold: the consequences of Israel's aggression against the Arab countries in June 1967 have not yet been eliminated and, moreover, the Israeli armed forces, aided by imperialist and Zionist forces, have continued without interruption to commit new acts of aggression against neighbouring Arab States.

15. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Brezhnev, speaking on 11 April, at a dinner in Moscow in honour of the President of Syria, Mr. Hafez Al-Assad, said:

"The courageous struggle of the Arab peoples, the united actions of the Arab countries and the firm support rendered them by the socialist States and all peace-loving forces—all this has led to a weakening of the aggressor's position. The myth of the invincibility of the Israeli army has been dispelled. The Arab peoples have proved that

they will never reconcile themselves to the occupation of their lands.

"We are all familiar with the decisions of the Security Council which opened the way for a settlement of the essential points of conflict. For the first time, an authoritative international forum has been established—the Geneva Conference—within the framework of which a lasting and just settlement can and must be achieved.

"However, it is evident that the situation remains explosive. It cannot be otherwise until the main sources of tension are removed, the occupation of Arab lands is ended, the consequences of Israeli aggression are eliminated and reliable guarantees are provided for the security of all the countries of the Middle East.

"It is essential for everyone to realize this. The danger is that, as some of the heat has been taken out of the situation, the aggressor and his protectors can renew their efforts to avoid a radical, comprehensive solution of the problem. It is no coincidence that what I would call "ersatz plans" for a Middle East settlement have recently been put in motion. In practical terms this means the substitution of various kinds of "partial" agreements for a general settlement.

"The position of the Soviet Union is clear and consistent. Our policy has been and will continue to be directed unswervingly against aggression and in support of the legitimate rights of the Arab peoples. We are for a just peace in the Middle East, and that means the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the territories occupied in and since 1967, the guaranteeing of the security and sovereignty of all the States of the area and respect for the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine."

16. The Soviet delegation fully supports the protest of the Lebanese Government against Israel's latest act of aggression against Lebanon. We strongly condemn Israel's policy of continuing its acts of aggression against Lebanon and other Arab States.

17. In deciding what should be done in this case the Council must, in our view, take account of the following points. Repeatedly, the Council has not only condemned Israel but has warned that country that, if it continues its armed attacks on neighbouring Arab States, the Council will consider the question of adopting adequate, effective measures in accordance with the Charter. The time for this has come. The Soviet delegation considers that the Security Council must not only strongly condemn Israel's latest acts of banditry, but must also take effective measures to halt the acts of aggression and banditry committed by the Israeli militarists. The time has also come when those who wish to protect Israel should stop preventing the Council from taking an appropriate, necessary and just decision on this question.

18. Mr. EL HASSEN (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): Once again my delegation, meeting a political and moral imperative, feels duty-bound to speak on the question of the Middle East. We speak after most of the aspects of the question before us today have been broadly

discussed here by the representatives of Lebanon, Egypt, Kuwait, Syria, Saudi Arabia and the Soviet Union. Therefore, I do not intend to go into detail about the merits of the complaint of Lebanon. I merely wish to try to place the problem in its true context.

19. Our attitude obviously must be dictated by our natural solidarity with the Palestinian people and with Lebanon, but it is further justified by the legitimate nature of the cause that we defend and by our attachment to the principle of justice, which has been set down in golden words in the Charter of the United Nations.

20. When all is said and done, what are we dealing with here? We are dealing with the very grave injustice which is incarnate in Israel, the creation of which was and remains a permanent source of conflict which has developed and grown until it has acquired the scope and size that it possesses today. A simple backward glance will in fact remind us of what Palestine was 26 years ago and a simple comparison will show us what it has become today and what has happened to the Palestinian people. Then they lived in peace—they lived in security on their own lands and in their own country. There was a feeling of tolerance, of community and of, I would say, fraternity which linked the diverse elements of the Palestinian population. Nothing led one to believe that there would be an obstacle to their efforts to continue living such a harmonious existence, such a peaceful and promising life. But what has happened to the Palestinian people and to the Palestinian earth? The Palestinian people, whose lives and existence were one over the centuries with the geography and with the earth of Palestine itself, were evicted from their homes. Their aspirations, however just they were, were stifled, as was their eagerness for justice and for human dignity. That people was uprooted and condemned to deteriorate, condemned even to extinction by Israel, whose fate had to be created on the ideology of Zionism. Those who occupy Palestine today and who say that they speak in its name have come from all parts of the world except Palestine. The true Palestinians were there earlier, yet they were evicted and condemned to poverty. They have been forced to live on international charity. The true Palestinians are those who are living in distress and despair, which weighs on our conscience today. Their blood has been sacrificed on the altar of injustice. They have been forced into a dark and endless tunnel haunted by spectres.

21. There are, to be sure, many resolutions—sort of ends in themselves—which have remained a wonderful bandage for the wound of a guilty conscience that we carry with respect to that people, a people whose sole crime was that they were tolerant and whose only fault was that they were weak. And as all the weak have done, they placed their hopes in the United Nations, and more particularly in its most competent organ in this question.

22. The Palestinian earth itself has been disfigured by a policy of the settlement of Jews coming from several parts of the world. Towns and villages have been destroyed. Holy places of all religions have been abused and desecrated. No one can justify the death of innocent people; no one can approve of questioning basic human freedoms; nor can one deny to the Palestinian people their right to existence, their

right to a homeland; more particularly, no one can possibly deny to the people of Palestine their right to mourn and to cry. In their desperation and as a gesture and an act of despair, they have sometimes committed acts that are reprehensible and they have sometimes committed acts that should be condemned. But they cannot be held responsible. Those responsible for those acts are Israel. As a result of its policy of domination, its policy of genocide and of violence, Israel has forced that people to take up a murderous struggle in order to live, or rather to survive.

23. It therefore becomes, to say the least, cynical and fallacious to consider Lebanon, a peace-loving and quiet country, responsible for the acts of despair committed by the Palestinian people. The punitive expedition of the night of 12 and 13 April committed by the regular armed forces of Israel against Lebanon was an act of State banditry that cannot be justified under any pretext. I feel sure that the Council will adopt the measures dictated by the gravity of that act of banditry.

24. Israel has never, least of all today, stood for peace on the basis of the most sacred and fundamental principles of the Charter and on the pertinent resolutions of the United Nations. Israel's true desire is to subordinate law to force. It is the duty of the Council to compel violence to bow to the rule of law. Every Member of the United Nations must be allowed to enjoy the fundamental rights guaranteed by international law.

25. The destruction of Lebanese towns, the massacre of innocent human beings, the kidnapping of old people and peasants committed not by uncontrollable elements, but by an organized authority and one that publicly assumed that authority, is a challenge to common sense. It is a challenge to the United Nations and to the international community as a whole.

26. It is the imperative duty of the Council to take up that challenge, particularly at a time when the United Nations is exerting all its efforts to establish a new era in international relations, relations that are based on justice, respect for the sovereignty of States, their security and the equality of all.

27. Mr. CHUANG Yen (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Recently the Israeli Zionists brazenly sent their armed forces to intrude again into Lebanon where they damaged villages, abducted and killed civilians, incurring a new blood debt to the Lebanese and other Arab peoples. Furthermore, the Israeli Defence Minister Moshe Dayan blatantly clamoured that Israel would continue its raids into Lebanon until all of southern Lebanon is deserted. This is not only a wanton violation of Lebanon's sovereignty and territory, but also a provocation against all the Arab countries and peoples. The Chinese Government and people sternly condemn the Israeli Zionists for their fresh crime of aggression and firmly support the just stand of the Lebanese Government and people in opposing aggression and safeguarding national independence, sovereignty and territorial inviolability.

28. In the fourth Middle East war last October, the heroic Arab and Palestinian peoples, united as one, took up arms, dealt heavy blows at the Israeli Zionists and their sup-

porters and won brilliant victories in their war against aggression. Their just struggle has won the resolute support of the third world and the people of all countries. Although the Israeli Zionists have suffered disastrous military defeat and found themselves in unprecedented political isolation, their aggressive nature will not change and they will inevitably continue to make troubles and put up desperate struggles. However, the arrogance of the enemies is but a temporary phenomenon. Their momentary rampancy only shows their intrinsic weakness. We believe that the Arab and Palestinian peoples, further strengthening their solidarity and uniting themselves with the third world and all the forces that can be united and persevering in struggle, will certainly foil all the super-Power schemes of manipulating the Middle East situation, defeat the Israeli aggressors, recover their occupied territories and regain their national rights.

29. The Chinese Government and people have always deeply sympathized with the Palestinian and other Arab peoples and have always firmly supported them in their just struggles to oppose zionism and hegemony, to recover their lost territories and regain their national rights. The Chinese delegation holds that the Security Council should uphold justice, sternly condemn the Israeli Zionist aggression, enjoin Israel to stop all aggressive acts and firmly support the just demand of the Lebanese Government and people in resisting aggression and safeguarding national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

30. Mr. ANWAR SANI (Indonesia): Exactly one year ago the Council was convened to discuss the complaint of Lebanon against Israeli terrorist action on its territory. The Council today is again meeting to discuss a similar issue involving another case of official terrorism committed by Israel, a Member of the United Nations, on the territory of Lebanon, another Member of this Organization, under the pretext of taking retaliatory measures for a raid conducted by some members of a Palestinian liberation movement against the Israeli village of Kiryat Shmona.

31. It is not my intention to comment at length on the problem of terrorism. Not only have I already done so on previous occasions but this matter has already been so frequently dealt with by other speakers with far greater eloquence. Allow me, however, just to repeat what I said in this chamber almost exactly one year ago

"... 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 [more than] 25 years, and the number of refugees has been swelled by the repeated aggression of Israel upon the homeland of the Palestinians.

"The second root cause is the continued occupation by force of arms by Israel of territories belonging to three

neighbouring Arab countries." [1708th meeting, paras. 19 and 20.]

Efforts to eliminate this second root cause are now taking place, apparently with a realistic chance of success.

32. Under the circumstances, it is particularly tragic that the atmosphere should be negatively influenced by the latest Israeli action against Lebanon. It is particularly painful to note the statement made by Mr. Dayan, the Defence Minister of Israel, as reported by the newspapers, and I quote *The New York Times* of Sunday, 14 April:

"Defence Minister Moshe Dayan warned the Lebanese Government . . . that if it failed to police Arab guerrillas, Israel would continue its punitive raids until all of southern Lebanon was abandoned. 'The people will find it impossible to live there', the Defence Minister said. 'Their homes will be destroyed and the whole area will be deserted. . . . If we cannot live in peace. . . then eventually the entire southern part of Lebanon won't be able to live in peace'."

33. The latest raids and destruction perpetrated by Israeli forces on Lebanese villages, followed by such a defiant statement by its Minister of Defence, could hardly pave the way for the new era of peaceful relations between Israel and its Arab neighbours. Such action could only result in disastrously widening the gulf between Israel and its neighbours and would furthermore intensify the struggle of the Palestinians and force them in their desperation to resort to more violence and extreme methods.

34. My delegation has again and again reiterated its considered view that unless these two root causes are removed, until the Palestinian refugees are allowed to enjoy their inalienable rights and return home in accordance with United Nations resolutions, it would be illusory to hope that acts of violence born out of political despair and frustrations will cease, nor can there be any realistic prospects of lasting peace in the area.

35. Having said that, it does not mean in any way that Indonesia condones acts of violence and terrorism against innocent men, women and children. We condemn such acts of violence. We are not prepared, however, to view 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 violence committed by a Government as its official policy.

36. While we consider the violence—which we do not condone—committed by the Palestinians as the desperate expression of the legitimate aspirations of a people that has been unlawfully deprived of its rights, of its homes and its lands, we cannot but condemn the latest acts of violence perpetrated by Israeli armed forces, which, in playing the role of self-appointed *gendarmes*, raised and ravaged innocent Lebanese villages. This act of State terrorism on the part of Israel cannot be tolerated, as it constitutes a grave violation of the principles of the Charter and leads to lawlessness in international relations.

37. The case of Israeli incursion into Lebanese territory, as well as into the territories of other neighbouring countries,

is nothing new: the Council has in fact condemned Israel on previous occasions, and has in fact warned that country that such flagrant violations of peace must not be repeated. Resolution 280 (1970) declared in very clear terms 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". My delegation would like to urge the Council once again to take those "adequate and effective steps" referred to in that resolution in order to prevent a future recurrence of such acts of official terrorism.

38. In conclusion, my delegation would like to reiterate its firm support for the just cause of the Palestinian people and of the struggle of the Arab countries to liberate their territories occupied by Israel.

39. Mr. EFON (United Republic of Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): In opening the meeting of the Council yesterday, Mr. President, you mentioned, in moving terms, the sudden death of Ambassador Taylor Kamara, a former President of the Security Council, whose devotion to the cause of the United Nations was appreciated by everyone. My delegation associates itself with the condolences which you extended on behalf of the Council to the Government and people of Sierra Leone on the occasion of this cruel loss.

40. After the armed attack committed by Israel against several Lebanese villages in the course of the night of 12/13 April last, my delegation would like to express once again its deep concern at the wave of violence which is developing again in the Middle East. Does this surprise us? Well, in his recent report on the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East the Secretary-General made a point of indicating his concern over this situation: "Although quiet now prevails in the Egypt-Israel sector, the situation in the area remains unstable and potentially dangerous." [S/11248, para. 68.]

41. In the statement of the representative of Cameroon of 8 April [1765th meeting], attention was drawn to the fact that the situation remained tense and alarming in the Middle East and that it was important to take swift and determined action to see to it that an era of peace, justice and prosperity for everyone replaced the prevailing state of war or armed peace. That desire for peace does not, unfortunately, seem to be the priority concern of all the parties directly concerned, for in launching a raid of unprecedented violence against several Lebanese villages, killing and abducting innocent civilians and also destroying their goods, and by openly uttering threats of even more massive reprisals against Lebanon, the Israeli Government has once again demonstrated the obstinacy with which it is pursuing its policy of aggression against the Arab countries, a policy which the international community has always firmly condemned.

42. Such acts of violence anger my delegation particularly because they were again aimed against a friendly country whose aspiration to peace and whose well-balanced policy

in the region is familiar to everyone. Because Israel's policy of force gravely infringes the fundamental principles of the Charter, because it is a policy which is liable to jeopardize the slim chances for peace which have existed since the signing of the disengagement agreement of 18 January 1974 and as a result of the current mediation efforts, and because the Israeli armed attack was incommensurate with the pretext invoked to justify it, my delegation censures and condemns it vigorously. We should like to assure the Government and people of Lebanon of our sympathy in this its hour of tribulation.

43. The situation created by the recent act of Israeli aggression against Lebanon highlights once again the urgent need for the United Nations to seek with more determination than in the past a just, equitable and lasting solution to the Middle East crisis. The taking into account of the lawful and inalienable right of the Palestinian people and the withdrawal by Israel of its troops from the Arab territories occupied by force since the June 1967 war would be favourable pre-conditions for a peaceful settlement. From that angle my delegation is ready to support any initiative on the part of the Council whose purpose would be not only to draw the logical and immediate conclusions from the recent Israeli armed attack against Lebanon, but also to accelerate the process of implementation of resolution 242 (1967), which, in our view, can best guarantee the vital interests of all the peoples of the Middle East.

44. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): It is a dreadful paradox that this Council should be meeting today against the background of the sixth special session of the General Assembly. The special session is devoted above all to the search for a consensus of the nations of the world which will give us all a fairer international economic system. Yet the economic measures in which we must all co-operate to help the plight of ordinary people everywhere cannot avail if those same people are denied the basic human rights of living in peace and in security, unthreatened by the constant possibility of armed attack.

45. The incidents which have led to the meeting of this Council particularly concern the fate of ordinary people in two countries. This meeting was called at the request of the Government of Lebanon to discuss raids by Israeli armed forces against a number of villages in southern Lebanon in which, according to the Lebanese representative's letter, two civilians were killed and others wounded, 13 Lebanese civilians were kidnapped and 31 houses were destroyed. This is not the first time, as we all know, that this Council has met to consider a Lebanese complaint following action of this kind by the State of Israel. On previous occasions, my delegation has made clear that we deplore all acts of violence and terrorism in the Middle East wherever and by whomsoever they are committed. We can understand, sympathize with and indeed to an extent associate ourselves with the strong indignation that the tragic incident at Kiryat Shmona aroused in Israel. We can also agree that if it were established that the three terrorists entered Israel from Lebanon—I stress the word "if" because the Lebanese Government deny it, and the Council is certainly in no position to adjudicate upon it—it would be right in our view to remind the Lebanese Government of its duty under

international law to take all reasonable steps to prevent the organization on its territory of irregular forces or armed bands for incursion into the territory of another State. But having said that, violence cannot justify more violence. My delegation on previous occasions has made clear our view that a Government-organized operation into the territory of another sovereign State cannot be justified under the Charter. We believe that for the international community to accept such action as tolerable or justifiable would be a step towards reversion to a state of international anarchy.

46. At the same time, may I make clear our view that the international community condemns the killing of innocent people in incidents of the sort that occurred last week at Kiryat Shmona, in any view a brutal and a vicious action which the British Government has already condemned. I should also like to make it clear, if it needs to be clarified, that my Government deeply sympathizes with the lot of the Palestinian refugees, and over the years we have made our sympathy clear in a practical way by our contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. Furthermore, my Foreign Secretary, speaking in the House of Commons in the first foreign-affairs debate since the Labour Government came into office, expressed the view that there would be no permanent peace in the Middle East unless a settlement provided for—and I use the word he used—a "personality" for the Palestinian people. But however much we may understand the misery and the despair which leads men to commit acts of violence, brutal acts of this kind are not the way to win international sympathy for the cause of the Palestinians.

47. We had hoped that the cycle of senseless violence and counter-violence which we have so long seen in the Middle East had at last been ended following the October war. We had hoped that the Geneva Conference, the disengagement agreement between Israel and Egypt and the contacts undertaken even in the last few days by Mr. Kissinger with a view to achieving a similar disengagement agreement in the Israel-Syrian sector would have paved the way to a lasting settlement in accordance with resolution 242 (1967). It would surely be a dreadful tragedy if a new spiral of violence and counter-violence, of terrorism and retaliation, of indignation and condemnation were to dash those hopes of peace yet again. I think it is our duty, the duty of this Council and the United Nations, to do all in our power to prevent this. Let us concentrate on contributing in whatever way each of us can to the task of building a just and a lasting peace in the Middle East. That task demands tact, restraint and consideration. It means perhaps more balanced responses than those made recently in hot anger. It demands above all from all parties a degree of statesmanship and a vision which is difficult enough to aim for let alone to achieve. It demands from the Arab peoples that they refrain from expressing their indignation in deeds, and it demands from Israel that it exercises a restraint towards its neighbours in circumstances such as those of the last week, which must at times seem almost impossible. But it is only in the context of such an approach that the sort of incidents we have been considering will be avoided and all the people of that region of the globe may be allowed to enjoy the security and the prosperity which is their right.

48. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): At a time when a difficult negotiation is progressing slowly in order to open the road to a just and lasting settlement to the conflict in the Middle East, the Security Council has been convened on the request of the Government of Lebanon once again to examine new acts of violence followed by new reprisals. And thus the efforts of all sides to achieve peace must not only overcome the major obstacles that underlie the conflict but also take into account unforeseen events which suddenly create dangerous tension that might well jeopardize the results already obtained.

49. In their letters addressed to the President of the Council and in the statements they made yesterday the representatives of Lebanon and Israel have submitted their respective complaints. The facts they put before us give us a rather clear idea of what occurred on 11 April in Kiryat Shmona and on the night of 12/13 April on Lebanese soil. But there is still an element of uncertainty. Nothing can establish with any degree of certainty that the operation carried out by a Palestinian commando group originated in or received support from Lebanon. However, and regardless of the reasons that impelled those who acted thus, my Government must nevertheless condemn such acts of violence, which have caused the loss of numerous innocent lives.

50. As I stated a year ago, on 18 April 1973 [*1709th meeting*], before the Council in similar circumstances, I do not believe that the Palestinian cause has gained in any way by this attack on the most basic human rights. Today I would add to that statement that even if they sacrificed their lives those who massacred women and children did not thereby become heroes.

51. But if we condemn that act of violence we condemn also, and for the same reasons, the raids and reprisals undertaken by Israeli forces on Lebanese soil—first, because we cannot admit the principle of reprisals itself since it is contrary to fundamental law; secondly, because we refuse to equate the acts of more or less uncontrolled groups with those of a Government that is called upon to respect the laws and rules governing the United Nations; and, finally, because France attaches the greatest importance and value to respect for the security and integrity of Lebanon, whose worthy efforts thus far to remain outside the conflict despite the presence on its soil of 300,000 Palestinian refugees we have acknowledged.

52. That is a fact that the Israeli Government should have taken into account before proffering threats to Lebanon. What, however, is sure is that the attack on Kiryat Shmona and the operation carried out by the Israeli authorities at the very moment when violent combat is taking place in the nearby Golan Heights can only increase the tension and make even more difficult the search for peace. We understand full well that such events may have repercussions on the efforts that are being made to that end at the moment. All this confirms our conviction that today it is less possible than ever for the international community represented by this Council to shirk its responsibilities.

53. That being the case, my delegation considers that the Council should pronounce itself in the clearest fashion

against all acts of violence, regardless of their origin or reasons. It could well reiterate the warning it issued on 19 May 1970, in resolution 280 (1970), addressed to the Israeli Government concerning the territorial integrity of Lebanon. The Council could also make an appeal to all parties, in the interests of peace, to refrain from any act that might jeopardize the hopes that the international community has placed on the negotiations underway.

54. If the Council were to pronounce itself unanimously on those different points, I believe this body would be living up to the main role that the United Nations is called upon to play in the search for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

55. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Israel, on whom I now call.

56. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): The last two speakers have referred to Lebanon's responsibility for the terrorist attacks that have been carried on for years now against Israel from Lebanon and to the so-called peaceful vocation of the Lebanese Government. I think that what every visitor, every journalist in Beirut or in other parts of the Lebanese territory is aware of—and the representatives who have just spoken are undoubtedly also fully cognizant of it—is that Lebanon has in recent years become a centre of terrorist operations against Israel in the Middle East and in other parts of the world.

57. What good is there in an official Lebanese denial, presented for obvious tactical reasons in the course of a Security Council debate, of Lebanon's responsibility for the latest massacre in Kiryat Shmona, if the terrorist organizations which maintain their headquarters in Lebanon's capital officially confirm that they are responsible for the attack? To add to the various proofs and facts contained in my statement yesterday, I should like today simply to put on record one of the paragraphs in the official agreement between the Government of Lebanon and the Palestine Liberation Organization, the umbrella organization of all the terrorist groups, an agreement dated 3 November 1969, which still remains in force. It states: "Frontier access points would be designated and crossing facilitated for the fedayeen." This is taken from the *Le Monde* weekly selection of 24 April 1970.

58. I think it is necessary, in order to describe the magnitude of the problem which mankind confronts when it considers the menace of Arab terrorism, to put the following facts before the Council. From July 1968 till December 1973, at least 161 persons were arrested in connexion with international Arab terror in various parts of the world, and in particular in Europe. Their acts have included the massacre of 27 passengers and the wounding of 80 others at Lod in May 1972, the murder of Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympics in September 1972, the slaughter of 32 passengers and the wounding of many others at the Rome airport in December 1973, not to mention numerous hijackings of aircraft and attacks on civilian targets. Of the 161 terrorists arrested, only three today remain in prison. All the others have been freed, whether willingly or under the pressure of blackmail by Arab terrorist organizations.

59. The organ of the United Nations Association of the United States—*Inter-Dependent*—says the following in a recent issue:

“Statistics compiled by an eminent specialist, Brian Jenkins of Santa Monica, California, show that in the six years ending December 31, 1973, the casualty toll in all acts of international terrorism was 268 dead and 571 wounded. These victims were innocents attacked in places other than the terrorists’ homeland. The cost in measurable destruction in the same period was \$163 million plus \$32 million in ransom, plus hundreds of millions more spent on countermeasures. Yet only three Arab terrorists are held in Europe, none has been severely punished.”

60. While it is common knowledge that the Arab States, and in particular Lebanon, continue to harbour the terror organizations and to support them politically, militarily and financially, certain other Governments have displayed an attitude of callous indulgence towards the Arab terrorist organizations, all of which, as I already pointed out, are affiliated to the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization.

61. The release of most of the Arab terrorists detained by various countries after murderous attacks against innocent civilians, the permission granted to the Palestine Liberation Organization to maintain offices in a number of cities outside the Middle East, the invitations extended to its leaders to visit various capitals and their participation in international conferences and ceremonies, the failure in the United Nations by the representatives of such Governments to take firm and concrete measures against this scourge, have all encouraged and given succour to these assassins.

62. In all candour, the question does arise whether it is appropriate for Governments which conduct themselves in this manner to deny Israel the fundamental right to defend itself and to protect its citizens against the barbaric attacks of Arab terrorists.

63. There was nothing new in the Soviet representative’s statement. We have heard the same unfounded charges, the same distortions in years past. They have always reflected the most unhelpful role played by the USSR in the Middle East, a role that hampered the attainment of peace and encouraged Arab aggression. It is significant that in these very days, while Syrian acts of aggression are taking place along the cease-fire line, it was in the course of a visit to the capital of the Soviet Union that President Assad of Syria declared that as far as his country is concerned the October War is still continuing. That was on 11 April 1974. On 15 April 1974, Radio Damascus quoted President Assad as having said on the same day, also in Moscow: “Syria is determined to continue the war until Israel is defeated”.

64. Listening to the statement of the representative of the USSR, one could not but wonder, “Will there really be not a single constructive word or thought in the entire pronouncement”? There was none. Not a word about the right of every State to be free from armed attacks by irregular forces, by murderous gangs, organized and operating from the territory of neighbouring States. Not a word about the right, under the Charter of the United

Nations, of every State to self-defence. Not a word about the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States [*General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), annex*], initiated, I think, by the Soviet Union and stipulating:

“Every State has the duty to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in . . . 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.”

There was not a word in the Soviet representative’s statement about Lebanon’s obligation to put an end to a situation which is contrary to the principles of the Charter, to the provisions of the Declaration on Principles of Friendly Relations, to scores of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly.

65. The Soviet concept, according to Ambassador Malik, is that while international terrorism should be disapproved, Israel should do nothing at all to protect itself against the attacks by the terrorists. The people of Israel desire peace and they have sought peace throughout the years of Israel’s independence. It is because they desire it that they shall defend themselves against Arab aggression, whether it comes by means of regular armies or through the use of irregular terrorist bands.

66. If the Soviet representative wished to indicate his country’s interest in peace in the Middle East, he should have spoken of measures to stop terrorism, first of all in the Middle East, but also in the world at large, and not of steps to be taken against those who are victims of international terrorism.

67. The Soviet representative was followed by the Ambassador of China, to whom I would say that slogans cannot be a useful contribution to the examination of any situation, especially when such slogans are based on distortion. When those who speak in almost Kafkaesque terms—and this applies to both speakers to whom I have just referred—when those who consider that an Arab anti-liberation terror directed against the very life and liberty of the Jewish people is a liberation movement, also slander Israel as an aggressor, enlightened public opinion and Israel know for certain that the very opposite is true. To both these statements, I shall therefore answer with an ancient Chinese fable. Two men were near-sighted, but instead of admitting it, both of them boasted of keen vision. One day they heard that a tablet was to be hung in a temple, so each of them found out beforehand what was written on it, and when the day came they both went to the temple. Looking up, one said: “Look, aren’t the letters, the characters, ‘brightness and courage’?” “And the smaller ones there, you can’t see them, but they say, ‘Written by so-and-so in a certain month on a certain day’”, said the other. A passer-by asked what they were looking at. And when told, the passer-by laughed and said: “The tablet has not been put up yet, so how can you see the characters on it?” You are like those two short-sighted gentlemen, Ambassador Malik and Mr. Representative of China, competing with each other without seeing or wanting to see what is really going on in

the Middle East situation. Now, so that my use of a Chinese fable should not, Heaven forbid, bring about, as it did on another occasion, a Soviet accusation of an Israeli-Chinese conspiracy, let me add also a Russian proverb in response to both these statements, a proverb which says: "Slander, like coal, will either dirty your hand or burn it".

68. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic has indicated that he wished to take the floor. I therefore invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

69. Mr. KELANI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Israel has repeated once again today his charge with regard to Syria's responsibility for the tension prevailing at the present time on the Syrian frontier. Syria has agreed to Security Council resolutions 338 (1973) and 339 (1973) of 22 and 23 October 1973 and has demonstrated its willingness to apply the spirit and the letter of those two resolutions.

70. Resolution 339 (1973) lays down that the forces of the two sides should be returned to the positions they occupied at the time the cease-fire went into force. However, the Israeli troops were not withdrawn from the territory they occupied after 22 October, which means, quite clearly, that Israel refuses to put this resolution into effect, as it had agreed to, and persists in occupying this territory contrary to the unanimous will of the Council. Israel has thus taken the initiative in committing aggression against Syria from the very time when resolution 339 (1973) went into force.

71. Three days ago, Israel occupied a new Syrian position in Mount Hermon, a position where Syrian forces had been stationed long before the October 1973 war. The occupation by Israel of new positions reflects its policy of persistent aggression, expansion and provocation, which has brought the present situation to a grave stage of escalation and persistent hostility which grows worse each day.

72. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Lebanon.

73. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): The statement made yesterday by my Foreign Minister [*1766th meeting*] fully brought to the Council's attention the details of the attack conducted by Israeli forces against Lebanon on the night of 12/13 April, and he expounded the Lebanese position on this matter. There are however a few points that I should like to put into their proper context and to amplify for the sake of the record.

74. The representative of Israel has attempted to lead the Council into other matters and problems not pertaining directly to the case that we have brought before the Council. He has wandered so far, as to become even a story-teller here in the Council.

75. On many occasions since the October 1973 war the Israeli radio and news media have admitted the existence of manifestations of Arab commando activities inside Israel and inside the occupied Arab territories. Not very long ago, on 5 April, it was admitted that the incident that took

place at a bus station in Tel Aviv was conducted by such elements. The same news media, radio and television, from Israel, especially in Hebrew, have aired many interviews with representatives of television and Israeli people responsible for security affairs. It was generally admitted that many operations were conducted inside Israel and the occupied territories by such elements.

76. On 8 April, exactly three days before the attack on Lebanon, Mr. Schlomo Hillel, Minister of Police, recognized in an interview with Mr. Idzi Ledat that operations were actually being carried on inside Israel by a group of about 250 persons—Arabs—and he said openly that the 400,000 Arabs living in Israel should not be held responsible for the acts of 250 people.

77. It has also been recognized by Israeli news media that cells of resistance exist in many areas: in Nablus, in Gaza, in Jerusalem, in Tel Aviv and its vicinity and elsewhere.

78. Now let me make a point about the developments that took place at Kiryat Shmona on 11 April. The operation conducted by the three commandos began at 7.30 in the morning; at 9 o'clock Radio Israel stated, in Hebrew, that it was not known where the perpetrators came from. In the news bulletin at 10 o'clock that morning the same thing was repeated. At 11 o'clock the operation was already over and the Israeli Government's verdict was made—automatically made, so quickly made—that the perpetrators had come from Lebanon.

79. Immediately following that, Mrs. Meir and Mr. Dayan began making threats at Lebanon. Even on the day of the operation of Kiryat Shmona, Mr. Hillel, the Minister of Police, stated—and this was quickly put in a different context by the representative of Israel in order to forestall this argument: "I do not know whether the perpetrators came from outside or inside. We have to distinguish between operations conducted by elements from inside and those conducted by elements coming from outside."

80. But Mr. Hillel was to retract that statement the following day. Following the funeral of the victims of the operation of Kiryat Shmona, he said that the perpetrators came from Lebanon and that Lebanon must be held responsible.

81. I can understand the situation that Mr. Hillel had to face. We all know and we have seen on television the reaction of the people of Kiryat Shmona against Mr. Hillel and those responsible for security there. The Israeli authorities had to find a scapegoat to satisfy the people who were angered by the massacre that took place in Kiryat Shmona. The scapegoat, as usual—and we do not have to go very far to search for one—must be Lebanon, which lies close on the northern border of Israel. Therefore, following tradition, a reprisal had to be taken against Lebanon. Reprisal is a policy prohibited and condemned by international law and not permitted by the Charter of the United Nations, especially when carried out against a State Member of the United Nations which has no responsibility whatsoever for acts undertaken by individuals.

82. About midnight of 12/13 April, Israeli artillery began shelling the Valley of El Slouky between Bentjbeil and

Taïbé, and at about 1 o'clock units of the Israeli armed forces penetrated Lebanese territory, breaching for the nth time the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon. They attacked the villages of Wadi Sloki, Taïbé, Mohaïbeb, Blida, Aïtaroun, Yarin and Douhaïra, and they shelled the regions of Taïbé, Kfarkalla, Jovarel Salhani, Siddikin, Djebel el Batm and Ibl el Sally. Two people were killed, two were injured, 31 houses were destroyed and 13 persons were kidnapped.

83. We have before us the reports of the observers contained in documents S/11057/Add.402, 404, 405, 408, and others. These official documents of the United Nations confirm these acts of aggression conducted by Israel against Lebanon. In reviewing these documents and all the previous documents sent by the observers to the Secretary-General and the Security Council, we fail to find a single instance in which the observers mentioned that a breach of the Israeli border had taken place from Lebanon. This is a very important point that I wish to bring out. When we asked the United Nations and the Security Council to reinforce the observation system on the Lebanese border, we acted in good faith. We wanted the United Nations to be our witness. We would have welcomed more observers to help us in our task on the Lebanese-Israeli border. We have received some observers. Israel, on the contrary, has refused to allow these observers to operate on its side of the border. That is based on two assumptions. First of all, they do not want the presence of United Nations witnesses to their criminal assaults against Lebanon. Secondly, they have been acting in bad faith against Lebanon.

84. We believe in the United Nations and we believe in the authority of the Security Council. We want the authority of the Council to be strengthened and its role to be reinforced. Every time we have had a complaint, we have come to the Council. But Israel, as members know, has a clear contempt for the Council, which it has expressed on many occasions, and for the resolutions of the United Nations, and it has refused to come to the Council to bring its complaints, if it has any real complaints, against Lebanon. We have invited the Israeli representative and the Israeli Government on many occasions to bring any substantiated case against Lebanon to the Council. On the contrary, they wait until we bring our case. They attack; we bring our case to the Council; they follow us to the Council. What for? Out of respect for the Council? No. Only to use this forum as a spring-board for their propaganda. This is the use that Israel makes of the Security Council and of the other organs of the United Nations. We have a very vivid example in the statement made by Mr. Tekoah yesterday. Well, that is a stale statement; we have heard it here in the Council before; we have heard it in various committees and in the General Assembly. It was only brought up to date to fit the new development in Kiryat Shmona.

85. Israel in its actions against Lebanon attacks on two fronts; it launches against us a two-pronged attack: one on the ground to kill, to wound, to destroy; the other on the international front to vilify the reputation of Lebanon, to disfigure the standing of Lebanon in the international community. We are grateful to the representatives who have expressed their feelings today towards Lebanon, and their opinion about Lebanon and the policy conducted by the

Lebanese Government. Mr. Tekoah immediately raises the point. He takes them to task. Why? Because they have praised Lebanon; because they have mentioned that Lebanon has a certain vocation. He wanted to hear in the Council the falsifications, the lies we have repeatedly heard to the effect that Lebanon is the centre of international gangsterism, of international terrorism. Besides the absurdity of this allegation, I think that to intelligent people—not only here in the Council but everywhere—it is laughable.

86. It is very strange that those who try to vilify the reputation of Lebanon are precisely those people who since 1968 have launched scores of murderous attacks against Lebanon. We all recall the insidious attack on the airport of Beirut on 28 December 1968 and the destruction of part of Lebanon's civilian air fleet—13 planes standing on the defenceless and civilian airport of Beirut. That attack was followed by many others later on. I have a long list here and I could keep the Council perhaps for one hour to recite the details of all the attacks against Lebanon since then. But I only give you this very briefly: those attacks by air, land and sea, which were staged at intervals since 28 December 1968, have resulted in the death of 140 civilian Lebanese citizens; 290 were wounded; 300 houses were destroyed; many bridges and civilian installations were also destroyed.

87. And now it is ironic to read about Mr. Dayan's threat to turn southern Lebanon into a desert. Is this the kind of contribution he and his people wish to make to the development and progress and peace of the Middle East? Is this the new technique of a people who boast and claim that they have made the desert bloom? What we are being offered, indeed, is absolutely the opposite: the promise of destruction and devastation, of turning the blooming fields and orchards into wasteland. This is not the talk of modern statesmen governed by the ethics of international law, of international order; it is talk reminiscent of the dreadful calamities that Genghis Khan or Hitler, as we were reminded by Ambassador Malik this afternoon, brought to many suffering countries and peoples in the past. Mr. Dayan's reckless statement is symptomatic of the policy pursued by the Zionist terror organizations, and later by the Government of Israel, for four decades against the Arab States and against the Palestinian people. This policy has brought nothing but turmoil and, worse, bloodshed and tears to the countries and peoples of the Middle East. The Israelis brought these ordeals not on the Arabs alone but on themselves. Israeli families and Arab families are now mourning their dead; they are all sorrowing over the dead victims of the blind, adventurous and expansionist policy to which the authorities of Tel Aviv have been clinging so stubbornly.

88. Lebanon definitely does not assume any responsibility for the act of Kiryat Shmona. It was conducted by three persons who were in Israel. There is no proof whatsoever that they had gone there from Lebanon. The allegation of the Israeli representatives that the Israeli patrol had seen some footprints and had followed those footprints and determined that those people had come from Lebanon is unsubstantiated and is in contradiction with the facts. Before that so-called investigation of the footprints was made, contrary to the statements already made by the

Israeli authorities that the perpetrators of the Kiryat Shmona incident had come from Lebanon, they immediately rushed to put the blame on an act of infiltration from Lebanon which they later claimed to substantiate with so-called evidence that there were some footprints.

89. And regarding the Kiryat Shmona operation itself, we were not there to know exactly what happened; we are not in a position to know all the details. All we know about what happened is derived from the press—from the news media. Yet Mr. Tekoah comes to this Council and tells it that the commandos went into the building, took the children and started to hurl them out of the windows. That has been denied and is not substantiated.

90. Again, the commandos had sent a warning and a request to the Israeli Government, according to the spokesman for the Organization of the Popular Front, for the release of 100 Palestinian prisoners. However, instead of either negotiating or acting in a temperate manner, the Israeli forces attacked the building with recoilless guns and with grenades, and the three commandos, it seems, made good their threats that they would blow up the building.

91. I am not here to justify exactly what those three people did there. My Foreign Minister yesterday expressed in his name, and repeated in the name of the President of Lebanon, that we deplore acts of violence of this nature which result in the killing of innocent victims. And I repeat that we do deplore them. But what I wanted to show is the fact that Israel and its representative here try to dramatize these operations beyond the facts that they definitely know.

92. Mr. Dayan said, after the operation against Lebanon, "We tried to do this in a civilized manner." They tried to do this "in a civilized manner". That is a new definition of civilization; and it seems that according to the Israelis, Lebanon needs to be civilized—the Lebanon of 6,000 years of history and civilization needs to be civilized at the hands of the groups of aggressors and criminals coming from Israel.

93. We all recall the statement made last year by the Foreign Minister of Israel in Vienna that Lebanon "is the least civilized country in the world". A person must be either ignorant or of bad faith to make such a statement. Naturally, we know that Mr. Dayan and Mr. Eban are not ignorant—they are known to be scholarly—but their statements smack of bad faith towards Lebanon.

94. What is the responsibility of Lebanon when individuals go and commit acts of murder anywhere in the world or in Israel? What is Lebanon's responsibility in this case? Is it our responsibility because we have 300,000 Palestinians living on our land, in misery in the camps?

95. For once I agree with a theory of Mrs. Meir's—a theory she developed once here in the Council concerning the Eichmann case. I have cited this case before in the Council, and I think it pertinent to refer to it once more. Mrs. Meir, in this Security Council, after Argentina had lodged complaint against Israel for the abduction of Eichmann, developed the theory that under international law Israel

could not be held responsible for the action of its citizens outside Israel—its citizens: Israeli citizens. But since then we have learned what happened: there is ample evidence that those who abducted Eichmann from Argentina were not only citizens of Israel but agents of Israel, sent by the Israeli Government to abduct Eichmann. Still, Mrs. Meir came to the Council and washed her hands of it, saying, Israel was not responsible for their acts.

96. Israel is not responsible for the acts of its own agents outside of Israel, but Lebanon must be held responsible for acts committed by non-Lebanese on non-Lebanese territory. This is a new approach to international law.

97. We have 300,000 Palestinians on our land. What are we being asked to do with them? Throw them into the sea; be the agents of Israel and destroy them; commit genocide? Those people belong to Palestine; that is their homeland; they have their homes and properties there. The solution is for them to be empowered to exercise their inalienable rights—rights which have been adjudicated to them in many resolutions adopted by the Security Council and by the General Assembly of the United Nations. It has been recognized by many nations—indeed, a growing number of nations—that the Palestinian people must enjoy, like every other people, its right to self-determination for a homeland. That is the solution, and that will bring about or help to bring about peace and security in the Middle East.

98. Now, there is one point I should like to make concerning the statement of Mr. Tekoah yesterday, in which he showered slanders and calumnies on Lebanon. Naturally, we do not expect testimony of good behaviour from Israel's spokesmen and officials. Israel is a State which stands condemned by international organs, by the majority of States. A State which is isolated in the international community because of its aggressive, expansionist and military arrogance is the last State entitled to issue verdicts on morality and legality concerning the conduct of other States and certainly not concerning Lebanon.

99. Criminal Israel, which has introduced violence and terrorism into the Middle East, which brought to our area nothing but instability, turmoil, aggression and bloodshed, is not entitled to pass a sardonic, ironic judgement on Lebanon—"peaceful Lebanon", "innocent Lebanon", "law-abiding Lebanon", "virtuous Lebanon", "helpless Lebanon", "chaste Lebanon", "pure and honest Lebanon". As a matter of fact, I am not the one to say it, but Lebanon is indeed all of that, although it is not up to me to say so. But I know, and everybody knows, that Lebanon happily enjoys the widest possible relations of friendship with the majority of the countries of the world because of its peaceful policy, its friendly policy, its civilized policy, because throughout its history Lebanon has never harmed anyone, never attacked anyone and has never committed an act of aggression.

100. Finally, this is perhaps the twelfth time—I have lost count—that we have come to the Council seeking justice. Each time we have walked out with a resolution that gave us moral and political satisfaction. But all those resolutions have not stopped Israel from repeating its aggression against Lebanon. We have said before, and we repeat it now, that

the Security Council has been set up to maintain peace and security in the world, and particularly to protect small, weak and defenceless nations from the onslaught of militaristic nations.

101. There are being launched at us threats of dislocating and disrupting the civil life of Lebanon, of destroying southern Lebanon. Such attacks and threats are contrary to Article 2 of the Charter. I do not have to remind members of the Council of that provision, but I should like to insist that Article 2, paragraph 4, states the following: "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State", and was included in the Charter on the insistence of small, weak and defenceless nations. That is why we have come to you before, and that is why we come to you again.

102. Are we to walk out every time with only resolutions? Or is the Council going to act to make the aggressor refrain from pursuing his aggression? Perhaps we may ultimately get the message that the Council cannot do anything to protect us, that all it can do is satisfy us with a resolution. And then we may draw the conclusion that we must depend on ourselves for our defence. Is it Lebanon's vocation to turn into a militaristic State in the Middle East? Throughout history we have refused to do that, and we refuse to do it now.

103. We have confidence in the Security Council, in the United Nations, in the goodwill and friendship of nations, and on them we rely.

104. The PRESIDENT: I invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

105. Mr BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Council, for allowing me to speak again.

106. As I see things, I am afraid that the meetings of the Council may become an exercise in futility. However, there is no other recourse but to submit the problem to the Council, for after all I recall that when I attended the meetings at San Francisco when the United Nations was founded, the hope of the world was fastened on the Council for the preservation of peace and security.

107. Are we going to have other meetings without accomplishing anything constructive? I hear there is not even a draft resolution in the making as yet. And, assuming that a draft resolution is to be worked out, who is going to implement it? I think we should do some soul-searching and find out whether anything constructive can emerge from the United Nations and the Council.

108. I am afraid the representative of Israel has characterized the Council as being almost a nonentity.

109. Of course, the ritual is here. Letters are circulated. And we sit around these tables. We have been doing that since 1947 on this problem, and more so since after 1948, and nothing has been accomplished. Of course, Mr. Tekoah

invokes the right of self-defence. Self-defence against whom? Against Lebanon? Did any Lebanese troops invade the territories that were invaded by Zionism in Palestine? Let him answer the question. Palestine was partitioned. I was present when it was partitioned. I do not have to rehash what I have told the Council time and again since I have been addressing the General Assembly and the Council on this issue.

110. Can Israel arrogate to itself the responsibility of collective punishment? Collective punishment is forbidden in both national and international law. If individuals, whether they allegedly came from beyond the frontiers, or were in Israel, perpetrated that tragedy on innocent people and on themselves, does it mean that Israel has the right of reprisal? What is the Charter for? Then, everyone has the right of reprisal.

111. I wish our new colleague from the United Kingdom were here, but Mr. Jamieson is an old friend. I want to tell him how civilized his country is. You are familiar with what the Irish Republican Army is doing in Northern Ireland and in England. As far as I know, about a thousand innocent people have been killed. By whom? By members of the IRA. Mr. Jamieson, have you sent any detachments or any gunboats to Dublin, or destroyed the airport, as the Israelis did in Beirut? You never hear that the United Kingdom took the matter into its hands in such a drastic manner.

112. Then there is another civilized country, France, and, more so, Spain. Do not think I am discriminating and putting Spain in the balance—both of you, you know about the Basques. They are across the border from the Pyrenees. Some of the Basques want independence from Spain. We have seen articles and pictures of the so-called freedom fighters—as they call themselves, as everybody does these days who wants secession or independence—wearing hoods and giving press conferences on French soil. Did Spain send any detachments across the Pyrenees to punish those Basque rebels or liberators, whatever the name you want to label them by? No. Only Israel has the right to chastise Lebanon, which has never done anything to hurt the Jewish people.

113. In fact, the three or four thousand Jewish people in Lebanon have shops and banks, and are free to move. They forget all that. Lebanon should have a civil war and punish anyone who does something to regain his homeland—none other than the Palestinians, whom the Israelis call terrorists, and who are labelled freedom fighters, not by the Arabs only, but even by some of the Japanese. What happened in Lod was deplorable. But the Palestinians have fired the imagination of the youth of the world. I have been warning the Council and the General Assembly time and again that the Palestinian youth has fermented and leavened, so to speak, the Arab youth—and other youth for that matter.

114. As the Ambassador from Lebanon just mentioned, since Lebanon never was and never will be a militaristic country, what do you expect the Lebanese to do? To go and chase every Palestinian—three hundred thousand? How do we know what will emerge from the camps? They are not going to report to the Lebanese, "We are going to fight Israel." They do it on their own account. There are splinter

groups of the Palestine liberation movement. They may be here in New York. Some of them may be sitting there. How do we know?

115. You, Mr. Tekoah, invoke the right of self-defence? I am not holding a brief for the Palestinians. Whether they are using the right methods or the wrong methods is beside the point. But you forget your own terrorism which you started in that peaceful land. Most likely, those Palestinians thought, "Well, look, because of Zionist terrorism there is now a State. So why do we not resort to the same acts as the Irgun Zvai Leumi, the Stern gang?" I told the Palestinians that the only gap was that the major Powers were with the Israelis in the partition of Palestine. That is why they succeeded. If they did not have the major Powers behind them, terrorism would not have been enough for them to establish a State.

116. I know that the Western Powers have their internal problems. That is why when they speak they temporize. As we say in Arabic, "When you shoe a horse you send the nail, but sometimes you hit the hoof and hurt the horse."

117. But who brought these people into our midst? You Western Powers brought them into our midst. Why do you not do anything around this table to solve that problem, not by way of revolution but by ultimatums? You do not want to. Why? Because the Zionists have permeated your legislatures, your financial operations, your exports. More power to them. The Jews have a challenge everywhere—and they succeed. We do not begrudge them success. But why do you not stop them from hurting us? What have we done to you Western countries? We opened our doors to you to develop our countries.

118. Many of us now are veering towards another great Power out of bitterness—towards the Soviet Union. Why not? The Soviet Union considers the Middle East not very far from its frontiers. And as I have said time and again, the chess game is played on the checkerboard which is our region. But it is not a game played with wooden pieces. It is played with the destiny of our people.

119. Now, the tradition of Judaism. I happen to be a student of that religion, which is natural. I grew up in the area, and I am a student of Judaism, Christianity and Islam. By what yardstick—do not mention the Talmud to me; go to the Bible; yesterday I cited some passages from the prophet Micah—by what yardstick of justice or humanity do you, the leadership of Zionism, hailing from Central and Eastern Europe, destroy the houses of poor peasants? The peasant can go to the Government and bring about the downfall of the Lebanese Government—that is what you think. The poor peasants. You raze their houses. It is not the first time you have been razing houses. You have razed houses in the Gaza Strip; you have razed houses on the West Bank. And, good Lord, I am afraid that if somebody opposed you from amongst the Oriental Jews, you would probably raze their houses too because they are Oriental Jews. Anyone that is against you, raze their houses. Is that human? Now those people, the martyrs as the Palestinians have called them, who killed those poor people in that village across the border from Lebanon—and we deplore the killing, as well as we deplore, as I said yesterday, the fact

that those three men who sacrificed their lives should also die. They have mothers and fathers and sisters.

120. Do you think we like what is happening? I told you that we had peace before you came from Central and Eastern Europe with your new ideology. You want to live with us in peace? This is not the way to achieve peace. Time and again I have told you that this will bring more bitterness, more rancour, more hatred, and violence will breed violence, and there will be no end to the links in a long chain of future events.

121. What shall we do? Have another two or three meetings? Perchance a resolution will emerge, with a preamble as usual, and two or three operative paragraphs. And then there will be, in that room there, all kinds of caucuses and people will exchange views. "Condemn?" No. That is a big word. Somebody might veto that word "condemn". "Deplore?" No. But what happens? You will deplore that those 18 people were killed, and I do not know how many were wounded, and you will deplore that Israel saw fit to take the law into its own hands. And then, as I said yesterday and as I repeat again—there is benefit by repetition—another incident will happen.

122. It is within the power of those who created Israel to put a stop to this. Who created Israel? I am not going into the history and genesis of the matter, my good friend Mr. Richard, but I researched the question, even in London, between 1929 and 1939. You were losing the war against the Kaiser, you and the French. It was hanging in the balance in 1916-1917. I am a contemporary of that war. In the 1920s I was a young man. And the price of the Balfour Declaration was for international Zionism to railroad the United States, into the First World War. Whereas in 1916, when the Arabs were fighting on the side of the British, Lawrence and all, you said: "You will all be free from Ottoman rule". And then we found, in 1922—and I demonstrated in the streets of Beirut and Damascus—that there were Mandates, and the Mandates were colonial arrangements in disguise.

123. Now, the Second World War, unfortunately, made the Western Powers bankrupt. It is not unusual for a world war to make any nation bankrupt. And the empire dissolved. Then who took over? Our friends the Americans. We have warned them time and again, since 1945—when Mr. Stettinius was Secretary of State, and later—that while we have nothing against the Jews we do not want a new ideology in our midst. And Mr. Truman saw fit to work, openly and behind the scenes, for the partition of Palestine.

124. All the trouble began from that day. And when the State Department sent one of the Ambassadors—I think it was Mr. Wadsworth—to tell Mr. Truman that it was not in the best interests of the United States to precipitate a crisis in the Arab world, Mr. Truman said, and it is in his memoirs: "How many Americans of Arab origin do I have in my constituency?"

125. This is bad politics, with all due respect to the late Mr. Truman and his activities in other fields than this. So in fact it was the United Kingdom which started this trouble. I am sure it would not have done it if it had foreseen what

would be the consequences. Then our American friends took over, and it is within your power, if you want it, both of you or separately, to bring an end to this. Say to Israel: "All right, have you forgotten that we created you? What are you doing to Lebanon? Live in peace if you want to, but you cannot have that militaristic, not only attitude, but activity against a small country".

126. But what are you doing about it? Oh, détente. What do we get, we Arabs, from the détente between you? Of course we do not want you to fight with the Russians, because you will blow up and we will blow up with you, and the Jews will also blow up, and the Christians and the Moslems—all human beings. The whole world will blow up. And who will benefit?

127. I want to say a few words across the table. The motivation of religion for a political and economic end is *passé*, is gone. Ideologies are being used nowadays for political and economic ends. Ideologies replaced religions as motivations. And also the motivation of the ideology is gone.

128. Look at the Soviet Union trading with the capitalist States. There is nothing wrong with it; it is a new approach. There should be a new approach to world affairs. And it is true that our Asian friends, the Chinese, sometimes take issue with the Soviet Union, but this will be forgotten. I witnessed that happening between the Soviet Union and the United States in the early 1950s. We called it the cold war. We did not freeze. And one day you will bury the hatchet. In other words, the United Nations, including the Security Council, will be a window-dressing for the small Powers, including my own country and poor Lebanon.

129. You make your deals by Mr. Kissinger going to Moscow or to Peking and then Mr. Brezhnev coming to Washington, and we are false witnesses to what is happening. It takes Baroodi to tell you that. And the world should know that it is so. And this gentleman coming from Russia—he is not a Russian—by way of Shanghai laughs at it, while people, his own people and Palestinian people, perish. This is no laughing matter. I do not know how long—maybe some will say it is high time for Baroodi to leave the United Nations—I will stay, but I am warning you that whether I stay here for some time or I quit tomorrow we need a new approach to international affairs. We are duplicating what I witnessed in the League of Nations. What is the gist of it?

130. I remember seeing my Austrian colleague sitting there in the Council—and it heartens me for it is one of the most civilized countries in Europe. How come, finally, that at one time you would talk behind the scenes to the Soviet Union and to the United States about liberating Austria from occupation, and they would not listen. There was the bugbear of communism, on one hand, and then Marxism, the apostle of materialism, on the other side. But, finally, they came to an agreement, and Austria is sitting with us as a full-fledged independent State.

131. It is within your power if you want to accomplish things. Why do you not put an end to these incursions by a people which came from the continent of Europe—at least

the ideology came from the continent of Europe—all the time telling us "we were in this country 2,000 years ago"?

132. One more word about the Arabs. You call everybody Arab. Arabism is a culture, it is a way of life; it has nothing to do with blood or colour or race. Islam, likewise, is a religion, and religion does not constitute a nationality; it is the culture, the way of life, the language, the common interest that constitute a people and a nation. And why should not the Arab States—leaving aside the Palestinians for the moment—be afraid when the Zionists want to keep their indoctrination of 16 million Jews in the world and ingather them in Palestine? Who in the area would not be nervous that this people would expand and control—not necessarily geographically—but economically and financially, the whole area?

133. And if in this twentieth century geography is not and should not be the sole motivation, as in the case of the land of Palestine, why do our American friends not open Texas for them and give them 10 times the area of Palestine? They need motivation? I know Jews; 90 per cent of them are secular nowadays—in fairness to them, like the Christians. And the Moslems are also getting to be secular. I do not like them to get that secular, but they are getting to be secular. If you want to live as a community, as a nation, let those who created you provide you with the land.

134. You have said this is a *fait accompli*; all right, it is a *fait accompli*, but live with us—if you want to—within reason, not always by creating trouble in our midst. You will not succeed and you will create trouble for yourselves and for us. For Heaven's sake—just for humanity's sake—I am trying to jolt this into your consciousness: you cannot survive even if you bring 10 million Jews into the land, for in about 15 years we will be 150 million. And how can you live with a hostile Arab world surrounding you? It is not practical.

135. We do not hate you—as you always say we hate you. You made people hate you because you destroyed their homes—the Palestinians. You took their farms. You said they fled. Suppose they fled? Not all of them fled; those who heard about Deir Yassin in 1948 fled; many who did not hear about Deir Yassin remained in the Holy Land of Palestine. Suppose they panicked and fled, do they not have a right to their land? Think of that.

136. I think you have developed a psychosis and some of the Palestinians have developed a psychosis too: a psychosis of ultranationalism. Why do you not live side by side? What are you afraid of? You have technology, you have industry, and I am sure that you can live side by side in a binational State. Look at Switzerland, look at Lebanon. There are many sects, there is a confessional arrangement. But you do not want that because you have become like the horse with the blinders. You see a road that you want to follow and you do not want to look at what is going on in the world, and finally the world will get tired of you—if it gets tired of us we do not mind, there are too many of us—and I have told you that I would hate to see innocent Jews become scapegoats if one day something goes wrong economically and they say: "Aha, the Jews!" That is nothing new—not in our world. It has happened in Europe.

137. If Mr. Tekoah wants to research what I am saying, he will find that centuries before Hitler they picked on the Jew when there was something wrong. That was during the age of religious intolerance. And now it could be ideological intolerance, political intolerance. When religion loses its grip on people something replaces it—ideological intolerance, national intolerance.

138. If you want to commit suicide like the Massada I will deplore it. Why should you? But you, the leaders, will always survive; the people will be sacrificed. People are like sheep. Some leaders shear enough wool to clothe themselves and their entourage; others cut all the wool, and if the sheep perish they take to their heels and go to another land.

139. Did the influential in Nazi Germany suffer? Ninety per cent of them were abroad. I saw them in the 1930s in Europe. The humble Jewish people, the tailors, delicatessen men and those who had small shops, those were the people who really bore the brunt and finally were persecuted and perished.

140. And why do you want to let it happen again? And of all places in Palestine, where the three monotheistic religions grew up and flourished and had a message for the whole world? Why do you want it to happen in Palestine? And you, the major Powers, what are you going to do? I do not want now to use the term "super-Powers". According to the Chinese, the super-Powers are two. I am referring to the major Powers members of the Security Council, including France and the United Kingdom. What are you going to do about it? Will you send an ultimatum stating that this has gone on for too long and that you want to put an end to it? Or shall we come again and again and again to the Security Council in exercises in futility? This is the question.

141. I do hope something constructive will be done so that we may not find ourselves going in circles. I may have taxed the patience of my colleagues but I think we should call a spade a spade and do some plain talking instead of beating around the bush.

142. The PRESIDENT: There are no more names on the list of speakers of those wishing to make a statement. I therefore propose now to call on those members who wish to exercise their right of reply.

143. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I should like to reply briefly to some of the comments made by the representative of Israel, Mr. Tekoah. I could be proud of the fact that he accorded so much attention to me, the Soviet representative, in connexion with my statement. Accordingly, I draw the conclusion that my statement hit the mark. He accuses others of being short-sighted, but he himself is not only short-sighted but deaf. He concentrated for the most part on me. But all those who spoke before me condemned your country, as the aggressor, for this latest act of aggression. Why was I singled out in your response?

144. The Security Council has condemned your country more than 10 times for similar acts of banditry against

Lebanon. Are you deaf? Did you not hear? Are you short-sighted? Did you not see? You spoke about a "tablet". Read the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations—of the General Assembly and Security Council. There in black and white, in the five working languages of the Council and the Assembly, you will find the condemnation of Israel for aggression and the demand that it should liberate the occupied territories and live with its neighbours in accordance with the Charter. Have you not seen this? It must mean that you are short-sighted, together with your Government, your Dayan and the other extremists who, in the second half of the twentieth century, are threatening half of the State of Lebanon with destruction. It is monstrous! It is barbarity, cruelty, Hitlerism and fascism in the Zionist version. There is a tablet for you. Read the tablet—it has one inscription: "Get out of the occupied Arab territories". Then everything will be settled, and there will be peace, security and tranquillity in the Middle East. You do not see this tablet. That means that you are not merely short-sighted but blind. It is time for you to notice these things, and the sooner you do so, the better it will be.

145. I quoted a recent statement—an official statement—of the Soviet side, the speech of Mr. Brezhnev. The position of the Soviet Union is clear and consistent. Our policy has been and will continue to be directed unswervingly against aggression, in support of the legitimate rights of the Arab peoples, and towards the achievement of a just peace in the Middle East. This means the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the territories occupied in and since 1967.

146. There is the tablet. Open your eyes, Mr. Tekoah, and advise your Government to open its eyes, and you will notice the inscription on the tablet; it is not only in hieroglyphics, but also in English, French, Spanish and Russian—in the resolutions of the United Nations. There are the tablets of international opinion. You and your country are condemned. You are alone and isolated; you are supported by only one great Power, and by no one else.

147. We are in favour of guaranteeing security in the interests of all the States of the area, including your own. We are in favour of respect for the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine. That is our principle and our "tablet". Read this inscription, do not be blind, deaf or short-sighted, and do not reproach others with being short-sighted.

148. I have a very short comment to make on another point—the appeal by my distinguished friend, Mr. Baroody, to the major Powers. There is no need to appeal to the Soviet Union, Mr. Baroody; our position is clear and is one of principle; I have just stated it. Appeal to the other major Powers. Much depends on them. But when you appeal to the major Powers, Mr. Baroody, do not forget your own strength. Recent events have shown that the Arab world needs to be firmly united. Ensure that it is so. When you rely on the major Powers, do not forget to rely on yourselves and on your own strength and on the unity of the Arab world. You have the means of bringing influence to bear both against the aggressor and on those who help him.

149. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I should like first of all to refer to the statement made by the representative of Syria and to say categorically that all the positions that are maintained today by the Israeli Defence Forces along the cease-fire line have been so maintained since before the cease-fire.

150. My second observation to his statement is that he forgot to mention one significant fact, namely, that the Government of Syria refused to accept the 22 October 1973 call of the Security Council for a cease-fire until two days later. He will find reference to this crucial fact in the correspondence between the Secretary-General and me distributed as a Security Council document [S/11047].

151. We all heard what the representative of Lebanon had to say about the massacre in Kiryat Shmona. We listened carefully to his words and we noted that he could not hold back his sympathy for the perpetrators of that cruel and barbaric slaughter. We all noted how he came here to suggest that in the Kiryat Shmona carnage not the terrorists but their victims and the victims' defenders were at fault. That shocking pronouncement will not remain unnoticed. It is customary for him to refer to the existence of Palestinian refugees on Lebanese soil. If he would have read my statement of yesterday, he would have noted a historic fact. These Palestinians have been in Lebanon since 1948 and for more than two decades the Lebanese-Israeli frontier was an example of tranquillity. Why use them as a pretext now for terrorist operations by gangs usually coming from abroad and establishing their headquarters, training camps and operational bases on Lebanese soil?

152. I shall add only one further remark on this particular point. It is high time to be correct and to avoid falsification also about the number of Palestinians in Lebanon. The reports of the United Nations, the reports of UNRWA, the reports of the Secretary-General speak of 160,000. The representative of Lebanon feels himself free whenever he wants to refer to 300,000, to 250,000 and so on. I understand his discomfiture in view of the fact that his country has become, and is considered by the entire enlightened world, a centre of international terrorism. The Israeli representative does not come before the Security Council to prove that. This fact is known universally; it is reported by the international press daily; correspondents of international media of information are free to meet with leaders of these terrorist groupings in Beirut and to send on Lebanese wires abroad the stories and threats and statements made by these leaders.

153. Can the representative of Lebanon deny the existence of these headquarters, training centres, recruitment offices, operational bases of terrorist organizations in Beirut and in other parts of Lebanon? Can he deny that agents of these organizations have freely left his country on missions of death not only to Kiryat Shmona but also to other parts of the world, in particular Europe, frequently carrying Lebanese passports, boarding planes in Beirut, carrying with them explosives and other weapons of death? Can he deny the agreement signed by his Government on 3 November 1969 with these terrorist organizations giving them freedom of movement on Lebanese soil, giving them rights among which is the right to cross the frontier, as quoted by me from a paragraph contained in that particular agreement?

154. On what did the representative of Lebanon try to base his case that the murderers in Kiryat Shmona did not come from his country? On the fact that there were Israeli radio broadcasts while the murders were still taking place, as he himself admitted, stating that the facts were still not fully known. By bringing this kind of evidence before the Security Council the representative of Lebanon has achieved the very opposite of his purpose. The townlet of Kiryat Shmona, which was the target of this atrocious attack, is only one kilometre from the Lebanese border. If the Israeli authorities had desired to make, as the Lebanese representative alleged, Lebanon into a scapegoat, it would have been very simple for them to say that the geographic location of Kiryat Shmona is sufficient proof of the fact that the murderers crossed the border from Lebanon. The Israeli authorities did not do that. They waited until there was evidence that the three terrorists in fact had crossed the frontier, and it was only then that the official announcement was made. But at the very same time the terrorist organizations in Beirut were free to speak of the attack that was taking place in Kiryat Shmona. They already knew the full details of it; they already knew and published and circulated the names, the ages, the origins of the three assassins.

155. These are the facts and this is the balance of truth and falsehood, of right and wrong. And as for the true face of this so-called scapegoat—Lebanon—let Lebanese leaders describe it themselves. For instance, Mr. Pierre Gemayel, leader of the Phalangist Party, demanded on 30 November 1973 that

"No pretext should be given to Israel to shell southern Lebanon. None of the Lebanese leaders tried to enter to the root of the problem in order to discuss the real causes which have been turning southern Lebanon into a centre of demolition and destruction since until now this matter was dealt with in a cowardly manner full of lies while using justifications and hollow slogans and unwilling to see the truth."

That is a Lebanese leader speaking, a member of the Lebanese Parliament, not the Israeli representative. And then he continued:

"There is no way to tackle the problem without observing the truth as it is. We must first of all ask how to arrest the activities carried out on the borders by irresponsible and undisciplined groups. Secondly, we must see whether these activities are useful to the Palestinian cause, as they are harmful to Lebanon. The question is how can we expect that Israel would not carry out retaliatory operations while we turn our borders into a centre of sabotage against her."

156. Mr. Raymond Edde, leader of the Lebanese National Bloc, stated on 13 March 1974—only a few weeks ago—

"The south must be the cardinal subject before the Government because of the continuing hostilities there. The army should be present on the borders in order to prevent attempts by fedayeen who defy orders of their commanders regarding the crossing of the border and the firing of rockets. The army must detain them."

157. And if that were not enough, the leaders of the Lebanese Government themselves have something to say about the true picture of so-called peaceful Lebanon. It seems that this innocent virtuous Lebanon speaks in two different voices: one, a voice of propaganda meant for the gullible on the assumption that apparently they are to be found also around this Security Council table; and the second voice, when there is no escape from truth, when these leaders have to face parliamentary debates, when they have to face questions of other Lebanese statesmen. And thus the Prime Minister of Lebanon himself declared, on 5 March 1974:

"Lebanon is resolute. Lebanon is resolute in her decision to continue her co-operation with the fedayeen."

It is now obvious what the results of this co-operation and the close ties between the Government of Lebanon and the terrorist gangs are. The Minister of Defence of Lebanon declared, on 14 February 1974:

"The Lebanese army will not undertake a policy of forcibly preventing some fedayeen groups from carrying out operations through Lebanese territory. The army leaves these operations to the fedayeen command headquarters."

And three days earlier, on 11 February 1974, the Minister of Defence of Lebanon said:

"I have a list which shows that fedayeen activities in the southern region have not ceased, and that the bombing with missiles of Israeli villages on the southern border by fedayeens is one of the most important reasons for Israeli attacks."

158. Now, I suggest that these statements are an accurate reflection of the true situation—and not the concocted propaganda and allegation to which the Council has been subjected, yesterday and today, by Lebanese representatives.

159. The representative of Lebanon spoke of Israeli actions taken on Lebanese soil in the past. He forgot to mention one central fact: and that is that every single Israeli action was a counteraction to a long chain of ceaseless murderous attacks that came from the territory of his country. And on that I should like to quote a statement made by an international law authority, Professor Goodheart, and published in the *Daily Telegraph* of 29 July 1968. The renowned international jurist says:

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

"On this point Oppenheim and Lauterpacht stated the law thus:

"When, to give an example, a State is informed that a body of armed men is being organised on neighbouring territory for the purpose of a raid into its territory, and

when the danger can be removed through an appeal to the authorities of the neighbouring country, no case of necessity has arisen. But if such an appeal is fruitless or not possible"—this has been the case with Lebanon—"or if there is danger in delay, a case of necessity arises, and the threatened State is justified in invading the neighbouring country and disarming the intending raiders."'¹

160. Now, this statement of international law does not date back a hundred years or 200 years: it was written a number of years ago on the basis of an authoritative interpretation of international law as it stands today under the Charter of the United Nations. I have had the opportunity already to refer to the inalienable fundamental right of every State under Article 51 of the Charter to self-defence. There is only one way for Lebanon to make Israeli defence actions unnecessary on Lebanese territory, and that is for the Lebanese Government to live up to its international obligations and to put an end to the existence and operation of terrorist gangs on and from its soil.

161. I should like to refer to only one point raised by the representative of the USSR. He found it advisable to speak of Israel's alleged isolation in the international community. I wonder whether those who make such statements realize the meaning of isolation in general, and in respect of Israel in particular. Do they realize, for instance, that in all democratic countries, even in those whose Governments, for reasons of material expediency sometimes do lean towards the Arab States, the peoples, as demonstrated in public opinion polls, are squarely on Israel's side? I would even venture to say to the representative of the USSR that if such a free public opinion poll were allowed also in his own country the results would be the same, and the support of the peoples of the Soviet Union for Israel's struggle would be as strong as in other parts of the world.

162. As for the attitude of the Governments themselves, we attach great significance to it. But it is no secret that this attitude is frequently influenced by such considerations as the number of Arab votes in international organizations, the size of Arab territories and of Arab populations, and the need for Arab oil. These considerations have of course, no relation whatever to the merits of Israel's position and to the righteousness of its cause.

163. Moreover, this situation is not new. It is not new for Israel; it is not new for the Jewish people. We have always been a small nation, devoid of large territory or vast riches. Our strength has always been in the realm of the spirit, in our faith, in our civilization, in the values of morality and justice which we have enunciated and upheld through the ages.

164. Those who held different beliefs, those who disagreed with us, those who opposed us, have always been more numerous than ourselves. Yet, throughout history we have always remained faithful to our heritage and have always refused to abandon it and to join the majority. We knew at all times, in all periods of history, that it was easier to yield, to give in and to give up, and to become part of the multitude. We chose not to do that.

¹ L.F.L. Oppenheim, *International Law: A Treatise*, 7th ed., H. Lauterpacht, ed. (London, Longman's, Green and Co., 1955), vol. I, p. 266.

165. Have those who speak of Israel's isolation, as the Soviet representative did, given any thought to the question: What would have happened if at the time the Jewish people was the only one with a monotheistic religion it had discarded it because the entire world rejected the idea of one God? What would have happened to the birth of Christianity and Islam, both rooted in Judaism? What would have happened to the vision of the Hebrew prophets inscribed at the gates to the United Nations—the vision of a world at peace, of swords being turned into ploughshares, if the Jewish people had said to itself, "We are isolated because all nations believe in war. Let us therefore join them in the glorification of war, and stop preaching peace"?

166. The Jewish people was isolated when, 3,000 years ago, it proclaimed the concept that all men are born equal because they are all created in the image of one God. The Jewish people was all alone when, thirty centuries before the abolition of slavery, it established by binding law that slaves must be freed after six years of servitude. When the Crusaders massacred entire Jewish communities including those in the land of Israel; when the Inquisition burned Jews at the stake; when pogromists butchered Jewish women and children; when the Nazis annihilated them in gas chambers and crematoria, we were isolated. Do not, therefore, throw at us the epithet of isolation when our children and women are again being murdered—this time by Arab terrorists. Do not taunt us with isolation when we are still defending, as we have been for centuries, our very right to life as individuals and as a people, different but equal with others.

167. We shall not be impressed nor deterred. The Jewish people has never betrayed itself and never will, small as it is, surrounded by those who are more numerous, as it has always been. That has been our strength in all ages: isolation from injustice, isolation from a refusal to distinguish right from wrong; isolation from the belief that material power, numerical strength and the power of violence are supreme. That is a condition about which the Jewish people has never had any regrets. In fact, it is not isolation at all but a conscious choice, a conscious preference for and alliance with the right and the just and the humane even in times when only a few uphold those tenets.

168. For thousands of years, our people has found in this situation sufficient strength and inspiration to persevere and even to outline its detractors, because the Jewish people has always known that its ideals and values, its identity, the protection of its heritage, the righteousness of its cause are more precious than the plaudits of others. That is true also today.

169. Mr. CHUANG Yen (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The Israeli representative's earlier reference to my statement is beneath refutation. It is notorious that the Israeli Zionists have incurred huge debts in blood by their wanton violation of the national rights of the Palestinian people and the sovereignty and territory of Arab countries and peoples. It is futile for the Zionists to whitewash their undisguised crimes of aggression, however hard they may try. The more one tries to cover them up, the more glaring they become.

170. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): I wish to make only a few points in exercise of my right of reply.

171. First of all, Mr. Tekoah, in his usual manner of falsifying facts, even events and words that take place and are spoken here before the Council, immediately wanted to note that I held back my sympathy concerning the massacres of Kiryat Shmona. Yesterday my Foreign Minister said very clearly that he had no embarrassment in stating his opinion and the opinion of the President of the Republic, and I did reiterate that. He is playing on words, and in his usual manner of falsification and vilification Mr. Tekoah tries to lead the Council into error.

172. Regarding the Palestinians in Lebanon, Mr. Tekoah cited the fact that according to the UNRWA report we have 160,000 Palestinians there. It is true that according to that report we have such a number living in the camps and receiving rations from UNRWA. But apart from that number, we have a large number of Palestinians living in Lebanon—living, like everyone else, in apartments—to whom we have extended many facilities so that they may live a better life. They are in business; they are doctors; they are lawyers; they are bankers; they are professors; they are students in the universities; they belong to a class that no longer needs the alms of the United Nations—7 cents-worth of rations a day.

173. Mr. Tekoah always refers to the enlightened world that knows the facts about Lebanon. I have always failed to know which is the enlightened world. It seems that, according to Mr. Tekoah, who is defending his isolation and the isolation of his Government and its aggressive policy, the only enlightened people in the world are the aggressive leaders of Israel. That is a new definition of "enlightenment", and I think the Council would be well advised to take note of it.

174. Regarding what happened at Kiryat Shmona, I again repeat that, according to recorded broadcasts from Israel at 11 o'clock, immediately following the conclusion of the operations at Kiryat Shmona, Radio Israel categorically and automatically stated that the perpetrators of that act had come from Lebanon, and the Israeli Government has based its verdict against Lebanon on that information.

175. There are many points that Mr. Tekoah has raised to which I am not going to reply at this particular stage. But I should like particularly to refer to the statement attributed to the Minister of Defence of Lebanon. It is a fact that the Minister of Defence meant that the Lebanese army does not assume alone the responsibility for the prevention of infiltration into Israel from Lebanon. The Palestine Liberation Organization itself has been doing everything in its power to prevent any infiltration from Lebanon into Israel. The fact that the Prime Minister of Lebanon has stated that Lebanon supports the cause of the Palestinian people does not mean that Lebanon supports the acts of violence or that the Prime Minister of Lebanon is encouraging or allowing or permitting any infiltration from our borders into Israel on a mission of acts of violence. His statement means simply that he, as well as the Lebanese, without exception, support the cause—the right cause—of the Palestinian people, a cause seeking rights recognized as theirs by the United Nations.

176. We have those Palestinian people of all categories and of all shades. Who is responsible for their presence in Lebanon, but Israeli terrorism, Israeli terrorism and Israeli policy which has kept them in refugee camps for 25 years?

177. The melodramatic statements of Mr. Tekoah cannot efface the memory of the Zionist and Israeli atrocities in the Middle East against the Palestinian people. The path of terrorism in our area is indelibly marked with the footprints of Israeli terrorists.

178. As I have remarked once before, if the Palestinian people and individuals have taken arms in their hands, that is their business. We have nothing to do with it in Lebanon as a Government and as a people. But we have to remember always that the Israeli Government has raised terrorism to the rank of a State policy. We were reminded of that fact today by Ambassador Malik.

179. In application of that policy, plans are hatched at the ministerial level and handed to regular units of the armed forces of Israel to carry them out. They are issued by people whose prime responsibility at this stage is to promote and help in the promotion of conditions of tranquillity in the area, to better foster the chances of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. The Lebanese Government has always recognized its responsibility and worked, laboured and supported every effort to promote conditions of peace. It does so particularly at this stage when such delicate and intricate negotiations are being undertaken to achieve that objective.

180. I think Mr. Tekoah would do well to tell his Government and his people that there is a road to peace, that they should scrap their aggressive and destructive

policy and their threats and concentrate on one policy, and only one, that of a sane, constructive, steady approach to peace—peace alone. If Israel has the courage to work sincerely for it and to risk it, that will prevent orchards from becoming a wasteland and will indeed make the deserts bloom.

181. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): We regret that the representative of Israel used his right of reply for a completely unworthy and shameful tactic. He attempted to convey the idea that the policy of the Governments of the countries which strongly condemn Israel's aggressive and expansionist policy do not have the support of their peoples. We must state as decisively and categorically as possible that the Soviet people and the whole of Soviet public opinion has supported and continues to support the policy of the Soviet Government on the Middle East question. The Soviet people and Soviet public opinion strongly condemn Israel's acts of aggression against Arab States and its policy of expansion and annexation of foreign lands. The Soviet people and Soviet public opinion has always rendered and will continue to render all possible support to the just cause of the Arab peoples fighting for the restoration of their legitimate rights and the liberation of their land. It is perfectly clear that the State of Israel finds itself in deep political, moral and diplomatic isolation, and the sooner the rulers of Israel grasp this situation the better, for it is the practical manifestation of the condemnation of Israel's adventuristic policy by the whole of world public opinion and an overwhelming number of the peoples of the world.

The meeting rose at 7.40 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استلم 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.
