

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

1707th MEETING: 16 APRIL 1973

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1707)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 12 April 1973 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10913)	1

NOTE

Les cotes des documents de l'Organisation des Nations Unies se composent de lettres majuscules et de chiffres. La simple mention d'une cote dans un texte signifie qu'il s'agit d'un document de l'Organisation.

Les documents du Conseil de sécurité (cotes S/. . .) sont, en règle générale, publiés dans des *Suppléments* trimestriels aux *Documents officiels du Conseil de sécurité*. La date d'un tel document indique le supplément dans lequel on trouvera soit le texte en question, soit des indications le concernant.

Les résolutions du Conseil de sécurité, numérotées selon un système adopté en 1964, sont publiées, pour chaque année, dans un recueil de *Résolutions et décisions du Conseil de sécurité*. Ce nouveau système, appliqué rétroactivement aux résolutions antérieures au 1^{er} janvier 1965, est entré pleinement en vigueur à cette date.

SEVENTEEN HUNDRED AND SEVENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 16 April 1973, at 11 a.m.

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

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1707)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 12 April 1973 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10913)

The meeting was called to order at 11.30 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

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

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

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

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

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

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The first name on the list of speakers is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, Mr. Mohamed Hassan El-Zayyat.

4. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): Mr. President, it is indeed an honour and pleasure to be back in the Council, participating in these proceedings under your presidency. I thank you very much for allowing me to participate.

5. As the Council has heard from the representative of Lebanon [1705th meeting], my friend and colleague Mr. Edouard Ghorra, the night of 10 April 1973 witnessed an unprecedented aggression on his country—premeditated, prepared, carried out and arrogantly admitted to by the Government of Israel. Some 50 men and women were murdered in cold blood in their beds, in their homes, in their miserable camps or in the peaceful cities of Lebanon.

6. The assassins were not common criminals. They were Israeli soldiers trained and ordered by their Government to commit these common-law crimes. The defence correspondent of *The Times* of London, Mr. Stanhope, reported in *The Times* of 12 April that those crimes were executed by a secret Israeli department set up last year. That department, the correspondent says, goes under the code name of "Mivtzah Elohim", or "God's Wrath". Its chief is Major-General Aharon Yariv, a former head of "Aman", the military intelligence section. He was appointed by Mr. Moshe Dayan, the Defence Minister, but is responsible to Mrs. Meir, the Prime Minister, and comes under the daily supervision of Mr. Yigal Allon, the Deputy Prime Minister. Those are the persons who gave directives, who gave the orders to commit the common-law crimes of 10 April.

7. It is obvious that the acts of murder and assassination of the Palestinian leaders and refugees and of the Lebanese citizens in Beirut were planned by the highest authorities of the Israeli Government and executed by their official agents.

8. The reaction of Israeli authorities to those assassinations was simply shocking. The Prime Minister of Israel thought those assassinations were "marvellous". The Foreign Minister of Israel, on 11 April, claimed in the Knesset that the first echoes reaching his ministry reflected "great admiration" abroad for those horrid murders.

9. More, the Israeli authorities have served notice that such barbaric crimes will be repeated in Lebanon, in the Arab countries or anywhere else, whenever the men and women in authority in Tel Aviv so decide, undeterred by international ethics, assured against international action or sanction.

10. These murders suggest that Israel has now assigned to itself an imperial role in our region. Its leaders would decide the persons to be eliminated and the civilian planes to be shot down. This goes parallel to decisions on which territory is to be cleaned up of its Palestinian inhabitants, or Egyptian inhabitants, or Syrian inhabitants and annexed, which villages and towns are to be demolished, and which Israeli colonies are to be built on the ruins. Human beings are objects and international boundaries are fictitious marks on old-fashioned maps. The Zionist leaders decide the shape of the Middle East, and the Israeli armed forces and agents carry out the decisions.

11. Press reports coming from Israel today indicate that the Israeli Government is satisfied that the deliberations in this series of meetings of the Security Council will only follow the same routine as in previous debates and end as previous debates have ended. This comment means that your expected resolution will carry in Israel the same weight as your previous ones and will have the same effect—or lack of it—on the aggressive policy of the authorities in Tel Aviv.

12. In the past, this Council regretted, deplored, and condemned various acts of aggression committed by Israel. The Council, as you are well aware, has, in the last four years, passed the following resolutions, after discussing Israeli aggression in the Lebanese sector alone. I leave out now other aggressions, other resolutions and other condemnations.

13. First, on 31 December 1968, the Council condemned Israel "for its premeditated military action in violation of its obligations under the Charter" [*resolution 262 (1968)*] against the civil International Airport of Beirut. On that occasion, the Council issued

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

14. Secondly, on 26 August 1969, the Council condemned "the premeditated air attack by Israel on villages in southern Lebanon in violation of its obligations under the Charter and Security Council resolutions" [*resolution 270 (1969)*]. The Council again declared that

"such actions of military reprisal and other grave violations of the cease-fire cannot be tolerated and that the Security Council would have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such acts".

15. Thirdly, on 19 May 1970, the Council considered another large-scale Israeli attack against Lebanon and again condemned "Israel for its premeditated military action in violation of its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations" [*resolution 280 (1970)*] and declared that "such armed attacks can no longer be tolerated" and repeated

"its solemn warning to Israel that if they were to be repeated the Security Council would, in accordance with resolution 262 (1968) and the present resolution, con-

sider taking adequate and effective steps or measures in accordance with the relevant Articles of the Charter to implement its resolutions".

16. Fourthly, on 26 June 1972, this Council expressed its grave concern at Israel's failure to comply with the previous resolutions of the Security Council "calling on Israel to desist forthwith from any violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon" [*resolution 316 (1972)*].

17. All these condemnations and warnings had no effect on the authorities in Tel Aviv. Indeed, in its last assault, Israel escalated its aggression. It has become more violent and less inhibited. Today the authorities in Tel Aviv have espoused murder and assassination as a formal State policy and practice.

18. What do the people in our area expect from the Council today? What do the people in Lebanon expect? What do the people in Egypt expect? What do they want to hear? What are they waiting to hear?

19. Surely the Council has now taken account of the failure of the Government of Israel to comply with its repeated resolutions—I am using the language of the Charter. It is therefore the Council's inescapable duty to determine what measures it should now take in the discharge of its responsibilities.

20. The measures envisaged by the Charter include many things. We are conscious that some of them cannot be applied now. The United Nations has not yet formed its coercive forces. But there are measures envisaged by the Charter which include complete or partial interruption of economic relations, communications and severance of diplomatic relations. It is unbelievable that Israel continues to receive ever-increasing massive military and economic assistance from a Member State, even after it has read and is aware of all the previous resolutions by the Council on Lebanon alone. It is inconceivable that such massive aid should be provided to Israel while it occupies the territories of three States Members of the United Nations, while it continues to colonize the occupied territories, while it has made a mockery of the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence, while it has boycotted the peace mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, while it has acted contrary to all decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly on the Middle East.

21. Yesterday, Sunday, 15 April, the Chairman of the United States Senate's Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Fulbright, summed up the net effect of American military and economic assistance to Israel. On the television programme "Face the Nation" he stated the following:

"It is quite obvious [that] without the all-out support by the United States in money and weapons, the Israelis would not do what they have been doing. We"—that is, the United States—"bear a very great share of the responsibility for the continuation of this state of warfare".

All the weapons which have been provided to Israel during the past years have surely only made Israel more and more contemptuous of the decisions of the Council and of the General Assembly. A ban on military supplies and financial aid to Israel is today essential for the attainment of peace in the Middle East.

22. The least that the Security Council can do now is to call upon all Member States including and indeed especially the permanent members of the Council—and in this case the United States—to interrupt their economic assistance and their military supplies to Israel, which have facilitated aggression in the past and would facilitate the committing of further aggressions. Certainly the peoples of the world should come to know to what extent an international legal order based on the Charter of the United Nations is capable of protecting them. The people in our area have the right to know whether decisions of the Council do indeed have any practical value.

23. We are fully aware that Israel is bent on proving that the Charter is a mere fallacy; we are fully aware that Israel is bent on proving that the authority of the Security Council is a fiction. We are certainly aware that Israel, like all militaristic States, is bent on proving that what counts is sheer power and sheer terror. We refuse to accept this militaristic thesis. We want and need a world protected by law, protected by the United Nations Charter. That is why we will listen to the deliberations most attentively and wait for a meaningful and effective resolution.

24. It is also the intention of the Government of Egypt to ask later in this Council at this meeting, for a full review of the entire Middle East situation by the Security Council. Egypt will later ask for specific steps to be taken to bring about a full examination of United Nations efforts for the implementation of all its resolutions, and for applying the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations in the region. These would of course include the request for the submission of a full report by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Gunnar Jarring, and his mission.

25. The Council and the world it represents certainly have the right and the duty to know whether peace efforts in the Middle East have indeed reached a dead end. After almost six years of Israeli occupation, arrogance and efforts at humiliation, our people and indeed all the peoples of the civilized world have the right to know whether the United Nations has succeeded or failed in its duty to—and I am using the words of the Charter—establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from international law could be maintained. Certainly we have the right to know where the responsibility for the present situation lies.

26. On 9 April 1948 the peaceful village of Dir Yassin in Palestine saw the most horrible of massacres—the murder of its children by the Irgun Zvai Leumi of the Zionist movement. For those who have forgotten about that, I reluctantly recommend a book by Mr. Menachem Begin, a member of the Israeli cabinet until very recently and member of the Knesset. The book is called *The Revolt:*

Story of the Irgun, published by Schuman, New York, 1951. On pages 163 to 165 Mr. Begin tells us the story of how, in his words, the atrocities of the Irgun spread like wildfire after the massacre of Dir Yassin and caused the exodus of some 635,000 Arabs who ran away shouting in panic, “Dir Yassin, Dir Yassin.” Twenty-five years later to the day the peaceful city of Beirut saw another series of murders. What is different now is this. What was then attributed to irresponsible persons is now arrogantly claimed as a policy of the State of Israel. Twenty-five years have passed. There must be some youth in Israel today who is 25 years old, and he should try to follow the bloody trail from Dir Yassin to Beirut.

27. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): In the small hours of 10 April 1973, the Israeli Zionists flagrantly despatched armed bandits to invade Beirut, the capital of Lebanon, and carried out premeditated raids and slaughters at the headquarters of the Palestinian guerrilla organizations and refugee camps. Palestinian guerrilla leaders Mohamed Youssef, El-Najjar, Kamal Adwan and Kamal Nasser, as well as a number of other Palestinian revolutionaries, were killed, and heavy casualties were inflicted on the Lebanese people. These fresh crimes committed by the Israeli Zionists have evoked the indignation of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples as well as the peoples of the whole world. On behalf of the Chinese Government and people, the Chinese delegation expresses profound sympathy and consolation to the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples. We express the utmost indignation at and strongly condemn the aggression and brutal crimes committed by the Israeli Zionists.

28. The horrible atrocity of 10 April is by no means an isolated incident, but the continuation of a series of atrocities committed by the Israeli Zionists over a long period. This incident only serves as yet another proof that the Israeli Zionists resort to aggression as their State policy and have carried out their policy of aggression by most brutal means. After the atrocity of 10 April, the Israeli Premier openly and brazenly extolled it as being “very marvellous”. The Chief of Staff of the Israeli Armed Forces arrogantly declared that “there is no possibility” for Israel to “honour the sovereignty of Lebanon” as long as there are Palestinian guerrilla activities on Lebanese territory and that Israel “intends to continue” such operations. At the Security Council meetings here, the Israeli representative also openly declared that where there were Palestinian patriots Israel would have the right to attack. All this is undisguised gangster’s logic. As everyone knows, the Palestinian people have been driven out of their homeland by the Zionists and, destitute and homeless, are leading a miserable life. In these circumstances it is perfectly just for the Palestinian people to fight on the territories of other Arab countries for the restoration of their rights to national existence with the support of the fraternal Arab people. If the Israeli aggressors were allowed to act so recklessly, invading one Arab country today and another tomorrow, what would be left of the international code of conduct? All peace-loving and justice-upholding people of the world categorically reject the gangster’s logic of the Israeli aggressors and absolutely cannot tolerate their aggressive atrocities.

29. The Israeli aggressors think that by means of bloody massacre they can intimidate the Palestinian, Lebanese and other Arab peoples and stamp out the raging flames of the just struggle against Israeli aggression. This is a sheer fond dream. The fiercer the oppression, the stronger the resistance. By their perverse acts, the Israeli aggressors are lifting a rock only to drop it on their own feet. The people fighting for freedom and liberation cannot be exterminated. With one man falling, millions will rise and march forward along the path crimson with his blood. The awakened Palestinian and other Arab peoples will further see through the ferocious features of the Israeli aggressors, enhance their fighting will, unite closely and advance wave upon wave, to carry on the struggle against the aggressors through to the end.

30. It is necessary to point out here that the connivance and encouragement by the two super-Powers are the basic reason why the Israeli Zionists have not only long occupied and refused to withdraw from large tracts of Arab territories but also dared to perpetrate so blatantly repeated armed invasions and murderous atrocities against neighbouring Arab countries. Contending for their spheres of influence, the two super-Powers are deliberately maintaining a situation of "no war, no peace" in the Middle East and are intentionally taking advantage of the temporary difficulties of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples to make political deals at the expense of the latter's national rights, territory and sovereignty, so as to facilitate their contention for important strategic points and oil resources in the Middle East.

31. One super-Power has been supporting the Israeli aggressors with arms and economic aid, and the other is pouring a steady flow of manpower into Israel to supply the Israeli aggressors with sources for troop recruitment and even technical specialists. Previous speakers here have rightly said that the Palestinian and other Arab peoples are the victims of super-Power policies. However, the super-Powers' acts of seeking gains at the expense of others are being seen through ever more clearly by the Arab people and will eventually end in ignominious failure.

32. On this occasion the Chinese delegation reaffirms: The Chinese Government and people will, as always, firmly support the Palestinian, Lebanese and other Arab peoples in their just struggle against the Israeli aggressors. The Security Council must adopt a resolution sternly to condemn and stop the aggression and atrocities of the Israeli aggressors. The heroic Palestinian and other Arab peoples are by no means alone in their just struggles: the world situation is favourable to the struggle against hegemonism and power politics. The Palestinian and other Arab peoples are becoming ever more staunch through tempering in their arduous struggles.

33. We are deeply convinced that, no matter what difficulties and twists and turns they may encounter and what sacrifices they will have to make on their road of advance, with the energetic support of the justice-upholding countries and people all over the world, they will certainly defeat the Israeli aggressors, recover their national rights and lost territories and win final victory, so long as they rely on and mobilize the broad masses, persist in unity against imperialism and persevere in protracted struggle.

34. Finally, I have to point out that, in his statement of 13 April [1706th meeting], the Soviet representative deviated far from the subject under discussion in the Security Council to harp unabashedly on the hackneyed tune of the "non-use of force in international relations". He also made innuendos, attacks and threats against the Chinese delegation and all other delegations which oppose or do not support the Soviet proposal. By so doing, the Soviet representative tried to provoke a controversy and divert the attention of the meeting. We express regret at this.

35. At the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly, the Chinese delegation made a full analysis and refutation of the Soviet delegation's reactionary argument which distorted the spirit of the Charter and aimed at seeking fame by deceiving the public. It is clear to all that, in playing up once again the reactionary theory of the absolute "non-use of force in international relations", which makes no distinction between aggression and the victim of aggression, between justice and injustice, at a time when the Israeli Zionists have just committed the crimes of armed aggression and brutal massacre against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples, the Soviet representative is, in fact, whitewashing the aggressors' crime while asking the victimized Palestinian and other Arab peoples to give up their struggle against aggression and wait for death with tied hands.

36. He even went so far as to accuse all those who disagree with his reactionary theory of encouraging aggression and supporting Israel, trying thereby to exert pressure on them. This has revealed all the more clearly the high-handedness and ulterior motive of the Soviet representative. Judging his words by his own deeds, one will see that the proposal for the so-called non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons as propagated by the Soviet representative is nothing but a downright fraud. Its purpose is none other than to cover up their frantic arms expansion and war preparation and their attempt to consolidate their position of nuclear monopoly and nuclear blackmail and to lull the vigilance of the world's people so as to expedite their unbridled expansion and aggression in pursuit of their big-Power hegemony. The Chinese delegation declares that it firmly opposes that reactionary theory and infamous design of the Soviet representative.

37. Mr. Malik also said that the so-called "new rule of international law" about the so-called "non-use of force in international relations" must be "expressly stated" in whatever resolution the Security Council now adopts on the question under consideration. By insisting on thrusting such an issue into the resolution of the Security Council, he further reveals his strenuous attempt to place obstacles in the way of adoption by the Security Council of a resolution in support of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples and in opposition to Israeli aggression. The Chinese delegation firmly opposes such a scheme of the Soviet representative.

38. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of Israel is the next speaker on the list and I call on him.

39. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I remember hearing as a child the Chinese story of the blind man and laughter. Apparently a blind man was standing near a crowd of people who were in a jocular mood; and suddenly he heard them burst into laughter; he joined them and laughed as well. Asked one of the men in the crowd: "Why do you laugh, blind man, not knowing what it is all about?" And the blind man replied: "As you are all laughing, there must be something worth laughing about, and therefore I laugh too." What the blind man did not know was that the crowd was laughing at him.

40. To the representative of the People's Republic of China, who is relatively new in this Organization, I would say: Make no haste in joining the chorus of those who attack Israel by distorting basic international concepts, and by falsifying fundamental principles regarding peace and war and aggression, and the right of Israel, a victim of 25 years of Arab aggression, to defend itself against terrorism. One day these same distortions of values and precepts might be turned by their proponents against you.

41. But I would leave it to the founder of the Chinese Republic, Sun Yat-sen, to reply to the substance of the Chinese representative's statement. On 24 April 1920, Sun Yat-sen wrote a letter to a Zionist leader in Shanghai, Mr. N. E. B. Ezra, in which he said:

"I have read your letter and the copy of *Israel's Messenger* with much interest and wish to assure you of my sympathy for this movement, which is one of the greatest movements of the present time. All lovers of democracy cannot help but support whole-heartedly and welcome with enthusiasm the movement to restore your wonderful and historic nation, which has contributed so much to the civilization of the world and which rightfully deserves an honourable place in the family of nations."

It is time for the Government of the People's Republic of China to ponder those words.

42. It is clear that it is not a message of peace that Egypt's Foreign Minister has brought to the United Nations. There was not a glimmer of light, of understanding, of peace in his words today. He flew across oceans and continents to tell the world that Egypt supports international terrorism, that Egypt backs the savage outrages of Arab murder gangs. Disheartening as this attitude is, it is not new. It is an established and well-known fact that Egypt identifies itself with the campaign of atrocities carried on by Arab terror organizations against innocent civilians. The Egyptian Government has never concealed its full support for these crimes. Its Prime Minister, at the time of the Lod airport massacre, publicly praised that barbaric crime. Egypt rejected a request by the Federal Republic of Germany to assist in a last-minute effort to prevent the murder of the Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympic Games. It remained silent when Governments throughout the world raised their voices against the ghastly assassination by Arab terrorists of American and Belgian diplomats in Khartoum. Indeed, it is evident to all that Arab terrorist organizations would have been unable to pursue their operations and to perpetrate such acts without the backing of the Egyptian and other Arab Governments.

43. At our previous meetings I analysed the origins of Arab terrorism, which reach back 50 years and have their roots in the Nazi ideology of the infamous Haj Amin el-Husseini, Hitler's collaborator in the annihilation of 6 million Jews. After Israel's attainment of independence in 1948 and the defeat of the invading Egyptian and other Arab armies, the first murder squads to be sent against defenceless Israeli men, women and children were organized by the Egyptian Government in Gaza and Sinai. They were named fedayeen and their banner, appropriately enough, was the old Nazi SS emblem, the skull and cross bones on a black background.

44. In the early 1950s, they launched a campaign of incursions into Israel, blowing up houses with their inhabitants asleep, throwing grenades into classrooms, ambushing civilian buses on highways. The Canadian Lieutenant-General Burns, then head of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), wrote of those attacks in his book, *Between Arab and Israeli*.

"I felt that what Egyptians were doing in sending these men, whom they dignified with the name of *fedayeen*, or commandos, into another country with the mission to attack men, women, and children indiscriminately was a war crime. It was essentially of the same character . . . as the offences for which the Nazi leaders had been tried in Nürnberg, to cite the most recent example."

45. It was only the Sinai campaign of 1956, in which the terrorist bases in Gaza and Sinai were destroyed, that put an end to the sanguinary attacks from Egyptian-controlled territory. Egypt continued, however, to encourage and assist in the pursuance of terror operations from other Arab States. In recent years, Beirut has become the principal operational headquarters of Arab international terrorism while Cairo is undoubtedly its political capital. This was expressed as follows in a statement by President Sadat on 6 April 1972 at a conference in Cairo of all the terrorist groups:

"We have come together once again at one of your assemblies, which you generally hold in Cairo, your meeting-place and your home. I do not believe that this is a matter of chance. No, I do not see it even as a deliberate choice, but as something natural, a matter of course. For you and for us, there is nothing before us but to fight."

46. Egypt's role as protector of Arab terrorism and its machinery is especially evident in the growth of murder operations in and from Lebanon. It was Egypt that forced upon the Lebanese Government the 3 November 1969 agreement with the terrorist organizations, granting those organizations freedom of operation in Lebanon. That pact, known as the Cairo Agreement, was signed in Egypt's capital by the notorious Yassir Arafat on behalf of terror groups and by Lebanon's Chief of Staff, Emil Bustani, while representatives of the Egyptian Government, including the Director-General of its Foreign Ministry, participated in the talks.

1 Toronto, Clarke, Irwin and Company, Ltd., 1962, p. 88.

47. The supplementary agreements between Lebanon and the terrorist organizations were also negotiated and concluded in Cairo. Time and again the Government of Egypt exerted pressure on Lebanon to conform to these agreements and to give a free hand to the terrorist groups. Whenever it seemed that the Lebanese Government was unhappy with this situation, whenever it appeared that Lebanon might try to do something about having become the base for the export of bestial bloodshed. Cairo was up in arms, intervening and forestalling it. President Sadat's emissaries were always on the go to ensure the maintenance of the terrorist establishment in Lebanon. One of these emissaries who intervened several times in 1972 was Mr. El-Zayyat's predecessor as Foreign Minister, the present Secretary-General of the Arab League, Mahmud Riad. Another one, Hassan Sebri el-Khouli, holds the office of President Sadat's personal representative.

48. Today, Egypt is apparently concerned once more about the future of the terrorist operations from Lebanon. Israel's action on 10 April was a serious blow to the murder groups and their supporters. Egypt is again fearful that this might weaken the barbaric campaign of atrocities. Egypt knows, of course, that public opinion in the enlightened world is aroused against this scourge, views Israel's action against the terrorist centres in the Beirut area as timely and justified and expects Lebanon to eliminate them.

49. Just as Mr. Riad or Mr. el-Khouli used to intervene on behalf of the terrorists with the Lebanese Government, Mr. El-Zayyat has joined our debate to see to it that no harm comes to these murderers. To satisfy his demands is to satisfy the assassins at Lod, the murderers at Munich and the bloodthirsty butchers at Khartoum. To vindicate the position expounded by the Egyptian Foreign Minister is to vindicate the outrages committed by the Arab terrorists. Egypt is interested that the terrorist activities should continue and expand and not only in Lebanon. El Fatah-Black September personnel undergo training with the Egyptian army in a special camp. Special courses given in Egypt to members of terrorist organizations have included intelligence, frogmen, commandos, special weapons such as rockets and recoilless guns.

50. The Egyptian Government has at times been directly involved in actual operations by the terror groups. Thus, the military attaché at the Egyptian Embassy in the United Kingdom was the organizer of a plot to blow up an El Al plane at London airport. This was established in the Oxford trial of one Trevor Williams, who was involved in the plot and was sentenced to 10 years imprisonment in March 1970 for his part in it.

51. Late in 1968, an American volunteer of Lebanese origin joined El Fatah-Black September. He was trained in Baalbek, Lebanon, to carry out terrorist activities in Israel. Two Egyptian intelligence officers attached to the Egyptian Embassy in Amman were his instructors. They also supplied him with detonators hidden in toothpaste tubes and bars of soap.

52. On 21 September 1972, the semi-official Egyptian daily *Al Gumhuriyya* published information of a new terrorist operation planned to be carried out by Black

September. The report indicated that more details were available than could be published. It is obvious that that which was known to a journalist of *Al Gumhuriyya* must also have been known to the Egyptian authorities.

53. Cairo has become the safe haven for terrorists after the completion of their operations. These include members of the Popular Front who, in July 1968, conducted, from their office in Cairo, the negotiations concerning an El Al aircraft hijacked to Algiers; the popular Front pirates responsible in September 1970 for hijacking a Pan American Boeing 747 to Cairo and blowing it up upon its arrival there. The Egyptian Government made no attempt whatever to prevent the destruction of the aircraft and the terrorists were all set free. The murderers of Jordan's Prime Minister Wasfi Tal in Cairo were set free by the Egyptian authorities. The hijackers of the Sabena aircraft, which landed in Lod in May 1972, demanded that the aircraft be flown to Cairo with Arab terrorists to be released from Israeli prisons. A similar demand to be flown to Cairo was made by the gang which murdered the Israeli athletes in Munich.

54. Cairo is also a centre of terrorist propaganda. A special radio station has been placed at the disposal of the murder organizations by the Egyptian Government. The assistance given to the terrorist groups was summed up by President Sadat of Egypt in an interview published in a Lebanese newspaper *Al Bayrak* on 8 January 1973. To the question, "To what extent do you assist the *fedayeen*?", Egypt's President replied, "Our assistance is unlimited". Surely it is obvious to all that this attitude of the Egyptian Government constitutes a serious obstacle to peace. The avowed official objective of the terrorist groups and of their umbrella organization, the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization, is to destroy Israel and to eliminate it as a sovereign State. Egypt's support for and identification with these organizations and their activities cast a dark shadow over Egypt's ultimate goals in the Middle East situation. Egyptian leaders, however, have gone beyond that. Gamal Abdel Nasser's promise to strike a death blow at Israel's independence and existence is a matter of record. Egypt's objectives today have been openly formulated in the notorious "theory of two stages", which was defined as follows by President Sadat's confidant, Mohamed Hassanein Heikal, in an article in *Al Ahram*:

"There are only two specific Arab goals at present: first, elimination of the consequences of the 1967 aggression through Israel's withdrawal from all the lands it occupied that year and secondly, elimination of the consequences of the 1948 aggression through the eradication of Israel."

55. Exactly a year ago, in a speech on the birthday of the Prophet Mohammed, President Sadat said of the people of Israel:

"It was written of them that they shall be demeaned and made wretched. . . . The matter is no longer one of only freeing our country. . . . We shall send them back to their former condition."

56. These being the aims of the Egyptian Government, it is abundantly clear that the terror organizations are not at all a people's movement, but merely the artificial product of the policy of the Egyptian and certain other Arab Governments. These terror organizations were established and built up to serve the destructive objectives and designs of those Arab Governments on Israel's sovereignty, and are not supported by the vast majority of Palestinians. Should the Egyptian Government so desire, the terror organizations would cease to exist tomorrow.

57. However, in view of Egypt's attitude and of the objectives common to the terrorist organizations and the Cairo Government, what is all this talk by the Egyptian Foreign Minister that the United Nations has not done enough, that the Security Council should act against Israel? Is it a United Nations responsibility to assist Egypt and the Arab terrorist organizations to pursue their aim of depriving the people of Israel of the right to life? If action is to be taken, it is against international terrorism and States which harbour and assist it, not against Governments which take protective measures against these bloody outrages.

58. The world and Israel are weary of listening to Egypt and other Arab States invoking one-sided resolutions which brush aside the merits of the issues and Israel's legitimate rights and interests; resolutions forced through the United Nations organs by virtue of the purely mechanical numerical weight of Arab delegations in our Organization; while, at the same time, Egypt and other Arab States trample under foot the entire Charter of the United Nations, all its principles and all its obligations in relation to Israel.

59. What is this talk of coercing Israel to give up its legitimate rights to self-defence and to live in security? Has not Egypt learned the lesson, after 25 years, that the use of force and coercion cannot be effective against Israel, not after what its people has had to go through to regain and to defend its independence? Does not Egypt realize that the only way to resolve the Middle East question is by abandoning its present policy and embarking on the course of dialogue, understanding and agreement with Israel?

60. Egypt's Foreign Minister did not bring us a message of hope. Let him however carry back a message to his Government and to his people, a message that there is hope, real hope, for peace, if Egypt ceases to support the nefarious aims and activities of the terrorist organizations and enters into a free meaningful dialogue with Israel. This evening, the Jewish people all over the world will be celebrating Passover, its festival of freedom. It commemorates the struggle of the people of Israel, more than 20 centuries ago, to live in freedom and in independence, and ancient Egypt's attempt to deny them this right.

61. Egypt's present Arab rulers are not of the same people as those of the Egypt of the Pharaohs. Yet, they too have hardened their hearts; they too are trying to prevent Israel from living like other nations. It is to be hoped that, for the good of the Egyptian people and of all the peoples of the Middle East, they will be wiser and less obdurate than the Pharaohs.

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

63. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): It is obvious that the latest criminal assault by Israel on Lebanon has earned for Israel world-wide indignation and condemnation. It has evoked deep concern in the area and is having wide repercussions. It is this deep concern about developments in the Middle East and about the prospects of peace there which has brought the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, Mr. El-Zayyat—whom I esteem and whose friendship I cherish—from Cairo, across the ocean, in order to warn the Security Council and the world about these repercussions and the deep concern shared by all Governments. We, in our delegation, appreciate the fact that Mr. El-Zayyat has seen fit to come here in order to be with us when we are discussing the complaint of Lebanon about the Israeli aggression.

64. My delegation wishes to state that it is grateful for the statements already made in the Council by the representatives of the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, the Sudan and the People's Republic of China, in which they have defended our cause and castigated the aggression by Israel.

65. During the last four years Lebanon has been subjected to several heavy and massive attacks by Israeli air and land forces. Many of our towns and villages in southern Lebanon were destroyed. Hundreds of our civilian people, including women and children, were killed or injured. The Security Council has met to deal with these Israeli acts of aggression and adopted several resolutions condemning them, condemning Israel, and warning it against their repetition. The Foreign Minister of Egypt has recalled these facts in detail.

66. But these resolutions did not deter Israel. The inaction of the Security Council in September 1972, because of a veto cast by a permanent member of the Council, has emboldened Israel. It has undertaken several large-scale operations resulting in more death, suffering and destruction, the last of which is the gangster-like operation which has brought us before the Council.

67. Every time we speak of Israeli aggression against Lebanon, we see the Israeli representatives bring out of the hat their old worn-out tricks, mixing every aspect of the situation with what they call "acts of terrorism". We have just this moment heard Mr. Tekoah. He has to go back as far as Haj Amin el-Husseini to find a linkage between the plight of 6 million Jews in Europe—that holocaust which was condemned by all the peoples of the world and which we still condemn now—and the Arabs, and to portray the Arabs to the world as killers, as murderers, as terrorists.

68. Well, Hitler's Nazis also killed 18 million Soviet citizens; they killed hundreds of thousands of French, British, Austrian, Yugoslav, Australian, New Zealand and Indian people. Why do the representatives of those countries not come and tell us that because of a certain association between Haj Amin el-Husseini and Hitler the Arabs are the murderers and are responsible for the evils of the Second World War and all the sufferings to which their people were subjected?

69. This sing-song of the Israelis, aimed at exploiting the massacres of 6 million Jews, must be put to an end in the Council. There is always the attempt to widen the debate, to picture the Arabs as terrorists, to speak about terrorists as "Arab terrorists". It is a fact that Palestinian individuals are undertaking some acts. They are engaged in a struggle, in resistance against Israel. Why do all Arab people have to be responsible for every act committed by any individual Palestinian anywhere in the world, and why should Lebanon always be held responsible for those acts and suffer the murderous assaults against it by Israel?

70. The Israeli attempt to picture Beirut as the capital of international terrorism and Lebanon as the least civilized country in the world cannot but meet with our indignation, our strong indignation. Our people and our Government are indignant concerning those charges. A peaceful country such as Lebanon, a country that has, throughout history, maintained open friendly relations with all the countries of the world, which bases its policies and its way of life on freedom and on friendship with peoples—that is the country Israel is trying to picture to the world as a country of terrorism.

71. But Israel cannot deceive international opinion, because international opinion knows very well the history of Lebanon and the values we uphold there. They know what kind of a society we are building in Lebanon, where groups of various races and religions are building a modern society in harmony. I have heard many times that the Lebanese experiment is a wonderful one that should be copied by others.

72. Naturally, Israel does not want that experiment to succeed, because it is a challenge to the mode of government and way of life it is erecting in Israel. The attack on Beirut was political assassination conceived and executed by the responsible Government of Israel, a Member of the United Nations, against another Member of the United Nations.

73. I have just received a dispatch from Beirut telling me that the British and Belgian Governments have assured the Lebanese Government that the passports that were in the hands of two alleged British and two alleged Belgian subjects were false ones. The agents of Israel resorted to the fraud of falsifying passports in order to have people infiltrate Lebanon. Those so-called tourist gentlemen who like swimming and fishing at night were sent by the agents of Israel to prepare for their vile, base attack upon Beirut. And the Israeli Government sets itself up at once as accuser, judge and executioner. Mr. Tekoah came here the other day to proclaim, in Emile Zola's style, "I come to accuse Lebanon"—as though that would impress the Council and the world. Here we have the advocate of the perpetrators of one of the most abominable of crimes accusing Lebanon, the victim.

74. We notice that the press and the Israelis have emphasized that what happened in Beirut was the killing of three Palestinian leaders, three Palestinian terrorists. Well, naturally they try to gloss over this matter by emphasizing terrorism. But these were people living in civilian apartments with their families. They have, as Mr. Tekoah has claimed, had contacts with the Lebanese Government. They

have always been helpful in every way to the promotion of conditions of peace and security in Lebanon. But the press and the Israelis do not refer to the dozen other Lebanese innocents who were killed, to the 50 other people who were murdered in the refugee camps, or to the 30 other Lebanese who were injured. They do not refer to this repetitious aggression against the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon.

75. During the last several months Israel has followed a ruthless and murderous policy by hitting at Palestinian camps in both Syria and Lebanon, even if those camps are located far from Israel. It has done so without provocation or warning. It does not justify its aggressions except by the fallacious pretext that it is hitting Palestinian terrorists to prevent possible future murders. But the kind of terrorists who were killed in the bloodthirsty Israeli raid in Lebanon were none other than 17 innocent civilians in the homes and streets of Hasbayya and about the same in Dayr al Achayer. Twelve civilians were killed, 34 wounded and two are still missing in the attack on Rafid, where a woman and her six children were killed. In the refugee camps of Nahr El-Bared, Badawi and Beirut scores were murdered. A blind policy of reprisal that, in the words of *The New York Post*, far from honouring a cause, merely disgraces it.

76. The Israelis forget their barbarous attacks against schools and factories in Egypt at Abou-Zabel and Bahr-el-Bakar, where scores of peaceful workers and young children were butchered. To no avail are the attempts of Israel to deceive public opinion about the circumstances in which a Libyan civilian airliner was shot down, under orders, by Israeli pilots on 21 February 1973, and 110 innocent civilian passengers met their deaths. This barbaric act, the first of its kind in the annals of civil aviation, aroused the indignation and the condemnation of world public opinion, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the Commission on Human Rights and other bodies.

77. And Mr. Tekoah comes here today and speaks to us about Arab war crimes while his country is the only State Member of the United Nations which stands condemned by the Commission on Human Rights of this Organization for its war crimes against the civilian people in the West Bank, in Gaza, in the Golan Heights and in Sinai.

78. I should like to ask who started the campaign of letter bombs—even though an Israeli diplomat was killed in the process—a campaign to coincide with the discussion of terrorism at the United Nations last September? *The Sunday Times* of London stated at that time that:

"it was out of character for the Black September not to have claimed credit for those incidents as they had done instantaneously at the time of Munich and on other occasions."

Why is it that most of the letters were immediately intercepted and many of them proved to be duds? Who started and waged the method of sending letter bombs to German scientists working in Egypt? Certainly the Israeli representative knows the role played by a former Israeli security chief, Isar Halprin. He surely recalls the Lavon affair and the attempts which Israeli agents made to plant

book-bombs in the United States Information Libraries in Alexandria and Cairo to wreck the then improved relations between Egypt and the United States?

79. The latest Israeli operation proved that it was possible for Israeli agents to penetrate into Lebanon, in the guise of tourist gentlemen who loved swimming and fishing. Therefore, who loaded our mail boxes with letter bombs a few months ago, some of which exploded against victims? Perhaps the successor of Mr. Isar Halprin could tell us?

80. There is always an attempt to confuse the acts of individuals and the acts of Governments. I should like here to cite what the *Christian Science Monitor* said in its editorial of 11 April 1973: "Meeting terrorism with counter-terrorism and invading a sovereign, independent country in the process, is no way to solve the problem—the problem of the Palestinian refugees. The paper drew the conclusion that: "The net result of the Israeli operation can only be to exacerbate tensions." And I think that we have already proved the results of that operation.

81. The Israeli representative recalls to our memory the Munich incident. Concerning that incident, it has already been established that the Arab commandos had not intended to kill. They were forced to react violently when the accord with the German police was broken because of the intransigence and lack of human concern for the fate of the Israelis shown by members of the Israeli Government.

82. In the face of the terror campaign conducted by Israel against the Palestinian people, scores of United Nations resolutions remind it and the world of their existence. And there must be a discrepancy here between Mrs. Meir and her representatives. On the one hand Mrs. Meir declares: Who are the Palestinians? Who are they? Where are they? Whereas, Mr. Tekoah and other Israeli representatives, everytime we meet here, tell us that they are in Beirut, they are in Lebanon, the next day they are in Damascus, then they are in Cairo, they are in Algeria, they are everywhere. Therefore, these Palestinian people exist. They have legitimate rights and those legitimate rights have been upheld by the United Nations. Their right to exercise equal rights and self-determination has been upheld in many resolutions of this Organization.

83. The path that Israel is following, the path of the annihilation and extermination of the Palestinian people is fraught with grave danger. Perhaps it is useful to remind Mr. Tekoah of the warning that Lord Samuel, who himself was a Jew and a former High Commissioner of Palestine, once gave to the Israelis in the wake of terrorist acts they had perpetrated in Palestine. He told them to beware of treading again the course followed by the Zealots during the time of the Roman Empire. Such outrages, he said, would lead to the destruction of the

"... national home itself, because its moral and spiritual foundations will be blown to pieces, and without them it cannot stand."

84. The Foreign Minister of Lebanon, Mr. Kalyl Abouhamad stated in the General Assembly on 26 September 1972:

"... Palestinians are settled in a large number of countries, Arab and non-Arab. If Israel were to follow all their movements, suspect and implicate all the countries where they reside or through which they may have gone in transit, then it would be not only towards Lebanon but towards most of the countries of the world that it should launch its bomber squads.

"How can one allow Israel to attack Lebanon, and Lebanon alone, persistently, whenever any action is undertaken against its interest or nationals in any part of the world?"

85. The dilemma of the Palestinian problem has been with us for 25 years, as we were reminded by Mr. El-Zayyat today. What have we done about it? Are we going to let these people live in misery for ever? These are people who were born in the camps in misery, some of them educated in the schools and training centres of the United Nations. They have become cognizant of their existence, of their rights, of the great injustice done to them. What are we going to do? Throw them into the desert or into the sea? What is Lebanon asked to do? I have heard and even read from some elements among the Palestinians and their friends the following:

"Well, we are despairing of all the efforts of the United Nations to achieve a solution to our problem. Our only solution is to march, all of us at one time, from all over the Arab countries on the Israeli borders without arms, with white handkerchiefs in order to reintegrate our ancestral homes."

If they did, would Israel shoot them down as terrorists?

86. I mentioned that these people have taken cognizance of their existence and their rights. Allow me only to cite from a book entitled *The Disinherited: Journal of a Palestinian exile*, by Mr. Fawaz Turki. Mr. Turki said:

"Mine is an existential problem having to do with the yearning for my homeland, with being part of a culture, with winning the battle to remain myself, as a Palestinian belonging to a people with a distinctly Palestinian consciousness.

"If I was not a Palestinian when I left Haifa as a child, I am one now."³

They do exist, those Palestinians, and they have a problem.

87. I should like to recall here some very apt words stated by Mr. William Rogers, Secretary of State of the United States, in an address made on 9 December 1969 before the 1969 Galaxy Conference on Adult Education in Washington. Mr. Rogers said:

"There can be no lasting peace without a just settlement of the problem of those Palestinians whom the wars of 1948 and 1967 have made homeless."

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Plenary Meetings, 2041st meeting, paras. 50 and 51.*

³ *New York, Monthly Review Press, 1972, p. 8.*

He also said:

"The problems posed by the refugees will become increasingly serious if their future is not resolved. There is a new consciousness among the young Palestinians who have grown up since 1948 which needs to be channeled away from bitterness and frustration toward hope and justice."

88. What have we done to meet that challenge in order to channel the hopes, the energies and the minds of the Palestinian people towards a constructive life? You speak about terrorism. This is a question, as a matter of fact, which is not before the Council. The Council is seized with a complaint by Lebanon against an act of aggression committed by Israel, against a Member State called Lebanon. That is the complaint on the agenda. We are not discussing here the problem of terrorism in its entirety. This matter has been discussed in the General Assembly during its twenty-seventh session. It adopted a resolution on this matter [*resolution 3034 (XXVII)*] and decided to establish an *Ad Hoc* Committee, and the Committee is being formed in order to deal with it. But as I reminded the Council the other day, [*1705th meeting*], and as our Secretary-General reminded the world last September,⁴ you cannot discuss terrorism without discussing its underlying causes. May I quote in this connexion what a great statesman, President Pompidou of France, said in a press conference on 21 September 1972, following the Munich events:

"France has taken a position, and I myself, in the most clear-cut manner, against the Munich affair. But one cannot eliminate an event unless the causes are eliminated. We can condemn, take precautions, but we shall not eliminate terrorism and we will not have resolved a problem which in itself is profoundly human and beyond politics and that is the Palestinian problem."⁵

89. While we are on the subject of terrorism I should like to quote from an article by Mr. Kapeliouk which appeared in *Le Monde* on 11 April. He said:

"Terrorism in the State is more reprehensible if it is a matter of irregular groups. Acts like the one perpetrated in Khartoum or Cyprus are only the symptoms of an essential injustice which it is in our power to remedy. Those who are sacrificed sometimes revive and demand a settlement of accounts."⁵

90. There is one way to end all of this. We can go on for hours exchanging accusations. The way is peace, a peace for which all the Arab peoples yearn. They want it very badly in order to build up their economic, social and cultural conditions and better the conditions of their people. The Israeli Government attempts in vain to deceive the world by proclaiming its desire for peace. International public opinion already knows better. It knows that Israel sets up one barrier after another on the road to peace.

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, General Committee, 199th meeting, para. 97.*

⁵ Quoted in French by the speaker.

91. What have been the results of Israel's excessive and ever-mounting claims and intransigence? The mission of Mr. Jarring to implement resolution 242 (1967) is paralysed. The United States initiative, called the Rogers Plan, has been shelved. The mission undertaken in 1971 by 10 heads of State representing the Organization of African Unity to help promote a peaceful settlement of the conflict on the basis of resolution 242 (1967) yielded no positive results. An alternative United States plan to bring about an interim agreement between Egypt and Israel to reopen the Suez Canal is under heavy doubts. The General Assembly adopted many resolutions, among them resolutions 2799 (XXVI) and 2949 (XXVII) which specifically urge Israel to respond favourably to the United Nations initiatives undertaken to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

92. But all these efforts and resolutions have broken down because of Israeli intransigence and obduracy. Many an Arab Government has signified its willingness to find a just and durable solution within the framework of the Security Council resolution. They have proved on many occasions their willingness to co-operate with the United Nations and with the Member States to make an earnest effort to achieve peace.

93. While Israel proclaims its lip service to peace, it systematically scuttles every effort to make progress towards it. It pretends it wants it, but this is a political trick and a subterfuge. Peace is a categorical imperative. Declarations of intent and desire are not sufficient while the suffering and anxieties of peoples mount and the problem is being deliberately complicated, its solution delayed and acts of aggression pursued. Faith in peace must be matched by deeds, by the application of all resources to attain it. Reliance on power and military arrogance is destructive not only to the cause of peace but to the people resorting to it and to the fundamental and spiritual values they profess they are attached to. Has not God told the Israelis in the Book of Deuteronomy: "Take heed lest you forget the Lord your God. . . . Beware lest you say in your heart, 'My power and the might of my hand have gotten me this wealth' "?

94. By the might of the sword the Israelis have carved a State for themselves in Palestine, expelled from it the Palestinian people and visited upon them untold suffering for a quarter of a century; following the war of 1967, they occupied large areas of the territories of Egypt, Jordan and Syria, declared the annexation of the Holy City of Jerusalem and violated the human rights of the peoples in the occupied territories. Thus the Israelis are blinded by their newly-found military power and, in their haste to use it, they fail to see the intolerable harm they are inflicting on the Palestinians and other Arab peoples and the unacceptable damage they are causing to the principles and purposes of the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the cause of peace. This is a grim and grave reality with which the Middle East and the international community have been faced for a long time and which has led to endless turmoil, bloodshed and suffering. Israel bears the prime responsibility for this unhappy enduring situation and the United Nations shares in the responsibility for allowing it to last and further degenerate. Such a situation

cannot but prolong the sufferings of the people that are victims of the Israeli aggression and intransigence and endanger international peace and security.

95. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): There are three more speakers on my list. I must point out that any speakers in addition to them will be heard at our next meeting.

96. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Mr. President, if there is to be an afternoon meeting, then perhaps I can be the first speaker of that meeting in order not to delay our distinguished colleagues, of whom there are many here. That is an indication of the attention attached by all representatives to the United Nations to the discussion of the latest act of aggression by Israel against Lebanon. Perhaps it might be advisable to meet at 3.30 p.m. and continue our work then. I shall not try the patience of our colleagues. It seems that the members of the Security Council have grown accustomed to meeting at inconvenient times. But we have many guests. Perhaps we may have a break until 3.30 p.m. and continue our work at a second meeting.

97. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): On the basis of consultations an agreement exists that a meeting of the Security Council be held tomorrow at 10.45 a.m. If the speakers now on my list would be prepared to speak at the meeting tomorrow morning, I should have no objection. Furthermore, this afternoon there is a meeting of the Committee concerning sanctions against Rhodesia, which has a deadline that is very close. Therefore I should prefer that we not have a meeting of the Security Council this afternoon.

98. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Then I shall speak now. I very much regret that the situation is such that I have to speak at what may be termed an untimely hour, that is, lunch-time. I spared the Council and those who were present at its Friday meeting [*1706th meeting*] and decided not to speak in reply to the routine slanderous tirade in the statement of the Israeli representative. Not one single fact—and all the facts and arguments in the statement of the Soviet delegation were based on documents, on facts and on decisions of the Security Council strongly condemning Israel for its repeated aggression against Lebanon—was refuted by the Israeli representative. He confined himself to the slanderous fabrications which are typical of his style and behaviour in the Council, in an attempt to distort the position and policy of the Soviet Union.

99. We have grown accustomed to this. For the Israeli representative, anti-Sovietism and slander against the Soviet Union have become a kind of chronic illness. The sooner he recovers from it, the better for him and for his country.

100. Many more powerful statesmen have slandered the Soviet Union, after the October Revolution, after the First World War, in the period between the wars and after the Second World War. The murky constellation of slanderers and exponents of anti-Sovietism included Churchill, Hitler,

Goebbels and Dulles. Suffice it to mention those four names. But they have all passed into oblivion, whereas we, the first Soviet socialist Power in the world, live and flourish and follow the path of Lenin, the path of peace, friendship, mutual understanding among all peoples and unremitting struggle against aggression in all its forms and manifestations.

101. That is the situation with regard to anti-Sovietism and slander.

102. My reply on Friday would have been shorter. But today it will be a little longer because to the Israeli slanderers and exponents of anti-Sovietism has been added yet another—the Chinese slanderer and exponent of anti-Sovietism. So we have here a duet, a chorus. Israel and China have joined together in a common duet against the Soviet Union. And what have they found? Neither one nor the other has been able to refute a single one of the arguments in the statement of the Soviet delegation, for they are cast-iron arguments, it is impossible to refute them, they have been confirmed by all who have spoken here. I am deeply convinced that, in the condemnation of Israel, these arguments will be upheld by all members of the Security Council with, perhaps, a rare exception. Thus, anyone who takes up a position of anti-Sovietism and slander against the Soviet Union in an attempt to distort the just, firm, decisive consistent policy of the USSR with regard to the Middle East question, is opposing the overwhelming majority of the members of the Council and their positions, as well as the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations, which have repeatedly condemned Israel in General Assembly resolutions.

103. That is the true state of affairs. Both the preceding speakers, the speaker from Israel and the speaker from China, attacked me for referring to the General Assembly resolution adopted at the twenty-seventh session concerning the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. That is very significant. Furthermore, I must say that, in my statement, I did not mention China even once. Check the records. For this reason, the slanderous attack by the Chinese representative against the statement of the Soviet delegation reminds me of a Russian anecdote. In one village there had not been a robbery for many generations. The people lived honestly, they worked hard, they respected one another and nobody stole anything from anyone else. One day a theft occurred. The elder, the head man or mayor, of the village called an urgent meeting of its citizens, of all the inhabitants of the village. He told them of the extraordinary event. There had been a theft in the village and the thief must be found and punished. He appealed to them: "Respected fellow citizens, I know you are all honest people. We have never had a robbery here. A thief has committed a crime and he must confess before all the honest people here." But the thief remained silent. Then the elder said: "Look, the thief's hat is burning." The thief snatched at his hat and thus revealed himself. You will understand why I mention this story; it is because I have hit the nail on the head.

104. Let us return to the argument of the Israeli representative. What did I say? I said that it was quite obvious that anyone opposed to the adoption of a resolution on the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, anyone who voted against that resolution or abstained during the vote had, in essence, adopted a course of encouraging Israel and other aggressors to continue their policy of aggression and to continue to use force in international relations. I also emphasized that the adoption of this resolution by the General Assembly represented the establishment of a new rule of international law concerning the non-use of force between States. Members of the United Nations must take note of the General Assembly's decisions.

105. Furthermore, I proposed that it should be pointed out in any draft resolution to be adopted by the Security Council that Israel, as the aggressor, was violating not only the Charter of the United Nations but also that resolution. That did not please the Israeli representative. That is quite natural. As I stressed, a General Assembly resolution of that kind is not to the liking, not to the taste of an aggressor. However, at today's meeting it turned out that it was not to the taste of China either. What conclusion can one draw from this? Judge for yourselves, gentlemen. What did the representative of Israel refer to? He stated that 46 States had abstained. But how many voted in favour, Mr. Tekoah? Seventy-five. This is not your first day in the United Nations. This is not the first time you have participated in the work of a session of the General Assembly and you know that, if a resolution of the General Assembly is adopted by a majority, it becomes a resolution of the United Nations and not of Israel, not of the Soviet Union, not of China, not of the 46 who abstained and not of those who voted against it. It is a United Nations document, an official decision of the United Nations Organization. Please bear that in mind, Mr. Aggressor, and do not disregard that resolution. You assert that it is a "Soviet resolution". That is not true. The idea was a Soviet one, an idea corresponding to the world-wide desire to strengthen the peace and security of peoples, to wage a selfless struggle against aggressors and aggression in any form, in any manifestation. And, of course, such a resolution does not please the aggressor.

106. You took part in the work of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly. The Chinese representative took part also. You both know perfectly well that the draft resolution did not come from the Soviet delegation. The idea came from the Soviet delegation, the original outline of the draft. But then a contact group—from what group of States? From the third world—supplemented and reworded that draft, filled it out and did so very well. It thus became an expression of the will, of the desire, of the wish of the third world to put an end to the use of force in international relations and to put an end to the threat hanging over mankind: that of the use of nuclear weapons. As a result, the statements by the Israeli and by the Chinese merely confirm that the Soviet Union was right, that it has its finger firmly on the pulse of international life and takes note of the general desires and sentiments. We are proud that our idea was supported by 75 States, despite the abstention of those who abstained and despite the vote of

those who voted against the resolution. Incidentally, the representative of Israel, in his customary manner, distorted the number of those who voted against the resolution. There were only four negative votes, but you mentioned six, Mr. Tekoah. That is a distortion. That is an untruth. I shall remember all my life who voted against that resolution: China, South Africa, Portugal and Albania. A magnificent quartet. So there were not six, but four. Check that. Do you agree? Fine.

107. And both these statements—that by the Israeli and that by the Chinese—confirmed that I was completely right; they confirmed the position of the Soviet delegation that anyone who did not support that resolution, anyone who voted against it, or abstained, had in fact added grist to the mill of the aggressor, and particularly Israel, because, after the elimination of the hotbed of war in Viet-Nam, Israeli aggression is now the major threat to international peace and security; and it is on this question that all attention should be focused.

108. In this connexion, I venture to quote from the report by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev on the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. He said:

"The international situation has now become such that all who desire a genuine strengthening of universal peace must intensify their efforts to eliminate the hotbeds of war in the Middle East and remove the consequences of Israeli aggression against the Arab States. Many States have spoken out in favour of solving the Middle East problem on the basis of well-known resolutions of the United Nations Security Council. But, unfortunately, such statements are not enough. Had they been supported by concrete political acts, Israel would have been forced to accept a peaceful settlement, to recognize the lawful rights of the Arab peoples. So far as the Soviet Union is concerned, its readiness to make its contribution to that cause is well known."

109. I should like to emphasize yet again the touching coincidence between the statements of the representative of Israel and the representative of China in connexion with the statement by the Soviet delegation concerning the General Assembly resolution to which I referred. What unites them? First, anti-Sovietism; secondly, slander against the Soviet Union and an attempt to distort the position of the Soviet Union in general and on this question in particular; thirdly, the same position of opposition to the General Assembly resolution on the non-use of force and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. I stress once again in this connexion, gentlemen, that this is not a USSR resolution, it is a resolution by 75 States Members of the United Nations; I also stress again that, once it was adopted by a majority it became a United Nations resolution and each self-respecting Member of the United Nations must take it into account and not attribute this resolution to the Soviet Union. We are, of course, proud that it is attributed to us, but it is not ours; it is a resolution of the United Nations.

110. This is the platform on which Israel and China have united against the Soviet Union.

111. What did the Chinese representative say? I have already pointed out that he said that—although I did not mention China—that this resolution, as he put it, ties the hands of the Palestinians and of all fighters for the freedom of their countries, fighters for national liberation. That is a monstrous distortion of the resolution. I have the impression that the Chinese representative is not familiar with this resolution; apparently he has not read it. I shall read it for his information and, at the same time, to refresh the memory of other representatives. The resolution states:

“Mindful of the principle of the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by force and the inherent right of States to recover such territories by all the means at their disposal”. [resolution 2936 (XXVII)]

Where is there anything about tying people’s hands? On the contrary—and the Chinese representative must know this, he has no right not to know it—this resolution unties the hands of the victims of aggression in the struggle against the aggressor. The victim of aggression is a State which is subjected to aggression and it has the right to use all the possibilities open to it and to take advantage of the help of its friends to cleanse its territory of the occupiers, to free its land. Now, this is a new rule of international law, supported by the majority of members of the United Nations; it is now a United Nations document and, consequently, a rule of international law.

112. There is a second point. The Chinese representative, in his blind slander against the Soviet Union, in his malicious anti-Sovietism, asserted that this resolution—and I emphasize yet again that it is not a Soviet, but a United Nations resolution, a resolution of the General Assembly, a resolution of 75 States—ties the hands of the fighters in the national liberation struggle. Nothing of the sort. The resolution states:

“Reaffirming its recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle of colonial peoples for their freedom by all appropriate means at their disposal”.

Where is there anything about tying people’s hands? Does the resolution really tie people’s hands? On the contrary, it unties their hands, it helps them. In this resolution, the voice of the United Nations is raised in support of those fighting for national liberation. Whom, indeed, did this resolution displease? It displeased those who suppress the freedom of the African people—the South African racists and Portuguese colonialists. They voted against it. And we find China in that company. This is a historical fact, and it will go down in history as one of the most shameful pages on the position of China in the United Nations, a day when China, by its malicious anti-Soviet slander and policy, turned up in the camp of the enemies of freedom and national liberation, together with the South African racists and the Portuguese colonialists. As the saying has it, you can’t go any further than that. Today’s statement by China has confirmed that it is with the Israeli aggressors, because together with them, word for word, and in the same direction, it is waging a struggle against the General Assembly resolution on the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

113. Such are the facts and no anti-Sovietism, no slanderous fabrications against the Soviet Union by the representative of Israel or the representative of China can divert us from the facts or cover them up. All representatives sitting here at the Council table and in the Council chamber understand that perfectly well.

114. The whole world knows that Israel is a friend, an ally, and a comrade-in-arms of South Africa. I quote from the press:

“Strong bonds link Israel and the Republic of South Africa. What are the reasons for such close contacts, what aspirations unite these two States? The whole policy of the Republic of South Africa is based on racial segregation and the cruel suppression of the African population. *Apartheid* is one of the most shameful phenomena of our age. Racism in Israel has also been raised to the status of an official policy”.

Everyone knows this too. I recall that at some stage Mr. Tekoah drew our attention to the reason why the Israelis put forward the theory that they are the “chosen people of God” and that they are nearer than any other people to God. I am an atheist. But I do not believe that God could be so partial. God must be objective, just. Consequently, what is it that unites Israel and South Africa? Racism.

115. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Israel, on a point of order.

116. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I do not believe that the Security Council should be a forum for the kind of slanders and abuses of any people’s religious faith we heard just now from Mr. Malik. If he is sufficiently ignorant of the Jewish people’s faith—of Judaism—let him not speak here about it at all. But I do not think we are here to listen to the kind of vicious attacks that he has expressed just now, and I would respectfully request you, Mr. President, to draw his attention to this fact and to call him to order.

117. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I have great respect for the Jewish people. In our country there are about 3 million Jews. In my student days, Jews were my best friends. But those were genuine Jews, not Zionists who propagated racism and entertained hatred against all other peoples, including the Arab people. It is against that that we protest. With all due respect to the Jewish people, we are resolutely struggling against the Zionists, who consider other peoples to be semi-human, as did Hitler. We are struggling against racism and the racist philosophy of Zionism and that is what I am talking about now. I am drawing a parallel between the racists of South Africa and the racists of Tel Aviv, who are supported by international Zionism. And however much you bang your pipe on the table, [Mr. Tekoah] you will never be able to suppress this or to efface it.

118. And now a few words about the hackneyed, so-called formula, with which we are all bored, the formula which every Chinese representative repeats day after day at

meetings of United Nations organs about "two super-Powers" or "one or two super-Powers". What can one say about this? Instead of discussing Israel's aggression against Lebanon in a concrete manner and introducing concrete proposals, the Chinese representative is trying to divert the attention of the Security Council to anti-Sovietism and slander against the Soviet Union.

119. The demagogic nature of such a statement is quite obvious and does not require any comment. The peoples of the world and the Arab peoples are well aware of the consistent and firm policy of the USSR in favour of the complete elimination of the consequences of Israel's aggression against the Arab States, the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the occupied Arab territories, a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and the safeguarding of the lawful rights of the Arab people of Palestine. Therefore, no one will ever succeed by means of slander and hostile calumnies in distorting this fundamental position of the Soviet Union, which is to give support and help to the Arab peoples, the victims of Israeli aggression.

120. Israel slanders us because we help the Arabs and China slanders us for its own reasons, but they are both in the same boat. It is appropriate at this point to introduce some documentary evidence from statements by leaders of Arab States on this matter. In the communiqué concerning the visit to the USSR of the adviser to the President of the Arab Republic of Egypt on national security matters, Mr. Muhammed Hafez Ismail, in February of this year, it was stressed in writing that:

"The parties pointed out that friendship and comprehensive co-operation between the Soviet Union and Egypt is the most important factor in the struggle against imperialist aggression in the Middle East for the peace and security of the peoples of the region. They confirmed their unwavering desire to develop and strengthen Soviet-Egyptian relations, in strict compliance with the provisions of the Soviet-Egyptian Treaty on Friendship and Co-operation".

121. In the communiqué on the visit to the USSR of the Minister of Defence of Egypt, Mr. Ahmed Ismail Ali, in March of this year, it was stated that:

"The Egyptian representative expressed his deep gratitude to the Soviet Union for its consistent aid and support to Egypt in its just struggle against Israel's imperialist aggression".

122. A high opinion of the Soviet Union's support and aid to the Arab countries was expressed by the Vice-Chairman of the Revolutionary Command Council of Iraq, Mr. Saddam Hussein, in his speech on 22 March of this year. He emphasized that the problem of the Palestinian people and of the Zionist imperialist occupation of their homeland and of other Arab lands must be settled on the basis of a close union and solidarity between the Arab peoples and the friendly Soviet Union and the forces of socialism.

123. Apparently China is displeased at the friendship of the Soviet Union with the Arab countries and is attempting to slander that friendship.

124. In the communiqué concerning the visit of Mr. Saddam Hussein to the Soviet Union, it is emphasized that:

"The Soviet Union and the Republic of Iraq have once again confirmed that the friendship of the Soviet Union with Iraq and other progressive Arab States is in accordance with the fundamental national interests of their peoples and is an important factor in the strengthening of the national independence and social progress of the Arab peoples".

125. These are but a few of the official documents which decisively refute the anti-Sovietism and slander of the Chinese representative.

126. What does the Chinese representative propose? We are proposing: first, sanctions against Israel. Does the Chinese representative support this or not? He has been silent on this point. We are proposing the expulsion of Israel from the United Nations. Does the Chinese representative support this or not? We are proposing the resumption of consultations among the permanent members of the Security Council on the Middle East question. Does the Chinese representative support this or not? I am putting these questions squarely to the representative of China and I insist on a direct answer, without any cover of anti-Sovietism or slander. Steps must be taken. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Mr. El-Zayyat, our old friend and colleague with whom we have worked here in the United Nations, has today placed a question squarely before the Security Council: Does the Security Council exist within the United Nations as an organ for the maintenance of international peace and security or not, or is it only a figment of someone's imagination? Is the Council capable of taking specific steps against the aggressor for such monstrous crimes by the Israeli extremists, or not?

127. The representative of China did not comment on Mr. El-Zayyat's question. But, apart from that, it would have been possible to achieve something useful through joint efforts by the permanent members of the Security Council in various directions, including joint consultations among them, against the resumption of which the United States and China are objecting and protesting.

128. Very well, Mr. Chinese representative, you are blaming "two super-Powers" for the Middle East. This is how you propose to help the Council with your new ideas. There is a Russian proverb: "A new broom sweeps clean". So let us undertake some joint action, let us heed Mr. El-Zayyat's appeal. Let us adopt a strong resolution and impose sanctions on Israel for its uninterrupted and continuing aggression, for its monstrous crimes against the Arab peoples. Let us make joint efforts and not just talk. All we hear in the statements by the Chinese is anti-Soviet gossip and slander, but nothing of substance. That is the real state of affairs.

129. We should not let our attention be diverted to the bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and China. They are in a regrettable state, but we are optimists and believe that they will some day improve. For our part, we are working and shall continue to work to improve relations with China. We rebut and shall continue to rebut decisively and firmly China's anti-Soviet calumny and slander.

130. As to the interests of other peoples—in this case, the Arab, Palestinian and Lebanese peoples and the Arab States—which have fallen on evil times and have become victims of aggression as a result of the latest monstrous crimes of the aggressor, let us forget our bilateral disputes and concentrate on finding ways to curb the aggressor. That is our main task in the Security Council, and the Soviet delegation summons to this task all the representatives seated at this table, above all, the Chinese delegation.

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

132. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): Mr. President, I am very sorry if I have to ask for your indulgence and the indulgence of the members of the Council for two minutes. I do not propose to be led into the maze into which the representative of Israel wants to take me, away from the subject before the Council, which is, as Mr. Ghorra just said, the complaint of Lebanon against the aggression on it by Israel. But I really wonder why the representatives of Israel bother to speak at all in the Council. If the Council is going to adopt resolutions such as it adopted in the past, then the representatives of Israel have a ready reply to this.

133. From my memory and without looking into papers, I think the Council, after adopting such a resolution, was called by one Israeli representative, "a kangaroo court"; another said that it was "morally, legally and politically bankrupt"; and a third expressed the belief that all its resolutions were "doomed to the morgue of history". I am sure there must be some other expressions; I do not belittle the capacity of the representative of Israel to coin some new phrases. So this is quite all right for them.

134. Now if they are afraid of coercive measures by the Council, I am sure they know very well that, while they are being guaranteed against any physical dislodging from their colonies and occupied territories by the American Phantoms, they are equally guaranteed against any sanctions by the American veto. They should not worry. There will be no coercive measures from this Council in so far as there is a veto and the veto is lent to the Government of Israel.

135. I have taken the floor not to speak about this, but only on one single point. Among the distortions there is not only the distortion whereby four are made six—this distorting must be a habit—but also the distortion of the alleged declarations of the ex-Prime Minister of Egypt. I cannot let this pass because I was a colleague in his Cabinet and I know what happened. In a speech on television, which was recorded—the tape was heard by all the diplomatic representatives and representatives of the press

in Cairo and, should I come here in the future, this tape would be at your disposal, Mr. President—the Prime Minister of Egypt asked: "Where are the security measures that Israel is so proud to announce that it has taken and perfected?" He was not speaking on or about, or for or against, Lod. He was speaking about the security of Israel. Indeed, this is a very important point. Israel thinks that by occupation, annexations and terror it has gained security. If it has, then how did this happen in Lod? How is it that the Israelis are so afraid and are invoking "God's wrath"? How is it that they are still asking for and getting more Phantom planes? Is it that their security is only illusory and that force and coercion, occupation and terror, will never get Israel the security it needs?

136. Israel will only get that security if, during this night of Passover, it will really heed God's wrath and will fear and understand that really what is virtuous and what is going to stay and be lasting is the rights of men, the rights of nations. It is this which you are going to defend and which I am asking you to defend, Mr. President.

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

138. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I am sure that I am reflecting the feeling of many around this table, and many more others that must have been following today's meeting, if I express shock, protest and disgust, at the manner in which the representative of the Soviet Union turned this debate into a political agitators' meeting in Moscow. Now I do not know what people who listen to such absurdities as those voiced by him here say or how they react in his land, but I think I am certain that such nonsense, such slanders and such abuse cannot impress anyone at the United Nations.

139. The representative of the USSR is sensitive about my criticism, about the criticism of many others, of his Government's policy. And he is right to be sensitive. There is much to be sensitive about. He should be. His Government should be sensitive about the oppression of Soviet Jewry. His Government should be sensitive about the continued support it has given to Arab aggression in the Middle East, Arab aggression whose avowed aim is to destroy a sovereign State Member of the United Nations and annihilate its people. He and his Government should be sensitive about the fact that the murder of Israeli athletes at Munich and the massacre of innocent passengers at Lod airport were carried out with Soviet Kalashnikov rifles.

140. Apparently the Soviet representative, when speaking here, believes that the memory of his listeners is as short as his own. No, Mr. Malik, nobody has forgotten that the Soviet Government, not the Jewish people, made the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact with Hitler's Nazi Germany. No one has forgotten that the State which takes up so much of the Security Council's time by the kind of absurdities regarding international behaviour, that we were forced to listen to today, is the only one—

141. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

142. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): (*translation from Russian*): Mr. President, I would draw the attention of the representative of Israel to the fact that we are considering Israel's aggression and the monstrous attack on the capital of the sovereign State of Lebanon, and not the policy of the Soviet Union.

143. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of Israel may now continue.

144. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I was saying that no one has forgotten that the only Member State around this table which has ever been expelled from an international organization, from the international community, is the Soviet Union—expelled in 1939 by the Council of the League of Nations. This is the Government whose representative comes to sermonize to us about aggression. And the Soviet representative has found it necessary, as at the previous meeting, to build almost his entire argumentation on some resolution which all of us, even those that supported it, know to be the annual Soviet propaganda exercise. He did not mention, however, resolution 2625 (XXV) adopted unanimously by the General Assembly, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, which states:

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

145. The Soviet Union not only supported that Declaration but was one of its initiators. However, memory seems to be short when it comes to attacking Israel for demanding that one of its neighbour States abide by those provisions.

146. As I said earlier, the world is weary of listening to the catalogues of United Nations resolutions when the problem confronting us is the fact that Arab States have torn to pieces the entire Charter of the United Nations in their relations with Israel.

147. The Foreign Minister of Egypt has found it necessary to respond to my statement. I shall respond by quoting to him from an article written by President Sadat's closest collaborator, Ehsan Abd El-Qudusus, which appeared in *Akhbar El-Yom* the day before yesterday, Saturday, 14 April 1973:

“The operations carried out by members of the organizations constitute the continuation of the state of war. The Arab States that are backing and financing these operations and which open their gates to help them are States which will be in a state of war until the over-all battle begins.”

Now, that is the official reaction; that is the official explanation of why the Egyptian Government has been supporting and intends to continue to support the kind of terrorist atrocities that are being carried out from the territory of Lebanon.

148. That is the policy that Egypt asks the Council to approve. Without the slightest hesitation, the Government of Egypt has sent its Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Security Council to ask for a mandate to continue international terrorism, the very scourge the international community is so desperately trying to combat. It is not sufficient that these are the policies being propounded to us by the Foreign Minister of a State Member of the United Nations; he sees no reason why he should not himself resort to pure distortion and falsification of his own Prime Minister's statements. I shall quote the precise and full text of the statement of Prime Minister Sidky on Egyptian television on 1 June 1972, following the Lod airport massacre. The Prime Minister of Egypt said:

“The fact that three men with three machine-guns succeeded in carrying out the events that happened in Lod Airport discloses the truth about Israel. Where is the talent and the genius for organization without parallel in the whole world and the tremendous abilities that the imperialists kept on talking about after the June war, when they said it was impossible to fight against Israel because she possesses irresistible power? What happened at Lod proved that we can achieve victory in our fight with Israel.”

If there was anywhere at any time praise for the Lod massacre, it is in those words pronounced by the Prime Minister of Egypt.

149. The representative of Lebanon referred to international opinion, to the reaction of the enlightened world to Israel's action against terrorist bases on 10 April. I shall quote a brief comment from the *Cyprus Mail*, which cannot be suspected of being biased in favour of Israel. Yesterday, 15 April, the newspaper wrote:

“In frenetic exchanges of charge and counter-charge, of slander and reply in the Security Council which in the past few days have passed for debate on the latest incidents in the Middle East, the one clear fact that has emerged so far is that none of the Arab countries, nor their patron and protector the Soviet Union, is prepared to denounce, much less take any action to curb, international terrorism except in so far as it is perpetrated by Israelis. And because of the spectacular character of the latest Israeli incursion against targets in Lebanon the Arab outrage in Nicosia only a day before has become obscured in a fog of political hatred and prejudice in which the Council meeting has become engulfed. The Lebanese were mistaken in resorting to argument about infringement of their sovereignty as one of the main parts of their complaints against Israel, for nobody has been more guilty in this regard than the Arab bands which are honoured with the description of commandos—or apply the bland appellation ‘terrorists’, as you will. The Israeli assault on Beirut and Sidon was no more blatant a breach of sovereignty than were attacks on the residence of Ambassador Rahamin Timor and that at the international airport in Nicosia. The one, however, was a rank failure and the other a dramatic success. That is one of the root causes for the almost pathological reaction from the Arab capitals and even from Moscow itself.”

150. The base, malicious and vicious character of the falsehoods with which the Lebanese representative bombards this Council meeting after meeting is demonstrated by the allegation we all heard today that Israel is the one that sent letter-bombs to Israeli citizens in order to kill them. In the thousand-year old history of blood libels against the Jewish people, that is undoubtedly one of the most atrocious. And that in itself is sufficient to illustrate the worth of the Lebanese representative's arguments, claims and allegations.

151. He has, however, not confined himself to that horrendous libel. He went further. At this Security Council table, the representative of Lebanon spoke out—and we shall all no doubt read it in the record unless it is changed—to explain to the world that the Munich murderers had no alternative but to kill the Israeli athletes. That of course brings to mind a recent statement made by the Prime Minister of Lebanon, immediately after the assassination of the diplomats at Khartoum. The Prime Minister of Lebanon called the result a commendable one. Now, that is peaceful Lebanon. That is the Lebanon its representatives here try to claim is innocent.

152. I shall end by answering the Lebanese representative's question as to what his Government should do concerning the presence of the terrorist organizations, terrorists bases, centres, headquarters and hide-outs, in Beirut and other parts of Lebanese territory. I shall answer him with a Lebanese proverb, which says: "Seek good for your neighbour, and you shall find it at home." The Government of Lebanon should try to apply that good counsel in its policies and actions and eliminate the centres of terrorist atrocities and terrorist operations on its territory.

153. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I had announced earlier that all speakers in addition to the three inscribed on the list would be heard tomorrow morning. However, one of them has asked to be allowed to exercise his right of reply, and I shall call on him on the understanding, first, that he will be brief and, secondly, that this will be the end of the consideration in this debate of matters that are not strictly within the scope of document S/Agenda/1707.

154. I give the floor to the representative of China, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

155. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): I thank you, Mr. President, and also the members of the Council, for giving me the time to make a reply to the statement made by Mr. Malik.

156. Mr. Malik has assigned himself the self-appointed role of the spokesman for the proposal on the so-called non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

157. At the meeting on 13 April [1706th meeting] and at today's meeting he has repeatedly stated clearly that those who opposed or abstained on that proposal are supporters of the Israeli and other aggressors to continue their policy of aggression. I cannot but ask those representatives who

supported that proposal out of peaceful intentions whether they can accept Mr. Malik as their spokesman? Can they agree to the explanation made by Mr. Malik on that resolution? [*General Assembly resolution 2936 (XXVII)*] I do not believe that Mr. Malik is the only speaker qualified to explain that resolution.

158. Secondly, in his last statement, Mr. Malik cited the preambular paragraphs of that resolution, but he deliberately avoided any mention of its operative part. It is precisely the operative part of the resolution that reveals the ulterior motives harboured by the Soviet delegation when it initiated the proposal. The first paragraph of the resolution states that the General Assembly:

"Solemnly declares, on behalf of the States Members of the Organization, their renunciation of the use or threat of force in all its forms and manifestations in international relations, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons;"

159. Why should Mr. Malik read out only the preambular paragraphs, and not the operative paragraphs of that resolution? Mr. Malik asserts that the spirit of the Charter is precisely the non-use of force. This is a total and out-and-out distortion of the Charter. The Charter has explicitly provided that all countries subjected to aggression have the right to self-defence and to oppose aggression. Why did the Soviet representative at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly, when this resolution came up for discussion, refuse all along to include this provision of the Charter in the resolution? Why did he, after long discussions, mention this only in the preambular part and refuse to make any change in the operative part of the resolution? Could it have been a mere oversight at the time? If it indeed was an oversight at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly, why did you again deliberately avoid mentioning this point today in your statement?

160. Mr. Malik, you accused the Chinese delegation of so-called anti-Sovietism. Since you have betrayed the principles of Lenin, since you have betrayed the interests of all the people who have been subjected to aggression, then the Chinese delegation, as a matter of course, will have to expose you.

161. In my statement today I have already mentioned that we should listen to his words and judge him by his deeds. Then, by doing this, it should not be difficult to see through the Soviet representative and to see that his proposal of the so-called non-use of force is purely hypocritical and reactionary.

162. I need not go too far. In August 1968, hundreds of thousands of troops and thousands of tanks and planes were sent to invade the capital of one of your allies. Would this be called a non-use of force? Is this in accordance with your proposal for the non-use of force in international relations? At the end of 1971 you supported, by force, the dismemberment of a State Member of the United Nations. You obstructed at that time the adoption by the Security Council of a resolution for an immediate cease-fire and the

withdrawal of troops by the parties to the conflict to their respective territories. Would that also be in conformity with the principle of the non-use of force in international relations mentioned by you just now?

163. Today beyond its borders the Soviet Union maintains a large number of troops and a large number of military bases and is carrying out threats everywhere. Along the northern frontiers of China it has stationed a million troops to threaten China. Could this also be called the non-use of force or threat of force in international relations? If one adheres to a very simple principle—that is, that one should not only listen to someone's words but also look at his deeds—it will not be difficult to see through his true features.

164. The Soviet representative attempts to apply the reactionary theory of the so-called non-use of force in international relations to the situation in the Middle East. He attempts to include such a principle in the resolution which might be adopted by the Security Council on the aggression committed by Israel against Lebanon. The very reactionary nature of his argument is his non-distinction between aggression and the victim of aggression and between justice and injustice. In advocating the non-use of force in international relations in an absolute way without regard to conditions, he is in fact asking the Palestinians and other Arab peoples that are the victims of aggression, whose land has been occupied and who have been driven out of their homeland, to wait for death with tied hands.

165. Every time the Chinese representative makes mention of super-Powers, Mr. Malik becomes very sensitive. China did not invent the term "super-Powers". China is only using a term which has been generally accepted by the world at large. I remember that at the Security Council meetings in Panama City, when I made mention of the super-Powers, Mr. Malik did his utmost to argue that there was only one super-Power—not one or two—but in the course of my statement, when I refuted Mr. Malik's argument, all of a sudden Mr. Malik showed three fingers to everyone around the table. He not only admitted that there were indeed super-Powers; he not only admitted that there were two; he also tried to include China among the super-Powers. I should like to ask Mr. Malik these questions. Does China station a single soldier on foreign soil? Does China have a single military base on foreign soil? Does China have its own fleet to invade the territorial seas of other countries? Does China have its own military aircraft to intrude into the air space of other countries? He attempts to create confusion in order to slander China as also one of the super-Powers, but he will never succeed. As for the representative of Israel, he, like Mr. Malik, is also trying to create confusion in order to cover up his own aggressive nature.

166. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I had not intended to speak and prolong the meeting, but the representative of China has again made so many slanderous remarks against the Soviet Union that I must reply. First of all, I should like to express my satisfaction that the position of China and the position of the Soviet Union coincide in the interpretation of the Charter of the United Nations—that the victim of aggression

may defend himself and has the right to do so, with all means at his disposal. We have been interpreting the Charter in this way for 27 years. And we welcome the fact that China, too, shares this view. The essence of our policy is to help the victim of aggression by all available means and to recognize the right of the victim of aggression to defend his honour, freedom, independence and territorial integrity. Thus the Soviet Union and its heroic armed forces defended all these things during the Great Patriotic War. We successfully defended our honour, freedom and independence and saved the world from the Fascist plague; we also saved Jews throughout the world and helped China to rid itself of Japanese aggression. I would advise the representatives of Israel and China, as I once before advised the representative of Israel, that, instead of slandering the Soviet Union, they should recommend that their Governments erect monuments in the capitals of their States, Tel Aviv and Peking, in gratitude to the Soviet soldier, who saved the Jews from annihilation by the Hitlerites and China from annihilation by Japanese imperialism and militarism.

167. These are facts of history. And no anti-Soviet slander will efface or eclipse them. Both speakers make up for their lack of arguments with malicious anti-Sovietism and slander against the Soviet Union. But it is all trivial and unconvincing. No one will succeed in turning back the clock and discrediting the peace-loving policy which the Soviet Union has pursued since the time of Lenin.

168. It is not we, but you Chinese gentlemen, who have deviated from the Leninist norms. But I do not consider this chamber a forum for ideological debate. If the representative of China is seeking to impose an ideological debate on us here, that is his affair; it is an indication of weakness, not of strength. He referred to the events which took place when the Soviet Union came to the aid of a socialist State to save a socialist structure threatened by the forces of reaction and imperialism. China would like to see that socialist country in Eastern Europe end up in the hands of imperialism and reaction. That, essentially, is China's policy and what China wants. Neither the imperialists, nor the reactionaries, nor the Maoists got what they wanted. We acted correctly; we helped our brothers in a socialist country, and they are grateful to us. The whole socialist world is grateful. And the revisionists and betrayers of the principles of Leninism all slander us. Such are the facts.

169. The second is that of Bangladesh. Bangladesh is now recognized by the whole world; this confirms the correctness of the position of the Soviet Union, a position which it adopted the moment this problem arose, because it was a matter of the struggle for national independence of the people of Bangladesh. In the United Nations we helped them in that struggle. But you joined with the former military junta of reactionaries and militarists. That is quite natural, since it is your present policy. You are opposed to the national liberation struggle.

170. Both of you, gentlemen, the representatives of China and Israel,—and as it happens you are sitting next to each other—are again slandering us in connexion with the resolution on the non-use of force. But you must be aware

that this is not our resolution, but a United Nations resolution adopted by 75 States. I consider that paragraph 1 is good and that paragraph 2 is not bad. The representative of China read out paragraph 1. Paragraph 1—on non-use of force in international relations—is excellent, as is the recognition of the right of the victim of aggression to use any means to defend his rights. Equally excellent is the paragraph which contains a reference to the fact that those who are fighting for the national liberation of their peoples should use all the means at their disposal and that they should receive assistance in their struggle. What is bad in this? This is our position. We are proud of it. But you are slandering us. The overwhelming majority of all the Arab States voted in favour of the resolution; only two abstained. In slandering us you are, consequently, slandering them too. What—are they worse judges than you, Mr. Huang Hua? Their culture is just as ancient as yours. But they have more political experience in the United Nations than you have. And they realized that this resolution was to their advantage and not to Israel's.

171. The countries of the third world—the countries of Asia and Africa—realized that that resolution was to their advantage and not to the advantage of South Africa and Portugal. And so we voted with them in favour of the resolution. But you took no part in that, although you grandiloquently declare: “China is a defender of the third world, China is a component part of the third world”. That is where your friends are—in South Africa and Portugal. Our friends are here—all Africans and Asians; we voted with them because we understand that this resolution was opposed to imperialism, aggression, reaction and racism. You were talking nonsense here when you alleged that it ties the hands of the freedom fighters. On the contrary, it helps them and it would help them if you supported it. Let us convene the Security Council, let us consider and adopt a Security Council resolution supporting this General Assembly resolution, let us give it added strength as a rule of international law on the non-use of force in international relations; the peoples of the world will be grateful to us. Do not distort the essence of the matter; understand that you have taken the wrong course, and that we are trying to set you right.

172. You say that I am the spokesman for the resolution. No, my understanding of the resolution, the inner feeling, in my mind and in my heart, is that it is advantageous to the victims of aggression and disadvantageous to the aggressor. Look at the list of delegations which voted in favour of the resolution. It is disadvantageous to those who are seeking to become super-super-Powers and to control the whole world; but that is the idea which the Chinese leaders are nurturing—to use the third world as a means of becoming a “super-super-Power”. That is why in Panama I showed the representative of China three fingers, as he mentioned. I was talking about three major Powers, but he was talking about two. I did not invent the term “super-Powers”. And if Mr. Baroody is here, he will remember the argument we had with him in the First Committee before China was admitted to the United Nations. I objected vigorously to the term “super-Powers”. The Soviet Union does not claim to be a “super-Power”. This label has been hung around our neck. And the representative of China repeats it. Well, let him repeat it if he likes it. But by

putting the imperialist Powers and the Soviet Union in the same boat he is sheltering imperialism, not to mention aggression and reaction. This is also in keeping with China's policy and goals. If we are to talk about who has deviated from Leninism, then, I think, no comment is needed—China has deviated.

173. You grumble and complain because I speak about this resolution at almost every meeting. Yes, and I will continue to do so. Whenever aggression is under discussion and whenever the need arises to defend the victims of aggression, I shall always speak about this resolution as an expression of the desire not only of the Soviet Union but of a majority, a significant majority, of Members of the United Nations not to use force in international relations and to renounce permanently the use of nuclear weapons.

174. The representative of China spoke about armaments and military bases. Is there now an opportunity to test our sincerity and yours? There is a General Assembly resolution [2930 (XXVII)] which set up a Special Committee to prepare for a world disarmament conference, but you are impeding the work of that Committee. Let us convene the Committee. Incidentally, the Secretary-General is convening a meeting of the Committee on 26 April. Come to the meeting and let us discuss, among other things, the elimination of military bases on foreign territory. Do not take the credit for this proposal; as early as 1946 we first proposed in the United Nations the elimination of bases on foreign territory and we are ready to eliminate all of them today. You refer to the fact that we have an air force and a navy. But we have them for defence at a time when the whole imperialist world has armed itself against us—and you are well aware of this; you are helping those who establish military blocs against us; we are obliged to have a good navy, a good air force and a magnificent army, but not for the annexation of foreign territory or for aggression; we do not intend to attack China or anyone else. We do not need to. What reason have we? This is something you have dreamed up with your fantasy about a threat from the north; you are using this fantasy mainly to achieve internal and other goals.

175. In this connexion, I should like to quote to members of the Security Council the words of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, from his report to which I have already referred:

“The Chinese leaders state that they are apprehensive about some kind of threat from the USSR. If these statements are sincere, it is impossible to understand why in that case China has left unanswered the proposals, which we have made repeatedly since 1969, that we should enter into a clear, firm and lasting obligation which would exclude the invasion of one party by the other. If Peking is really anxious about China's security, why have the leaders of the People's Republic of China not agreed to conclude a special treaty on non-use of force, the draft of which was handed to the Chinese on 15 January 1971? This draft treaty states quite clearly that the parties—I quote—‘will not use against each other armed force including any types of weapons, including (a) conventional weapons, (b) missiles, and (c) nuclear

weapons'. No, the actions of the Chinese leaders are clearly not consistent with their complaints of a mythical 'Soviet threat'."

176. This is the actual state of affairs, and no calumnies, no malicious slander, no anti-Sovietism on the part of the Chinese can either erase or conceal these facts. The Soviet Union does not intend to attack China and is not preparing to do so. China has created a phantom for itself and is shouting about it to the whole world. Evidently, it suits China to do so. Well, if you like, shout about it just as you shout about "super-Powers". You find it useful and advantageous, so carry on, if it pleases you.

177. As to the strengthening of the northern frontier with the USSR: while China and the Soviet Union enjoyed relations of peace, friendship, mutual respect and fraternal co-operation, there was no threat for the USSR. But China has violated the friendly fraternal relations and the peaceful situation at the frontier. We were compelled to concern ourselves about defence. Thus all China's fantasies about "the threat from the north" are far-fetched, and, as comrade Brezhnev stated, China's actions are inconsistent with its words.

178. The representative of Israel accuses the Soviet Union of introducing proposals for propaganda purposes at every session of the General Assembly. We are proud of this. I would be ready to pray to Allah and to your God, Mr. Tekoah, if at every session of the General Assembly Israel would introduce proposals on the strengthening of peace and international security and on non-aggression by Israel against the Arab countries. That would be magnificent propaganda. Try it! Yes, at every session of the General Assembly we introduce proposals on the strengthening of peace and international security, on disarmament and on the convening of a disarmament conference. At its twenty-seventh session, the General Assembly considered more than 15 items introduced at various times on the initiative of the Soviet Union with the aim of strengthening peace and international security, advancing the struggle against colonialism, supporting the national liberation movements, and so on. We are proud of this—this is what the United Nations is for, this is why it was established, and God grant that the Americans and British and everyone sitting at this table, including Israel, might also introduce good proposals on how to strengthen peace.

179. Today our distinguished friend Mr. El-Zayyat came here for this purpose. He placed a task before the Security Council: members of the Security Council, he said, take measures, strengthen peace and security in the Middle East, protect the victims of Israeli aggression, punish the aggressor. This is natural; it is what the United Nations was established for, and it is written in its Charter.

180. When therefore, the representative of Israel tries to accuse us of introducing proposals on peace, security and disarmament at sessions of the General Assembly, allegedly for propaganda purposes, we are proud—this is praise, although expressed in the form of slander and an attempt to distort the position of the Soviet Union.

181. So, to sum up. Yes, the representative of Israel has already referred to the Kalashnikov rifle. This is a good weapon, which was invented in 1947, after the war. A few days ago I read in *The New York Times* that we, apparently, have invented a better weapon. Well, so what, that is your affair. If Mr. Tekoah takes it upon himself to investigate the history and distribution of the Kalashnikov rifle, he will see that it can be found in any corner of the globe, and we are glad and proud if the Kalashnikov rifle is in the hands of those who are fighting for the freedom and independence of the peoples of Africa—in southern Africa, in Guinea (Bissau) and in other oppressed and colonial Territories: it means that we are really helping the freedom fighters both in word and in deed.

182. Incidentally, the representative of China spoke of "words and deeds". But he did not answer my questions: what will we achieve in the Security Council by discussing the question of Israel's aggression against Lebanon? I repeat these questions once again and address myself to the representative of China: is he for or against sanctions against Israel? Is he for or against the use of force by Israel against the Arabs? And when I propose that we include in the resolution a reference to the General Assembly resolution on the non-use of force, my intention was to condemn Israel for using force against the Arabs. Are you, the representative of China, against this? If so, say so, and the Arabs will know that you support the use of force by Israel against the Arabs. Are you in favour of the resumption of consultations on the Middle East among the permanent members of the Security Council, or not? Are you in favour of the expulsion of Israel from the United Nations or not? You have not answered these questions: you have tried with a murky wave of anti-Sovietism to conceal your position on these questions.

183. No, we insist that here in the Security Council we should discuss together with you what action we are to take on the question under consideration. Or do you wish to get by with anti-Sovietism and slander against the Soviet Union? It will not work: the peoples of the world await effective action by the Security Council. You declare that you are in favour of effective action, of deeds not words. Then let us take effective joint action, and answer the questions I have put. That will be the best answer to the latest monstrous crimes committed against a sovereign Arab State by the Israeli aggressors, who declare that they do not recognize the sovereignty of States.

184. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Lebanon in exercise of the right of reply.

185. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, by your leave and that of the Council, I should like to refer to some points raised by the representative of Israel. The Ambassador of Israel quoted from a newspaper published in Cyprus. I, of course, would not wish to comment on what that newspaper said. Perhaps for that newspaper Arab blood is not of the same value as Israeli blood. At any rate, I would, on the other hand, wish to quote what was said quite recently by an Israeli professor. Professor Avishai Margalit of the University of Jerusalem lately drew attention to "the increasingly wide-

spread conviction of Israeli youth that the classical Zionist solution is unfair because it is based on inequity toward the Palestinian people”.

186. Mr. Dov Bar Nir, one of the leaders of the Mapam, said: “I would never have consented to the abolition of the unhappiness of my exile by creating new unhappiness—the dispossession of the rights of another people.”

[The speaker continued in English]

187. I think we all recall here the contribution, and the value of that contribution, of a former colleague, the former representative of the United States, Mr. Charles Yost. I should like to recall what he wrote in the *Christian Science Monitor* on 4 September 1972, following another Israeli aggression against Lebanon:

“Understandable as they may be, can we justifiably exclude from the definition of terrorism the Israeli retaliatory raids against Palestinian camps in Lebanon and Syria last week, which surely killed many wholly innocent people and which probably helped create a new crop of terrorists among their relatives and friends. Was that either humane or wise?”

He went on to say:

“Until we can agree that methods of warfare or police action which inevitably, whatever the extent, kill large numbers of civilians are terror and are unacceptable just as much as the slaughter by political organizations and individuals, we shall not have clean hands . . .”

188. I should like also to quote Mr. William Raspberry, who wrote in the *Washington Post* on 16 September 1972 as follows:

“As outrageous as the Olympic assault was, it was the act of outlaws. And if it was the act of outlaws whose Government shared their sense of injustice at the hands of Israel, that does not make it an act of Government. Israel’s reprisals on the other hand, were clearly an official undertaking. It takes some fairly tortured reasoning to equate the two.”

189. Finally, the representative of Israel raised some doubts about what I said regarding the Munich outrage. My Government and I here in the Council expressed our sorrow about what happened in Munich. I was not here to justify what happened in Munich. But I called attention to the fact that the Commandos had reached agreement to fly off to Tunisia with the Israeli athletes at that time. I want to make that clear in the record, so Mr. Tekoah can understand it. The commandos and the Israeli athletes would have been alive today if someone had not started shooting at the Munich airport because of the intransigence of the Israeli Government.

190. Another point I should like to make concerns a statement allegedly made by the Prime Minister of Lebanon, Mr. Saeb Salam, following the Khartoum incident. This is another distortion of the kind we are

accustomed to hearing from the representative of Israel. Mr. Tekoah claimed that the Prime Minister of Lebanon said that the Khartoum incident was a “commendable result”. Those are the correct words, but they were taken out of context.

191. First, Mr. Salam and I, in the Commission on Human Rights, expressed our sorrow about what happened in Khartoum. We expressed our sympathy to the delegation of the United States, to the Government of the United States, to the Government of Belgium and to the families of the victims. What Mr. Salam was referring to was the second phase of the Khartoum incident, namely, when the commandos were prevailed upon by the Sudanese Government to surrender without harming the other hostages. Did Mr. Tekoah want the Saudi Arabian Ambassador, the Jordanian Ambassador and the wife of the Saudi Arabian Ambassador to be killed also? That was the result that was commendable to the Prime Minister of Lebanon. It was that there was a happy outcome to the second phase of that outrage, that the Prime Minister of Lebanon considered to be commendable, and the fact that the commandos surrendered to the authorities of the Sudan.

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

193. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I apologize, but I shall be very brief indeed. First of all, the following comment was made by *The Times* of London on 5 March 1973 regarding the statement by the Lebanese Prime Minister which his representative at the Council table has tried to explain away:

“With the bodies of the three diplomats lying murdered in the Embassy’s cellar, it is an extraordinary statement. It does not augur well for the reactions to the outrage which can be expected from other Arab capitals.”

194. Secondly, I should like to take exception to one term that has been used here both by the representative of Lebanon and by others. They consistently refer to the murderers, such as those who committed the slaughter of Israeli athletes in Munich and the massacre at Lod airport, as individuals. It is true, they sometimes add some derogatory term, like “outlaws”. Now who are these “outlaws”? The murders in Munich were committed, as we all know, by Black September. Black September is a branch of El Fatah. El Fatah is headed by a gentleman by the name of Yassir Arafat. This gentleman also happens to be head of the umbrella organization known as the Palestine Liberation Organization. Members of the United Nations frequently come across this name in United Nations documents submitted and signed by Arab delegations. Mr. Arafat, his organization, together with El Fatah and other terrorist groups which are members of it, are welcome guests in Cairo, and participate in all political and military conferences organized by the Arab Governments.

195. Now let us, therefore, know exactly what we are dealing with. For instance, immediately after the Munich killings, these individuals received a reward of \$5 million from the ruler of Libya, who is known to be subsidizing the Black September with \$30 million annually, not to speak of

the subsidies which these groups of murderers receive from other Arab Governments.

196. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have no more speakers on my list, but before adjourning the meeting, I should like to inform the Council that, after consultations with members, it has been agreed that the next meeting be held tomorrow at 10:45 a.m.

197. I should like to add that I have noted that representatives have probably enriched their knowledge on many

items with regard to which members have spoken brilliantly. I regret that I must say, however, that I do not think they have made, a very great contribution to the order and clarity of our debate. I therefore hope that, at the meeting tomorrow, the speakers will limit themselves to the item on the agenda, namely: The situation in the Middle East: letter dated 12 April 1973 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.

The meeting rose at 3.10 p.m.