

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

**1460<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 29 DECEMBER 1968

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1460/Rev.1) . . . . .	1
Statement by the President . . . . .	1
Adoption of the agenda . . . . .	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 29 December 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8945);	
(b) Letter dated 29 December 1968 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8946) . . . . .	1

## NOTE

*Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.*

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

## FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTIETH MEETING

Held in New York on Sunday, 29 December 1968, at 6 p.m.

*President:* Lij Endalkachew MAKONNEN (Ethiopia).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Algeria, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Hungary, India, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1460/Rev.1)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
  - (a) Letter dated 29 December 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8945);
  - (b) Letter dated 29 December 1968 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8946).

### Statement by the President

1. The PRESIDENT: I wish to apologize for the delay in calling the meeting to order. As members of the Council are aware, it was necessary to hold prior consultations in order to facilitate our proceedings.
2. This meeting of the Security Council has been convened at very short notice, inasmuch as the President received a letter from the representative of Lebanon only this afternoon requesting that the Council should be convened as a matter of urgency. Subsequently the representative of Israel also communicated with me and requested an urgent meeting of the Council. I immediately contacted the members of the Council in order to arrange for a meeting this evening.

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Letter dated 29 December 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8945);

(b) Letter dated 29 December 1968 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8946)

3. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, on behalf of the Soviet delegation I wish to make the following statement.

4. The Soviet delegation, bearing in mind the urgency of this question and the lateness of the hour and not wishing to involve the Security Council in a procedural debate, will agree with great reluctance to the adoption of this agenda.

5. The Soviet delegation, however, reserves its right to return to this question later, since it considers that the second question really bears no direct relationship to the situation in the Near East, inasmuch as the incident took place in Athens. If the Security Council were to deal with all problems of this nature which arise in any country, then it would become a kind of international court for the trial of terrorist activities.

6. However, not wishing at the present stage to involve the Security Council in a procedural debate, the Soviet delegation has not objected to the adoption of the agenda in the form in which you have stated it.

7. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): Mr. President, I should like to have assurance that in adopting the agenda we have done so without prejudice to the positions that any member round this table or the parties concerned may take on the substance.

8. The PRESIDENT: In response to the representative of Canada I should like to say that it is my understanding that in their statements members of the Council may refer to any part of the agenda as it stands.

9. In accordance with the provisional rules of procedure and with the usual practice, I shall now, with the consent of the Council, invite the representatives of Lebanon and Israel to take places at the Council table in order to participate without vote in the discussion.

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

10. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now consider the question placed on its agenda.

11. I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to some information relating to the question that has been received from the Acting Chief of Staff of UNTSO. That information is contained in documents S/7930/Add.107 and 108.

12. The first speaker whose name is inscribed on my list is the representative of Lebanon. I now call on him.

13. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): I wish to thank you, Mr. President, as well as the other members of the Security Council for the prompt action taken in convening this meeting at my request on behalf of the Lebanese Government.

14. The Security Council is requested to deal again with an act of aggression committed by the habitual, trigger-happy aggressor, Israel. The new victim is peaceful and peace-loving Lebanon. I believe that members of the Council are shocked and dismayed, as are people all over the world, by the latest act of aggression committed by Israel. Great indignation has gripped the Lebanese people. That indignation is shared by Governments and peoples everywhere. This stems from their appreciation of the role that Lebanon has always played within as well as outside the United Nations for the promotion of peace in the world, international co-operation and amity, and cultural, spiritual and human values. The Lebanese Government and people have always applied themselves to promoting the true vocation of Lebanon as a free and democratic State and as a centre for social, cultural and economic progress. My country has become a great link of communications and understanding among peoples, nations and continents.

15. The international airport of Beirut has become a significant manifestation of Lebanon's vocational mission. That airport is an open, civilian, defenceless airport used by many countries Members of the United Nations. It became a target of the aggressive designs of Israel. At 9.30 p.m. on Saturday, 28 December 1968, units of the Israeli Air Force staged a surprise and treacherous attack on its installations and on the civilian aircraft which were in the hangars and on the ground of the airport. Explosive and incendiary bombs and rockets were used. The resulting damage is staggering. Thirteen airplanes were completely destroyed. They constituted the main portion of our civilian aircraft fleet. The planes destroyed were the following: one Boeing superjet 707, one VC-10, two Caravelles, three Comet jets, and one Viscount, all belonging to the Middle East Airlines Air Liban Company; two Coronado jets and one DC-7, belonging to Lebanese International Airways; two DC-6s, belonging to the Trans-Mediterranean Airways company.

16. All those companies are Lebanese and privately-owned. Hangars, repair shops and fuel depots were also hit and destroyed. The buildings of the air terminal also suffered extensive damage.

17. My delegation will supply the Security Council at a later stage with further information about the full extent of the damage sustained as a result of the attack. It is already known that the losses considerably exceed \$50 million in value.

18. The act in itself and the information I have put before the Council are sufficient proof of the magnitude of the aggression. The gravity of the situation it has created undoubtedly constitutes a threat to the peace and security of Lebanon, of the Middle East and of the world. The Israeli authorities have arrogantly and unabashedly proclaimed to the world that their military units are responsible for the attack on the international airport of Beirut. Intoxicated by their military might, the Israelis must feel that they have achieved a great feat. Their officials and press welcomed the safe return to their base of their aggressive units, applauding and hailing their shameful exploit. It is ironic that while Israel was hailing its aggression, the whole world was busy welcoming back to earth the American astronauts from their exploit of orbiting the moon.

19. The records of the Security Council, as well as those of the Assembly, are replete with resolutions condemning Israel for its series of acts of aggression in Palestine and against the Arab countries. I am not here today to review those records; the members of the Council are well aware of them. In invoking this, my delegation wishes only to shed light on the aggressive character of Israel, which on many occasions in the past has defied the United Nations and ignored international law and morality.

20. We humbly submit that it is time for the United Nations, and particularly the Security Council, to stand up to this defiance, for it constitutes a grave challenge to this Organization, which from its inception was meant to be a secure anchor for small peaceful nations like mine. Surely the aggressive act committed against my country is a flagrant violation of the principles and objectives of the Charter. Another condemnation of Israel will not be sufficient. Peaceful Lebanon has no aggressive designs. Ever since the foundation of the United Nations we have been one of its most faithful adherents; in this Organization we have placed our reliance for our security.

21. We therefore hope that the Security Council will go beyond the usual condemnatory resolutions. We ask for effective measures, under Chapter VII of the Charter; for should Israel walk out of this hall with only a condemnatory resolution being adopted against it by the Security Council, what assurances, in the light of the past, should we have that it will not immediately hatch a new act of aggression against Lebanon or one of the other Arab States?

22. This is a test case for the Council to raise the hopes of small peaceful nations and give them confidence that the United Nations has been established to protect their security and territorial integrity.

23. At a later stage the Lebanese Government, after having fully assessed the damage that we have sustained, intends to request the Council to take the necessary measures against Israel in order fully to compensate Lebanon for such damages. At this stage, allow me only to quote a declaration made today by the First Vice-President of the International Federation of Air Line Pilots Associations who described the Israeli action in these words: "Personally, I think the raid on Beirut Airport is the most

serious interlude against civil aviation that has ever taken place during peacetime.”

24. Lebanon rests its case in your hands, Mr. President, and in the hands of the members of the Council. We are confident that the dedication of the members of the Council to the principles and objectives enshrined in the Charter, to the maintenance of peace and security in the world, and to justice will undoubtedly justify the reliance of Lebanon on the Security Council.

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

26. Mr. ROSENNE (Israel): I wish to thank you, Mr. President, and through you the members of the Security Council, for meeting so promptly and at such an inconvenient hour at the request of my Government for this urgent meeting of the Security Council.

27. On 26 December, an Israeli civil airliner *en route* to New York on a regular scheduled commercial flight was viciously attacked by bombs and machine-guns at the Athens international airport. On board were fifty-three passengers, including fifteen women and three children. They were of varied nationalities: American, French, Belgian, Iranian, Mexican, and perhaps others; the minority were Israeli nationals. The assailants came from Beirut. They hurled hand grenades against our airliner; they succeeded in perforating one of the fuel tanks and in igniting one engine, and they tried to prevent the escape of the occupants by shooting at and deflating the emergency rubber chutes. They opened fire indiscriminately, with sub-machine-guns, against the passengers and crew, shouting—and I quote in translation: “We want to kill Jews.”

28. They killed one passenger, a maritime engineer, Mr. Leon Shiridan, who was travelling to New York at the invitation of the United Nations Development Programme to serve as a consultant on the subject of the construction of ports and artificial islands. Those projects were to be carried out in Latin America and in Africa. One stewardess was gravely injured.

29. I need not say that the news of this outrage was received in Israel with the greatest indignation and anger.

30. It is by now evident that an unprecedented plan of mass murder was thwarted only by a combination of factors: sheer chance, the efficient and calm behaviour of the crew and passengers, and the subsequent forceful intervention of the Greek police, who succeeded in arresting the perpetrators before they could either do more damage . . .

31. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union to speak on a point of order.

32. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, this raises serious doubts. Why is all this being narrated to the Security Council? This incident, which took place in Athens, concerns the sovereignty and competence of the Greek authorities. It occurred on the territory of Greece.

33. According to press reports the competent authorities of that country are dealing with this matter; they are studying it and apparently certain measures will be taken. Clearly there are executive and judicial authorities in that country. How is this matter related to the Security Council?

34. If the Security Council, as I pointed out in my remarks after the adoption of the agenda, were to begin to consider all terrorist acts committed no matter where, even in this country, then it would cease to be the Security Council. And this is what is happening. The Israel representative is involving the Security Council in the consideration of events which took place on the territory of a sovereign State, which is entitled to determine what happened and to draw the appropriate conclusions. That Government has not appealed to the Security Council. On what basis, therefore, is the Israel representative telling us all this?

35. We are dealing with an entirely different matter. The Security Council is examining a new act of Israel aggression against a peaceful Arab country, Lebanon. That is the substance of today's meeting, not the matter to which the Israel representative seeks to draw our attention.

36. I ask leave to point out this fact.

37. The PRESIDENT: I invite the representative of Israel to continue his statement.

38. Mr. ROSENNE (Israel): The mind boggles at the thought of what could have been the consequences of that diabolical plot, had fortune favoured the assailants: a giant airliner, with thirty tons of fuel in its tanks, engulfed in flames; men, women and children caught in the inferno; danger and death and destruction spreading to everything within reach.

39. The assailants, identified as Mahmoud Mohammed and Maher Suleiman, boasted that they were Arab commandos and admitted that they had been trained and equipped by a terrorist organization operating out of Beirut. They left the international airport of Beirut that same morning, 26 December, with the sole and avowed purpose of destroying the Israeli airliner and killing all its occupants. They left the international airport of Beirut on a criminal assignment: to kill men, women and children, to kill Jews, and to kill also other hapless persons of whatever nationality or creed who happened to be on the Israeli aircraft. These persons were not misled underground fighters. There should be no mistake about this. The two bloodthirsty gunmen are members of a paramilitary organization which operates quite openly in Beirut and with the full knowledge and blessing of the Lebanese Government, which is fully aware of all its doings, its purposes and its methods. From Beirut they went to Athens and violated the sovereignty of a third country. In its name they perpetrated a most shocking and piratical outrage against the freedom and safety of international civil aviation. The crime which they committed in its name is a new one in the history of international civil aviation. It is absolutely without precedent.

40. The eyes of the world turned to Beirut in anxious expectation of what the Lebanese Government would say and do. Would the Government of Lebanon, recognizing its vocation to which the representative of Lebanon himself referred in his statement just now, rise at last to its responsibilities and disband the terror organization, detain and bring its members to swift justice, condemn the crime and take all necessary measures to prevent its repetition? Those who hoped so were soon disappointed. Instead of this, the official Lebanese news agency, in a lame statement, tried to throw off all responsibility, taking shelter behind communiqués issued by the terror organizations in Beirut which were widely reproduced in the Arab press and broadcast by Arab official radio and television stations, boasting of the exploit and extolling the murder in Athens. At the same time, the Lebanese Consulate in Athens extended its consular protection to the assassins.

41. Not even tonight did the Ambassador from Lebanon find it possible to utter one single word about this dastardly assault and the loss of life it caused.

42. The feeble excuses which came from Lebanon, from Beirut, will deceive no objective person. By its tolerance and connivance, Lebanon has once again ranged itself on the side of defiance of international law. It has thus continued, both by omission and by commission, the policy enunciated by its Prime Minister on 16 February 1968. The official position of the Lebanese Government was then expressed by Mr. Abdalla el-Yafi in the Lebanese Parliament as follows—and I am quoting from Radio Beirut: "We remain at war with Israel. Lebanon will remain faithful to the Khartoum decisions." There is no need for me to repeat before this Security Council the trinity of negatives that constitutes the Khartoum decisions.<sup>1</sup>

43. On 30 April 1968, Abdalla el-Yafi publicly pledged support to warfare by terror against Israel. He publicly encouraged Lebanese nationals to join terrorist organizations and promised them arms to fight Israel. That is the declared policy of the Government of Lebanon.

44. The Beirut daily *Al-Yaum* vividly described the official ceremony held on 30 April last when the Prime Minister took leave of fifty Lebanese citizens who had joined the El-Fatah terror organization, a representative of which thanked the Lebanese Government for its assistance.

45. The newspaper *Al-Anwar* of Beirut, of the same day, added that the Prime Minister spoke enthusiastically in favour of the continuation of warfare by terror against Israel, and had instructed the Lebanese border guards to facilitate the movements of El-Fatah units.

46. To attack Israel is indeed an easy way to gain popularity, and the Arab leaders do not shun it. On 2 May 1968, the newspaper *Al-Hayat* reported extensively on the presence of the Prime Minister of Lebanon at the funeral of an El-Fatah man who had been killed in action, where armed El-Fatah men, dressed in camouflage uniforms and

shooting into the air, were seen surrounding the Prime Minister.

47. On 8 May 1968, the Lebanese daily *As-Safa* reported that "training centres for Lebanese young men who join the *fedayeen* movement have been established in the town of Sidon". In a statement made on 6 May, the Lebanese Prime Minister reiterated his Government's support for terrorist warfare. The following night the first of a series of armed attacks was launched from Lebanese soil against an Israeli village, Manara.

48. Since then, the Government of Lebanon has not restrained itself either in its actions or in its threats against Israel. My delegation reported these and other incidents to the Security Council in its communications of 14 May 1968 [S/8585] and 15 June 1968 [S/8637]. Those notes stressed the grave dangers to the cease-fire created by these Lebanese provocations.

49. Those and other warnings were not needed. On 2 November 1968, the Prime Minister of Lebanon declared to the Kuwait newspaper *Ar-Rai Al-Amm* that he did not believe in political solutions and that his Government would support the *fedayeen* since he considered their activities to be lawful. Later in the day he received a delegation and, according to Radio Beirut, repeated that statement. On 2 November 1968, Radio Baghdad quoted the Prime Minister as saying that what was taken by force would be recovered by force. On 6 November 1968, the representative of Israel forwarded again a complaint to the Security Council. He wrote:

"I am instructed to stress once more the responsibility of the Lebanese authorities to ensure scrupulous observance of the cease-fire and to prevent all armed action against or incursions into Israel from its territory, whether by regular or irregular forces. When the cease-fire is violated from the Lebanese side, Israel must reserve the right to take appropriate defensive measures." [S/8891]

50. In this very month of December, Lebanon acted as host to an Arab regional conference, which vowed to continue terror warfare against Israel.

51. On 24 December 1968, a bare five days ago, the El-Fatah headquarters in Beirut published a warning to Christian pilgrims that they would be risking their lives by going to Bethlehem for Christmas. *The New York Times* of 25 December reported that the Arab terrorists had planned a dramatic act of violence to disrupt the holiday. According to the newspaper, only the vigilance of the Israeli defence forces prevented an infamous act of desecration.

52. The dastardly and murderous outrage of 26 December is thus the culmination of a long sustained and officially encouraged campaign. All through 1968 Lebanon, turning a deaf ear to Israel's appeals, has been playing an ever increasing role in the over-all Arab belligerency against Israel. It was in Beirut that the major Arab terrorist organizations established their headquarters and set up their international networks. From this safe haven, and taking advantage of its activities, they mobilized their resources, built up their propaganda machine, planned and directed

<sup>1</sup> Resolutions taken at the Arab Summit Conference held at Khartoum from 29 August to 1 September 1967.

their murderous attacks launched against Israel villages and cities, the acts of sabotage, the planting of mines and boobytraps, and the hijacking of an Israeli airplane last July. They made no secret of their far-reaching and devilish plots and plans. All this is taking place on Lebanese soil, in Beirut, the very capital of that country, under the complacent eyes and ears of the Lebanese authorities. The Government's responsibilities are clearly established. They are direct responsibilities, not vicarious ones.

53. The latest tragic and barbaric act in Athens has again brought to the Lebanese Government the cheap rewards of applause by a public opinion continuously whipped into senseless and blind hatred. The influential Lebanese newspaper *An-Nahar*, gloating over the murder, wrote on 28 December:

"The homeland of the Palestinian is the entire world—in Jerusalem, in Tel Aviv, in Los Angeles, in Rome and Athens. One day it will be in New York, Washington and London. For as long as the Palestinian is without a homeland, the entire world is his. His home is where the enemy is . . . And New York, Washington and London or any other places might be the scene of the next Palestinian protest operation. The world will support or condemn, be happy or be afraid."

54. Other mass media, including state-controlled broadcasting services, joined in voicing their satisfaction at the attack on the Israeli plane. The Beirut daily *Al-Jaryda* wrote, on 28 December 1968, that the attack had the advantage of publicizing the *fedayeen* activities all over the world. The Lebanese newspaper *Al-Hadaf*, which voices the views of El-Fatah, commented, also on 28 December 1968, that the attack in Athens was a demonstration of what it called extraordinary heroism.

55. To proclaim disrespect and brazen defiance of every accepted principle of human decency and international behaviour, to glamourize crime, seems to be the accepted currency in Beirut today, at least as far as Israel is concerned.

56. However, not only are general principles of law and order, of freedom of transit, of international safety at stake. Lebanon has undertaken specific obligations towards Israel under the Security Council cease-fire resolution. Any attack against an Israeli civil aircraft, wherever it might be, is as much a violation of the cease-fire as any attack on Israeli territory, and entitles the Israeli Government to exercise its right of self-defence. Two attacks on Israeli civil aircraft this year, within six months of each other, perpetrated by the same terrorist group, based in Beirut, have made it abundantly clear what their objectives are, namely, to disrupt Israeli civil aviation, wherever it might be, without any consideration for loss of life, for the identity of the victims, for the material damages or for the disruption of international civil aviation in general.

57. This is a grave matter in itself; this is a grave matter for Israel; this is a grave matter for every country. It threatens the very basis of international law and order. It strikes at the very foundations of the whole complex network of international transportation and communications.

58. After the hijacking of our aircraft last July, the Government of Israel exercised the maximum of restraint. We refrained from reacting in force and took diplomatic action instead for the release of the plane, the crew and the passengers. The Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Eshkol, made it clear at that time, on behalf of the Government of Israel, that we would not accept interference with free movement along our air routes. He emphasized that the kidnapping not only endangered Israel but also violated principles of freedom and safety of aviation, and he called for a cessation of acts of this kind. Unfortunately, an end has not been put to this dangerous practice. Once again, unprecedented criminal attacks have been perpetrated, this time on an Israeli airplane in another international airport.

59. It was indeed fortunate that the reckless act of hijacking last July was not accompanied by any loss of life, although members of the Security Council will recall that it provoked a major international crisis. There was reason to expect that, in the light of the harsh reaction of world public opinion and of the organizations concerned with civil aviation, the Arabs would desist from this particularly vicious form of terror warfare. Last Thursday's action in the international airport of Athens has belied these hopes and expectations. The Government of Israel was duty bound on this occasion to take appropriate action in self-defence designed to prevent any repetition of this nefarious attack.

60. On 28 December 1968 a commando unit of the Israel defence forces landed at Beirut airport and struck at a number of aircraft belonging to Arab airlines parked in the airport. There was no loss of life. Strict precautions were taken, as far as possible, to avoid damage to non-Arab aircraft. The action was directed solely against the base from which the terrorists had departed on the previous occasion.

61. This action was taken to uphold Israel's basic right to free navigation in international skies. Its purpose was to show once again that Israel's rights on land and sea and in the air cannot be jeopardized and trampled on with impunity. It is a reminder to friend and foe of the firm and unconditional commitment of the people and of the Government of Israel to protect its very existence, its territory and its lifelines, resolutely and unswervingly.

62. Without in any way belittling the gravity of this terrorist warfare being conducted against Israel's civil aircraft, wherever they might be, the complaint that we are discussing must also be seen in the broader context of the continuation by the Arab States, including Lebanon, of active belligerency and warfare against Israel through the instrumentality of irregular forces and organizations armed, trained, encouraged and financed by the Arab Governments, including the Government of Lebanon.

63. This warfare is in flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations, of the cease-fire régime, and also of the United Nations resolutions on the inadmissibility of interfering in the internal affairs of other States.

64. The activities of the terrorist organizations very seriously undermine the patient efforts of Ambassador

Jarring towards the attainment of a peaceful settlement. These terror organizations openly proclaim that their objective is to thwart any such settlement and to destroy Israel, regardless of Israel's shape and size. Members of the Security Council will recall that, as the Secretary-General himself reported at that time, this kind of government-backed terrorist activity contributed not a little to the general deterioration of the situation preceding the outbreak of the 1967 war. The Arab Governments—including the Government of Lebanon—cannot be relieved of their responsibilities for the activities of these organizations.

65. Just before the June war, in this very Council Chamber, on 30 May 1967, it was the Foreign Minister of Lebanon who said:

“This time it must be clear to everybody that it would be a total war. In a total war, the Arabs will use all means to defeat their enemy . . . It would be a long war, with no cease-fire until final victory.” [1344th meeting, paras. 19 and 21.]

66. Not without regret do we have to say to the representative of the Lebanon, our neighbour, through you, Mr. President, that in the light of all that has happened since those words were first uttered, it seems to us that that is still the guiding tenet of his Government's policy. The Security Council is today faced with a very grave challenge. My delegation hopes that it will at long last exert its authority and clearly indicate that it can no longer tolerate the continuation of warfare under the guise of terrorist activities and will hold the Arab Governments, including the Government of Lebanon, firmly to their duties under the Charter and under the cease-fire.

67. In a statement on Israeli television today, the Prime Minister, Mr. Eshkol, said:

“We have no desire whatsoever for a worsening of our relations with Lebanon. Israel is interested in a limitation of the hostile front; not in its expansion. But we are obliged to defend ourselves against all aggression, wherever it is planned and carried out. This practice adopted by our enemies must stop. States that make it possible for terrorist organizations to organize and perpetrate acts of terror bear responsibility for aggression, a responsibility which they cannot disclaim. This is accepted as a fundamental principle of international law. On no account can we accept the notion that the waging of war against Israel should be permitted when those who wage it call themselves this or that organization and not a Government.”

68. I wish to reserve the right of my delegation to intervene again in this debate and, if necessary, to submit further evidence to this Council, both about the attack on our airliner by the Beirut-based and Beirut-inspired terrorists and on other aspects of their nefarious activities.

69. Mr. WIGGINS (United States of America): Mr. President, I wish first of all to convey my congratulations to you, on the first opportunity I have had to do so, on your assumption of the duties of President of the Security

Council. This is a source of double satisfaction to your colleagues here. Your country, since 1924 when it was admitted to the League of Nations, has played a distinguished role in the councils of the world. Its voice has been heard again and again in the cause of right in the international councils of nations. Unfortunately, it has not always been heeded, but repeatedly it has really been the voice of the conscience of our civilization. You, Sir, we regard as a distinguished representative of that tradition, and we are delighted to see you in a position to preside over this body with the patience, dignity, kindness and courtesy which have always distinguished your attitude towards all of us. I am especially pleased to see you occupying your position at a time when problems of such difficulty and complication are before us.

70. I wish at the same time to express my congratulations to your distinguished predecessor, the Ambassador of Denmark, for the skill, patience and objectivity with which he presided over the affairs of this body in the previous month.

71. The year is ending on a note of tragedy and of violence in the Middle East. The Council, which has met so many times during the year to consider acts of terrorism and military counter-action, meets on this occasion to deal with a most regrettable Israeli action which my Government strongly condemns. As Ambassador Goldberg stated in the Council on 21 March [1402nd meeting], my Government opposes violence from any quarter in the Middle East.

72. Carrying the pattern of terrorism and reprisal into the centres of international commerce and travel adds a new dimension of destruction and risk which directly touches the interests of all States. My Government can understand, and in fact it shares, the concern of the Israeli Government over the increasing interference with the right of unimpeded air travel between States. Israel was rightly aroused and legitimately concerned about the attack upon an Israeli aircraft in Athens on 26 December and the previous hijacking of another Israeli airliner. The free movement of peaceful transport among countries is a matter to which we are going to have to give increasing attention. Armed intervention that interrupts the movement of civilian aircraft is an outrageous disregard of the law of nations and an intolerable interference with the safety of civilian passengers.

73. However, the United States feels that this action does not justify the Israeli retaliation of 28 December. In the first place, we do not see a justification for a retaliation of any kind against Lebanon. Nothing that we have heard has convinced us that the Government of Lebanon is responsible for the occurrence in Athens. On the contrary, the Lebanese Government has made efforts to control the actions of *fedayeen* groups in its territory. Lebanon is a country which clearly has been doing its best to live in peace with all other States in the area. Secondly, apart from the question of Lebanese culpability, the Israeli action is unjustified. Such a military attack upon an international airport is an unacceptable form of international behaviour. In magnitude it is entirely disproportionate to the act which preceded it. It is disproportionate in two ways: first,



in the degree of destruction involved; and secondly, in a more fundamental way, in the difference between the acts of two individual terrorists and those of a sizable military force operating openly and directly under governmental orders. It can be attributed to good fortune that there was no loss of life; but the risk to scores of innocent people, including passengers on aircraft in the airport at the time, was very great. Our reports confirm a substantial amount of damage to equipment and facilities.

74. Beyond the strong sense of concern at this specific action is the increasing evidence that terrorism and other acts of violence have become a way of life in the Middle East. We see no way to peace in this direction. The history of the past year has shown that violence leads to more violence and that retaliation does not bring an end to terrorism; in fact it tends to weaken the forces of peace rather than to strengthen them.

75. It must now be plain to the Government of Israel itself that the attack on the international airport at Beirut has introduced new dangers into the already alarming situation in the Middle East. This destructive operation has enlarged the ring of reprisal and widened the circle of terror to touch areas and peoples hitherto struggling to keep aloof from these measures. Surely the Government of Israel must be having sober second thoughts about this act of arrogance. It would be a refreshing variation from previous patterns of behaviour in the region if that Government would candidly and frankly itself give voice to its own misgivings about the results of its military operation. An honest acknowledgment that this enterprise was ill-conceived and a candid expression of regret would illumine the bleak political landscape of the region like a flash in the night. It would reassure the friends of Israel who regret a situation in which the Government of that country seems to be putting its confidence in the almost unrestricted use of force, and it would silence many of Israel's critics who find in this episode new arguments with which to reproach the Israeli Government. It would even set before its enemies an example of reasonableness, without which peace can never be achieved in the Middle East.

76. The Security Council—indeed every Member of the United Nations—has a responsibility to help break the pattern of violence in the Middle East. We hope this Council will speak promptly and clearly on the issues before it. Surely all the parties in the area have a responsibility to adhere scrupulously to the cease-fire resolutions of the Security Council. Surely it is evident to all that a meaningful arms limitation agreement in the area should not await the conclusion of a political settlement of differences which have proved intractable for more than two decades. Surely the principal parties in the area, as well as the members of the Council, must redouble their efforts in support of the mission of Ambassador Jarring, whose sole purpose is to help facilitate a just and lasting peace, which would benefit all peoples of the area and help bulwark the political independence and the territorial integrity of both the Israelis and the Arab States. The time has long passed for halting the vicious circle that could lead to further tragedy, pain and destruction.

77. For its part the United States is prepared to support prompt action by the Security Council to condemn this

latest Israeli action. In the meantime we shall continue our intensive efforts in support of Mr. Jarring, as we shall continue to seek a meaningful arms limitation agreement in the area. In these ways the foundations for peace in the Middle East can be laid.

78. The PRESIDENT: I should like to thank the representative of the United States for the friendly message he addressed to me and to my predecessor. I should like to thank him in particular for the warm and generous reference he made to my country and to its contribution to the cause of international understanding and peace.

79. Sir Leslie GLASS (United Kingdom): I am sure you are aware, Mr. President, of the affection, respect and admiration in which you are held by my delegation. We are very glad to see you back in the post you have held in such a distinguished manner in the past and we are only sorry that you will be leaving us soon.

80. I speak shortly tonight to emphasize at the earliest possible moment in this Council the profound concern of my Government at the action of the Israeli Government in sending forces to commit dangerous and deplorable acts of violence at the international airport of Beirut on 28 December.

81. We in the Council must necessarily look at events not in a vacuum but against the background of past violence in the context of the situation in the Middle East. We cannot ignore the dangers to peaceful international air travel threatened by such acts as the hijacking of aircraft and the machine-gunning at Athens Airport. There is a terrifying trend here which all nations must surely join in deploring. However, the scale and intensity of the Israeli action stands out exceptionally against even this sombre background. Although we have noted what the representative of Israel has said, it is particularly sad that the flames should have spread to the country of Lebanon with its history of peace and conciliation.

82. As we look backward, we must also look forward. We can see only too clearly that violence breeds violence; that incident inevitably follows incident; that it is all too easy to find self-justification for yet more bloodshed and destruction; and that the spiral will end inevitably in disaster unless at some stage common sense can prevail and a peaceful settlement is worked out in the Middle East. We have had more than enough evidence of that, and the nations of the world are entitled to demand that to all actions in the Middle East there should be applied the yardstick of whether such actions advance or retard the chances of a peaceful settlement. By that yardstick the events of 28 December are a grave setback.

83. The ingredients of possible settlements exist. What we still seem to lack is the will to peace. Over the years in the debates in the Council we have been all too aware of the passions alive in the Middle East; but we have now reached the stage when the sheer mutual instinct for survival and a common fear of disaster must surely begin to damp down those passions.

84. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for his expressions of friendly sentiments.

85. Mr. CHAYET (France) (*translated from French*): My delegation will confine itself today to making a few preliminary remarks, reserving the right to add to these initial comments in the light of the subsequent debate in the Council and the additional clarification to be given us by the Lebanese Government.

86. My delegation believes it essential to express at the outset its serious concern over the Israeli raid carried out yesterday, 28 December, on the international airport of Beirut. It regrets that act all the more as a serious blow to a country which is a traditional friend of France and has always shown respect for the principles of the Charter.

87. The facts have been clearly established: in consequence of an individual action committed at Athens against an aircraft of El Al Airlines, the Israel Government caused the destruction at the Beirut airport of at least thirteen civilian aircraft, belonging to various Arab airlines.

88. That raid, both because of the substantial material damage which it caused and because of the obvious political dangers of such a reckless operation, fully justifies this urgent meeting of the Council.

89. My delegation has, unfortunately, already had occasion many times to state that the very idea of reprisals is unacceptable. From that point of view the raid carried out yesterday, 28 December, is inadmissible and therefore deserving of condemnation.

90. The Council has a duty to put an end to actions which extend violence and spread it successively to the States of the Near East. Such operations can only compromise the efforts made to establish a just and lasting peace. As my delegation has already pointed out, a satisfactory settlement can result only from the implementation of resolution 242 (1967) adopted by the Council on 22 November 1967. A joint action by Member States, particularly those with special responsibilities, is therefore urgent and indispensable, for it is becoming increasingly clear with every passing day that the conflict in the Near East threatens the peace of the world.

91. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Strange and monstrous: that is the only way to describe the criminal aggressive act perpetrated by Israel—this time against Lebanon. Suddenly, under cover of dark night, like gangsters, soldiers of Israel, with the knowledge of Israel's Military High Command and with the official approval of the Israel Government, committed this monstrous piratical raid on the peaceful civilian international airport at Beirut, the capital of Lebanon.

92. As has already been mentioned here and in the press, more than ten modern airliners at the airport were set on fire and hangars were destroyed; a serious moral and political blow was dealt against the peace-loving Lebanese people and against the entire Arab East. The prestige and authority of the United Nations and the Security Council have been seriously impaired. This is a new act of aggression by Israel and that is the only way in which it can be considered. This military action by Israel cannot be

justified in any way, no matter what inventions and fabrications the Israel representative may shower on us. This new aggressive action by Israel can be regarded only as the expression of a premeditated, preplanned and deliberate decision to act in such a way as to complicate further the situation in the Near East, to undermine the United Nations decisions aimed at a political settlement in that region, and to frustrate Ambassador Jarring's mission. That is the only political assessment that can be made of this new act of aggression by Israel.

93. Israel's military action against Lebanon grossly violates the Security Council's decision on the establishment of a cease-fire in the Near East. It is one of the most serious military provocations committed by Israel recently. It is designed to aggravate the situation in that region, to increase tension and to create a threat to international peace.

94. What is the real objective of these new aggressive acts by Israel? It is not difficult to reply to that question. The substance of the matter is to undermine the possibility of a political settlement, to increase tension in the Near East and thus to pave the way for the consolidation of the results of last year's aggression, for the absorption of the occupied Arab territories, and for the fulfilment of the mad plans of the Israel extremists who are fostering the wild idea of creating a greater Israel by seizing the territories of neighbouring States. No other assessment can be made of this new aggressive act.

95. This new aggressive action cannot be regarded as an isolated act of aggression by Israel, perpetrated by Israel extremists who, intoxicated by last year's victories, have gone mad. It is a direct consequence and result of the attempts made, ever since Israel's aggression last year against three Arab countries, by some high protectors of Israel to conceal and justify every new act of aggression by Israel. That is the position of several countries, including unfortunately some members of the Security Council. It is well known to all of us seated around this table.

96. In this connexion, we cannot fail to recall—and members of the Council certainly remember—the constant attempts of certain representatives on the Security Council, in particular the representative of the United States of America, to place Israel the aggressor, and the Arab countries victims of its aggression, on the same footing. In this connexion, mention must also be made of the recent visit to this country by Moshe Dayan, the Israel Defence Minister. In this connexion also attention must be drawn to the conclusion of an agreement between the United States and Israel for delivery to Israel of modern weapons of attack-supersonic Phantom aircraft. It is, of course, no accident that the news of this agreement was made public the day before yesterday and the new act of aggression by Israel was committed yesterday.

97. We understand the difficult situation in which Mr. Wiggins now finds himself. For the first time in the Security Council a United States representative has seriously condemned an aggressive act by Israel. He found himself obliged to reap the fruit—the bitter fruit—of his predecessors' acts. Their encouragement and protection

went too far. Now the international prestige and authority of those who have protected and are continuing to protect the aggressors are compromised. This creates a very serious and delicate situation. Counting on the future moral and political support of certain circles in the Western countries, the Israeli extremists pursue their adventurist policy, defying the entire world, expanding the front of aggression, and thus threatening universal peace.

98. By attacking Lebanon—that Arab country against which Israel had not taken any large-scale military action in the recent past—Israel is pursuing this very objective. It is the duty of all peace-loving States and of the Security Council at last to stop the arrogant Israeli aggressors, to force them to respect the legitimate rights and interests of all States, the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, and the Charter of the United Nations. Only then will it be possible to hope for a political settlement of the conflict in the Near East.

99. The Security Council must take the necessary measures to destroy the Israel extremists' desire to continue provocative and aggressive acts of this kind and to justify them by the most fantastic assertions, which no one accepts, not even those who have frequently supported such action in the past.

100. In the view of the Soviet delegation, the Security Council must first of all condemn most resolutely the criminal military adventure which Israel has perpetrated against Lebanon. The Security Council must warn Israel and take appropriate measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. The Security Council must oblige Israel to punish the military pirates who committed that criminal act against neighbouring States, that attack which caused them such enormous damage. That is the action which the Security Council must take. Only such a decision by the Council would contribute to the achievement of a speedy settlement in the Near East.

101. The Soviet delegation considers that it may confine itself to this brief statement. It reserves the right to speak again on this question after a careful study of all the facts and data presented at today's meeting by the Lebanese representative and after studying the additional information which has just been received from the Acting Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization.

102. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): Mr. President, since this is the first time that I have spoken under your presidency this month, I should like to pay my tribute to you before proceeding to express the views of my delegation on the grave situation which has resulted from the Israeli attack on the civilian airport of Beirut. The Council is indeed fortunate to have a person of your eminence and experience as its President during these grave moments. Under your wise leadership, I am sure it will take some forceful and effective measures to alleviate the situation. Both as a colleague and a friend, you have always shown the utmost consideration to me. I shall always cherish the very close association that we have had in the Council in the last two years.

103. On 28 December, Israeli troops landed by helicopter at Beirut International Airport and destroyed several

civilian aircraft. Extensive damage was also caused to other aviation facilities and installations. The representative of Lebanon has given the Council full details of the Israeli aerial and ground action. We offer our deepest sympathies to the Government and people of Lebanon for the grievous loss they have suffered.

104. In the light of what the Ambassador of Lebanon has said, as well as from independent reports, it is clear beyond any doubt that Israeli military action against his country was unprovoked, unnecessary, and a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations. This Israeli military attack on Beirut is blatant and reprehensible, and should not be tolerated. It is the duty of the Council to condemn it and to take suitable measures under the relevant provisions of the Charter to prevent the repetition of such wanton acts. At the same time, the Council should demand of Israel the payment of compensation to Lebanon for the damage caused in Saturday's action.

105. There is another aspect of the situation to which my delegation would like to draw the Council's attention. During the last few months, Israeli forces have attacked and destroyed several public installations in neighbouring countries. In October the targets were two bridges and a power station in the United Arab Republic; a month later, road and railroad bridges in Jordan; and now it is the international airport of Beirut.

106. The premeditated nature of these attacks and the enormity of the action seem to point out that it is the intention of Israel to deal crippling blows to the economy of Arab countries. My delegation believes that the Council should take serious note of this new phase in the escalation and widening of the area of conflict and adopt appropriate measures to arrest the fast deteriorating situation. Incidents in occupied Arab territories or individual acts against Israeli property have been cited as justification for the recent recrudescence of tensions. My delegation deplors all violent incidents leading to loss of life and property. We cannot, however, accept that they would justify in any way the massive attacks launched by Israel on Arab civilian property. Those incidents have no relevance to Israeli military actions, such as the one on Beirut International Airport on Saturday.

107. During the entire period of its membership of the Security Council, the Indian delegation has espoused certain fundamental principles that should govern relations among Member States. These are the principles of the non-use of force, the respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of States, and the peaceful settlement of disputes. For this reason, we have lent our full support to the Security Council's efforts to bring about a lasting settlement of the entire range of problems confronting the States of West Asia. The way to the peaceful solution of these problems has already been shown in the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. Since then, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Jarring, has been making strenuous efforts to bring about an expeditious implementation of that resolution in all its aspects.

108. It is the wish of my delegation, indeed that of all members around this table, that the mission of Ambassador

Jarring should be successful in laying the foundations for a peaceful settlement in West Asia. However, actions of the kind in which Israel has indulged recently, including the latest, the attack on Beirut International Airport, have set the mission of Ambassador Jarring a dozen steps backward. Particularly at this juncture, when hopes of making progress seemed to have risen somewhat, these actions, by heightening tensions, are a serious setback to the achievement of a political settlement. It is therefore the duty of the Security Council to ensure that Israel stops such wanton acts and pays full compensation to the Government of Lebanon. If the Government of Israel does not comply with these demands, it will be incumbent upon the Security Council to take further appropriate measures under the Charter to secure Israel's compliance.

109. The PRESIDENT: I should like to reciprocate in full measure the friendly sentiments that my friend and colleague the Ambassador of India has expressed in his statement.

110. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): The Security Council has been convened in emergency session, on the initiative of Lebanon, to deal with the latest—and, let me add, particularly brutal—aggression by Israel against one of its Arab neighbours: an armed attack by Israeli armed forces against the international airport of Beirut, the details of which have been elucidated not only in the moving statement of the representative of Lebanon but also by the official information supplied by the Acting Chief of Staff of UNTSO in documents S/7930/Add.107 and 108.

111. This latest unprovoked aggression by one Member State against another bears all the well-known features that have come to characterize the conduct of Israel in its international relations. Some of those features I wish to mention here very briefly.

112. Firstly, this incident convincingly shows that for Israel, the Charter of the United Nations simply does not exist and the provisions of the Charter forbidding the use of force in international relations are systematically rejected by Israel. Israel uses armed force against its neighbours in violation of all those provisions.

113. Secondly, as on numerous previous occasions, one of Israel's Arab neighbours, a victim of its aggression, is again obliged to turn to the Security Council to seek redress against the banditry practised by Israel. Israel usually pretends to have been wronged, but never even thinks of coming to the Council.

114. Thirdly, only the pretexts under which the repeated aggressions are committed change; the effects of the armed attacks, outlawed by international law, remain the same. But no pretext is justifiable; in no circumstances would Israel be entitled to resort to arms before the Security Council had decided on the course to be taken. In the present case, the pretext given here by the representative of Israel refers to an act committed by individuals in Athens, Greece. The representative of the Soviet Union has rightly pointed out in his brief statement that such problems, including this question in particular, do not belong on the agenda of the Security Council. The question is already

being dealt with by the proper local authorities. The Security Council cannot intervene in proceedings taking place under national jurisdiction without grave violation of the Charter. Similar acts of sabotage have never been brought before the Council for the simple reason that the Council is entitled to deal only with problems and conflicts between sovereign States and their Governments. Since in the case mentioned by the Israeli representative, no direct relation exists between the perpetrators of the sabotage and the Government of Lebanon—in fact that Government has resolutely denied any responsibility for the sabotage—the inscribing of the question on the agenda of the Security Council is completely out of order. This is only an attempt by Israel to distract our attention from the real issue under our scrutiny: that is, an act of armed aggression committed by commandos of the Israeli armed forces against Lebanon, causing serious material and human damage. The responsibility for that act is fully recognized by the Israeli Government. The substantive difference between the two cases is evident; they cannot be placed on the same level. The complaint of Lebanon clearly belongs within the competence of the Security Council, whereas the letter of the representative of Israel is an empty pretext and a vain attempt to justify his country's aggressive policy.

115. Fourthly, the purpose of these premeditated aggressive acts, which are as a rule announced beforehand, is to terrorize the neighbours of Israel and their civilian populations. These acts show the true face of Israel and afford the Council insight into the kind of peace that the leaders of Israel never tire of offering to the Arab States.

116. Fifthly, it is a characteristic feature of the Israeli attacks that they aim at the destruction of peaceful installations, the sinews of the economic life of its Arab neighbours. It has become the policy of the Israeli Government systematically to destroy industrial plants, harbour installations, electric power stations, and—as on this occasion—a civilian airport. I could describe them by using the words of the Israeli representative: to glamourize crime. All these add a revealing touch to the true intentions of Israel with regard to the economic development of the Arab States.

117. During our debate we have heard very strong statements revealing the facts and condemning the deliberate acts of aggression committed by Israel, and it would seem that there is almost complete unanimity among the members of the Council since the facts are undeniable. There is, however, a strange phenomenon present, in that certain Governments, though making strong statements, are inconsistent in their actions. To condemn the Israel aggression in words while simultaneously proceeding to supply the aggressor with the most up-to-date war material, including Phantom fighters, is indeed inconsistent.

118. In this case, as in previous ones, Israel committed an aerial attack against a neighbouring country, and now one member of the Security Council is sending Israel additional airplanes which can be used for further acts of aggression. It is as if we wanted to extinguish a fire and, instead of pouring water on it, poured gasoline on it. It is aggravating the situation in the Middle East; it is inviting further acts of aggression on the part of Israel.

119. Such acts are seriously obstructing the possibility of finding a peaceful settlement in the Middle East based on resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council and are seriously obstructing the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Jarring, to promote the cause of peace in that dangerous area of the world. But we are duty bound to add that if Israel dares to act in such a way—as if the United Nations and its Charter simply were not in existence—the earlier inaction of the Council on similar occasions is also to blame. The reasons for this inaction, I feel, need not be stated here.

120. I wish to mention only that those countries members of the Security Council, Members of the United Nations, and other States which advocate peaceful settlement of differences should exert their influence to make the Government of Israel discontinue the series of deliberate destructive acts committed against its neighbours and compensate the victims for the losses suffered, and to induce the Israeli Government to respect the Charter of the United Nations and implement the resolutions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly.

121. The Hungarian delegation is strongly convinced that here too the time has come to take resolute action against Israel. The Council cannot remain a passive witness to the situation brought about by Israel. The strongest provisions of the Charter envisaged to deal with armed aggression by a Member State against another must be strictly applied. The conduct of Israel leaves no alternative to the Council. The Hungarian delegation will co-operate with other members of the Security Council in the application of Chapter VII of the Charter.

122. Mr. BEN KACI (Algeria) (*translated from French*): Before taking up the question under discussion, I wish to say that the Algerian delegation has accepted the revised agenda as a gesture of co-operation with you, Mr. President, and the members of the Security Council, because it, too, considers that the question raised in the letter of the representative of Israel does not come within the competence of the Security Council. Nevertheless, we accepted the revised agenda so that the Security Council could discuss as a matter of urgency the question placed before it by the representative of Lebanon. That is our understanding of the content of the agenda.

123. Once again the Security Council has been convened at the request of an Arab State—on this occasion Lebanon—to examine an act of aggression committed against it by Zionist authorities.

124. That aggression was carefully premeditated and undertaken with an arrogance that clearly reveals Israel's intention of playing in the Middle East the part formerly played by Prussia in Europe. The Tel Aviv authorities responsible for this act of aggression are now trying once again to deceive world public opinion. However, their impudence has reached such a degree that they now disregard not only the dictates of the international community but also the words of warning given by their staunchest allies.

125. This behaviour flows from the encouragement and effective assistance which Israel receives from certain major

Western Powers. Proof of this is the recent decision of the United States Government to supply Israel with modern fighter aircraft, a fact which, especially in view of the events at Beirut, has sinister implications in the eyes of the Arab countries.

126. It is therefore clear that such assistance encourages Israel in its reckless plans.

127. Such behaviour discloses Israel's true nature, since it no longer even tries to cultivate the image of a so-called small peace-loving country constantly struggling against aggressive Arab States, and reveals on the contrary its attitude towards the United Nations and in particular towards the Security Council, both of which assumed well-known responsibilities at the time of the creation of Israel to the detriment of the Palestinian people.

128. On this last point, however, we should recognize that Tel Aviv has gained considerable experience, since it has always ignored the decisions of our Organization and defied world public opinion.

129. The recent aggression confirms once again that Israel's warlike attitude is part and parcel of its very nature and a prerequisite for its survival. Israel literally feeds on aggression and is fated ever to pursue an annexationist policy to which our Organization unfortunately, notwithstanding its responsibilities, has so far been unable to put an end.

130. We are witnessing a revival of gunboat policy, which our Council must necessarily condemn; in so doing, however, the Council cannot consider its task to have been fulfilled, for it must also demand the payment of compensation to the party which has suffered considerable damage.

131. If the myth of "Israel, a small, peaceful and persecuted State", is collapsing somewhat throughout the world and yielding to a more realistic idea, the myth reflects despite everything only a marginal reality, since the background to this conflict is and remains Palestine. We repeat and shall continue to do so as often as is necessary that, so long as the right of this people to self-determination is not recognized, the Council will unfortunately have to meet to discuss the most recent Israeli demands and take decisions which will be more or less inversely proportional to the requirements of the hour.

132. The war in the Middle East will not be quenched by palliatives, if indeed they exist. Peace in that area will become a reality only if solutions are finally implemented which take due account of the vital interests of the Palestinian people: in the last analysis the right of that people to the restoration of its legitimate national rights.

133. To return to the specific question before us today, the Israeli aggression against Lebanese territory, the Algerian delegation considers that the Security Council must unequivocally condemn the Tel Aviv authorities for their act of aggression and must see to it that, in addition to the necessary compensation, effective measures are taken under the Charter to put an end to the systematic policy of

aggression pursued by the Israel authorities against the Arab world.

134. The Algerian delegation reserves its right to speak again on this question at a later stage.

135. Mr. M'BENGUE (Senegal) (*translated from French*): My delegation would like first of all to fulfil a pleasant duty, Mr. President, by extending to you its warm congratulations on your election to the presidency. I am especially happy to do so since you represent a country which enjoys much prestige. You are assuming your responsibilities at a particularly difficult time. Nevertheless, your well-known qualities, which have been duly recognized here by my colleagues, afford us the best assurance for the success of our work. I should also like to congratulate your predecessor, who conducted our debates most happily during November.

136. On the problem before us today I should like first of all to make some preliminary remarks, reserving my right to speak again at a later stage in the light of the additional information to be given us by the Lebanese delegation.

137. We are meeting today once more as the result of a grave incident which has again disturbed the Middle East. The raid on the Beirut Airport by Israel troops, which has been interpreted by observers as a reprisal, has caused much concern in the world and will certainly contribute to increased tension in that area, already sufficiently disturbed by the Israel-Arab conflict. Such acts serve to make the prospects for peace more remote. They ruin the efforts which Ambassador Jarring has been making for several months for a peaceful settlement of the conflict.

138. My delegation's position is well known. It has had occasion to state it here. In its view, international problems should be resolved peacefully, in particular by means of a dialogue. It therefore condemns all acts of reprisal, no matter by whom. It especially condemns this act which has just been committed against Lebanon, a peace-loving country which never took part in the June war.

139. Confronted by acts of violence which are increasing in number, the members of the Security Council must agree to implement resolution 242(1967) adopted by the Council in November 1967. In that way they will meet the obligations which devolve on them under the Charter.

140. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of my predecessor and on my own behalf, I should like to thank the representative of Senegal for his kind references to us.

141. Mr. DE ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil): Mr. President, first of all I wish to join with all delegations which have rendered a tribute to Ambassador Borch, the representative of Denmark, for the skill and statesmanship with which he presided over our proceedings during the month of November. At the same time, my delegation wishes to express its satisfaction at seeing you, sir, as President of the Security Council when we are confronted with such serious problems. We count on your guidance and leadership.

142. The Brazilian delegation wishes to state briefly its views on the very serious problem with which the Security

Council is again confronted. The pattern of events, such as the one we are considering, has become all too familiar to all of us. It cannot be ignored, however, that the over-all situation becomes more and more serious and explosive each time such events take place. It may even be later than we generally think. Without wishing to sound alarmed or alarmistic, we might even say that we are entering the initial stages of another round of fighting.

143. The unjustified and premeditated attack by Israel against the civilian airport of Lebanon clearly shows how close we have come to open warfare. The Brazilian delegation wishes therefore, Mr. President, to express its appreciation for the promptness with which you have called us on this Sunday to the Security Council chamber. Seldom indeed since June 1967 has the situation in the Middle East been so gloomy and so fraught with danger.

144. Time and again my delegation has expressed the view that short of a political settlement along the lines provided for in resolution 242 (1967), the Security Council would find more and more difficulty in securing an adequate cease-fire between the parties to the dispute. My delegation has, on four different occasions, given vent to its preoccupations with the arms escalation in the area. Time and again my delegation has insisted on the necessity of strengthening the hand of Ambassador Gunnar Jarring in trying to secure from both sides a more conciliatory and constructive attitude. And time and again we have felt frustrated by a new eruption of violent acts, retaliation and, sometimes quite clearly, of over-retaliation.

145. As we have stressed before, the authority and prestige of the Security Council have been challenged. We have been unanimous on many issues, and unanimously we have failed. We have likewise expressed the view that the question of the Middle East, which is difficult to settle on its own terms, may become downright insoluble if it becomes inserted into the context of the cold war.

146. A recent resolution of the Security Council [258 (1968)] has emphasized that it is incumbent upon all Members of the United Nations to help in the peaceful solution of the question of the Middle East, and my country has not failed to live up to its responsibilities on that question. Today we just wish to reassert our earnest conviction that such violent acts as the premeditated attack against a civilian airport should not be ignored or permitted to pass unnoticed. It is imperative that the Council should act promptly and speedily by discharging its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

147. We are prepared to join in a constructive effort to reassert the authority of the Council and to preserve its powers under the Charter of the United Nations. That will be our position up to the very last minute of our term as a non-permanent member of the Security Council.

148. The PRESIDENT: Again speaking for myself and for my predecessor, I should like to express appreciation for the friendly sentiments addressed to us by the representative of Brazil.

149. The representative of Lebanon has asked for permission to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

150. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): I wish to reserve the right of my delegation to reply to the statement made by the Israeli representative this evening. I only wish to state now that his statement is full of distortions and unfounded allegations and accusations against my country and my Government and has not convinced any one of the members of the Council who have spoken so far.

151. The Israeli representative has said that in my statement I did not refer to the incident that took place in Greece. I certainly would not refer to an act which has taken place in the territory of a friendly State, Greece, which is not a party to the deliberations of this Council. In our view, the incident which took place at Athens Airport is a matter of common law and the Greek courts have sole jurisdiction in the matter. They certainly do not need the help of Israeli armed units.

152. The Israeli Government has for long been extending its aggressive jurisdiction to many countries and territories. It is projecting itself now to becoming the *gendarme* of international aviation. Perhaps it will one day claim for itself jurisdiction here and in Cuba to deal with the hijacking of aircraft to that Caribbean State.

153. What seems to irritate the representative of Israel and his Government is the fact that we in Lebanon have a free press. We cannot suffocate freedom in order to accommodate Israel's aggressive, expansionist aims and designs. The representative of Israel knows that Lebanon's policy is decided in the Council of Ministers and the official position of Lebanon should be evaluated in the light of official communiqués issued by the competent authorities. The ugly, murderous actions by the Israelis seem to be equated with press reports.

154. We have been comforted by the friendly statements we have heard tonight from various delegations; we are deeply moved by them. I wish to express the appreciation of my Government for the support we have received. The unanimous sense of indignation and condemnation of the blatant and murderous attack by the Israeli Air Force against the international airport of Beirut has been felt here around this table. This has justified our reliance on the Security Council. I thank you, Mr. President, and I thank all the delegations who have spoken in a manner so friendly to my country.

155. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel has asked for permission to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

156. Mr. ROSENNE (Israel): I shall be brief. In reply to the statement we have just heard from the representative of Lebanon, I wish to tell him and assure the members of the Council that the Government of Israel is doing no more than claim the right that every self-respecting Government claims, the right to protect its civil aviation wherever it is being deliberately, recklessly or wantonly endangered.

Nothing that the representative of Lebanon has said can obliterate the fact that his country took part a year and a half ago in the genocidal Arab plot against Israel and that Lebanon has supported and continues to support the Arab campaign of encirclement and suffocation of my country.

157. On 5 June 1967, Lebanon declared itself in a state of war with Israel. It undertook military operations against my country, and only belatedly, on 2 August 1967, did it signify its acceptance of the cease-fire.

158. Nor was the representative of Lebanon able to whitewash the responsibilities of his Government in abetting and supporting terrorist activities against Israel, which I mentioned when I spoke earlier this evening. Too often in the past the Security Council has been unable to heed Israeli complaints and to take a clear-cut stand against terrorist attacks in violation of the cease-fire and of the Charter. The result has been an increased spiral of violence, fostered by those who draw benefits from turmoil and chaos, whose familiar voice we have heard again tonight.

159. My delegation ventures to hope that, in accordance with the agenda that the Security Council has adopted, the Council will deal equally with the complaint of my delegation and not limit itself, as some members of the Council seem to desire, merely to the complaint submitted by the Beirut Government. When the Security Council adopted its cease-fire resolution in June 1967 it clearly intended to call for a complete cease-fire. It never contemplated for one moment that one party, the Arab party, would be free to evade its obligations by dressing up its armed forces in the guise of irregulars and terrorists. In that regard the excuse we hear time and time again, and we heard again tonight, is a flimsy one which has been sedulously fostered by a number of statements made in this Council from time to time—and we have heard them again tonight.

160. The action of 28 December was the inescapable consequence of the prior action of 26 December and of the failure of the Lebanese Government to take adequate measures to prevent any repetition thereof. My delegation respectfully invites the Council to face up to the challenge that the Arab terror poses for it. Terror warfare in violation of the cease-fire must be stopped. Only then will the way be open to a freely negotiated and freely accepted peace, which alone will bring tranquillity, security and hope to the peoples of the Middle East.

161. The PRESIDENT: No further speakers are inscribed on my list to speak at this stage. I have conducted informal consultations with members of the Council, and it appears that the preference of the Council is to schedule a meeting for tomorrow at 9 p.m. and to use the time between now and then for intensive consultations. I shall make myself available for such consultations among all members. If there is no objection to that proposition, I shall adjourn the meeting until 9 p.m. tomorrow.

*The meeting rose at 10.50 p.m.*

---

#### **HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS**

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

#### **COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES**

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

#### **КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ**

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

#### **COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS**

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

---