

UNITED NATIONS

UN LIBRARY

AUG 12 1980



UN/SA COLLECTION
SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

1736th MEETING: 13 AUGUST 1973

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1736)	1
Welcome to Sir Donald Maitland, representative of the United Kingdom, and expression of thanks to the retiring President	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 11 August 1973 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10983)	1

Y9A921- 111
009 8 1 1 1 1
NOTED 1100 431111

NOTE

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

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

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

SEVENTEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 13 August 1973, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. John SCALI (United States of America).

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/1736)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 11 August 1973 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10983).

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

Welcome to Sir Donald Maitland, representative of the United Kingdom, and expression of thanks to the retiring President

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like to put aside my gavel for a moment to bid a very warm welcome to Sir Donald Maitland, who makes his initial appearance in this chamber as representative of the United Kingdom scarcely 24 hours after his arrival in New York. I also wish to express for my own delegation and for the entire Council deep appreciation for the distinguished leadership provided the Council during the month of July by the United Kingdom Mission. We say "Thank you" to Sir Colin Crowe, who came back to New York expressly to preside over the resumed Middle East debate. His impeccable performance added a chapter to the record of an outstanding Briton who will be long remembered by us all. I might also say "Thank you" to Sir Kenneth Jamieson for his valuable contributions to our work during July.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 11 August 1973 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10983)

2. The PRESIDENT: A letter has today been addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representative

of Lebanon, requesting that he be invited to participate in the discussion of this item without the right to vote. If I hear no objection I shall, in accordance with the usual practice, proceed to invite the representative of Lebanon to take a place at the Council table in order to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. E. Ghorra (Lebanon) took a place at the Security Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: I have also today received a letter from the representative of Israel in which he requests an invitation to participate in the discussion of the question before the Council without the right to vote. In accordance with the usual practice and if there is no objection, propose to invite the representative of Israel to take a place at the Council table in order to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel) took a place at the Security Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT: Letters have also been addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Iraq and Egypt in which they ask to be invited to participate in the Council's discussion without the right to vote. I would suggest that, in view of the limited number of places at the Council table, the representatives I have just mentioned be invited to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, and that they be invited to be seated at the Council table when they are called upon to speak. There being no objection, I now invite the representatives of Iraq and Egypt to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. K. Al-Shaikhly (Iraq) and Mr. A. E. Abdel Meguid (Egypt) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT: The Council will now begin its consideration of the question placed on its agenda this afternoon, which is based on the complaint of the Government of Lebanon contained in a letter dated 11 August 1973 from the representative of Lebanon to the President of the Security Council and circulated in document S/10983. Upon receipt of that letter, which requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council, I instituted consultations with members of the Council and, with their concurrence, arranged for the scheduling of this meeting.

6. I should also like to draw attention to document S/10984, which contains the text of a letter addressed to

me on 11 August by the representative of Iraq in connexion with the item just included in the Council's agenda.

7. The first name inscribed on my list of speakers for the discussion of the question before the Council is the representative of Lebanon on whom I now call.

8. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): Mr. President, as you assume for the first time the presidency of the Security Council, it gives me pleasure to extend to you my congratulations and my best wishes for your success. We trust that under your presidency the Council will be able to make significant moves forward in improving conditions for international peace and security.

9. I also wish to thank the members of the Council for having convened this meeting at such very short notice.

10. This month was presumed to be one of relaxation for the members of the Council. It was generally believed that it would be an uneventful one, one in which quiet diplomacy and the visit of the Secretary-General to the Middle East would create the conditions needed to start once more efforts for a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

11. Last month, in its habitual fashion the Israeli Government attempted to deceive the Council once more during the debate on the Middle East problem. The Israeli delegation went to great lengths to assert that what it described as a mechanical, numerical and undemocratic decision would, if taken by the Council, constitute a blow to the efforts of diplomacy and would wreck the chances for peace. But how soon that apparently innocent pretense has been belied, and how soon the deceit has been exposed. We trust that this time the totality of the Council can be convinced that Israeli falsehoods have always been intended to borrow more time and, to that end, to hoodwink international public opinion.

12. I have been instructed by the Government of Lebanon to request the convening of this meeting of the Security Council to deal with a grave and unprecedented act of Israeli air piracy, an act which at the same time violated Lebanon's air space and sovereignty. Allow me first to put on record the facts.

13. On 10 August 1973, between 2045 and 2220 hours, Beirut local time, units of the Israeli Air Force, in separate formations, penetrated Lebanese air space at different altitudes ranging from 4,000 to 10,000 feet and flew over different areas of central and southern Lebanon. Some of these units circulated in the air space over the Beirut area, between El-Damour in the south and Jounieh in the north, including the air space over the Beirut International Airport, which at the time was busy with the heavy traffic of departing and arriving civilian aircraft. The activities of the Israeli Air Force thus seriously endangered the security and safety of civil aviation in the air space over the International Airport of Beirut.

14. At 2100 hours, a civilian Caravelle airliner belonging to Middle East Airlines and on lease to Iraqi Airways had prepared to take off from Beirut to Baghdad. The Beirut

control tower informed the pilot of the plane, as well as pilots of other planes, of the situation prevailing in the air space over the airport because of the presence of the Israeli military planes, and suggested to him that he delay his departure, which he did. After a while, the pilot requested that he be allowed to take off, using runway No. 3 instead of runway No. 21, which had originally been assigned to him, in order to avoid ascending southward. The control tower allowed him to take off.

15. At 2135 hours, that is, moments after the plane had taken off, two Israeli Mirage jet fighters dived towards the plane and reached it at a point west of the town of Byblos and ordered it to follow them. One of the Israeli jets contacted the pilot by wireless and ordered him to stay at an altitude of 6,500 feet. The pilot was forced to follow the two Israeli military jets for 45 miles west of the Lebanese coast and then to turn towards the south, where the hijacked plane entered Israeli air space. The plane was forced to land at an Israeli military air base under the threat of being shot down. The plane was carrying 74 passengers of various nationalities, mainly Lebanese and Iraqis, as well as a crew of seven Lebanese.

16. As soon as the Lebanese civilian plane landed, it was ordered to open its doors, and members of the Israeli armed forces in combat uniforms and with guns in their hands broke into it. They inspected it and ordered the passengers and the crew out, whereupon they were subjected to military interrogation. After the plane had been forcibly detained for over two hours at the military base—I underline the words "military base"—it was permitted to take off and it landed at the Beirut airport at 1.15 a.m. on 11 August 1973. The pilot of the hijacked plane stated after his return that he had had to comply with the orders given to him to ensure the safety of the passengers for he did not want to have his plane and passengers meet the tragic fate which the Libyan plane and its 115 passengers had met on 21 February 1973, when it was shot down by the Israeli Air force in Sinai.

17. The conclusion we draw from those facts is simple and crystal clear and provides no room for double or dubious interpretation. That conclusion is that Israel has engaged as a State in an act of air piracy, of hijacking, of State terrorism. In other words, Israel has committed an act of State terrorism against international law. It already had the distinction of being the only State Member of the United Nations condemned for aggression and kidnapping. Now it has added to its record the crime of premeditated and well-planned hijacking.

18. It is an indisputable fact that the Israeli authorities, which conceived, planned and carried out that operation, have either sunk to the level of hijackers or elevated hijacking to the level of a State policy. In either case, the culpability, avowed and defended by General Moshe Dayan, Minister of Defence of Israel, is proven beyond any doubt. This new act, violating Lebanon's air space and sovereignty, breaching international law and endangering the safety of international civil aviation, has aroused a storm of worldwide public indignation and condemnation.

19. It would not be difficult for me to apprise the Council of all the repercussions that this incident has had in the

world but I shall cite only a few examples which manifest the strong reactions it has aroused. *The Sunday Express* of London described it as an "act much more than a crime". *The Observer* stated that "The hijacking of a civilian airliner in the Lebanese air space is a blow directed against the international community as a whole, and it is a grave matter when it is directed from a Government and not from terrorists." *The Guardian* asked: "Is it a wise policy to break international law? The answer is 'no'. The hijacking of a civilian airliner blows up Israel's request to take measures against countries involved in aerial hijacking." *The Times* of London opined that: "Defying international law and the international community seems to be a habit deeply rooted in the Israelis." The Spanish newspaper *Nuevo Diario* wrote: "This act is an unjustifiable aggression which makes a mockery of international conventions and agreements. The international community must condemn this act most vigorously." The Yugoslavian newspaper *Borba* wrote the following: "This is an ugly act of piracy in defiance of international law and security." The paper also condemned Israel's horrible conspiracy to murder all the leaders of the Palestine movements, to whom Israel denies their right to live free in an independent State. The French newspapers *Le Monde*, *Les Echos*, *l'Humanité* and *Le Parisien* have severely criticized and deplored this act of Israel.

20. An official spokesman of the United States State Department deplored the deviation of the plane and the violation of Lebanon's sovereignty and of international law. A spokesman for the French Government described it as "condemnable". The British Airline Pilots Association said in a statement: "This act makes nonsense of Israel's support last December of a resolution to impose sanctions against countries responsible for such acts. This incident clearly demonstrates that Israel is not fit to be a member of a civilized organization like the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). A country which makes hijacking a tool of its political policy is not fit to be a member of ICAO." The 2,000-member Guild of Air Pilots called for the expulsion of Israel from ICAO for air piracy in intercepting the Arab passenger plane over Lebanon and forcing it to fly to Israel. Even the association of Israeli pilots has condemned the incident.

21. The chain of Israel's acts of aggression against Lebanon is indeed a long one. It began with the most dastardly attack on the International Airport of Beirut on 28 December 1968, when almost the totality of Lebanon's civilian air fleet was destroyed. This was the first act of its kind perpetrated by any State against international civil aviation.

22. The Security Council in its resolution 262 (1968) of 31 December 1968 condemned Israel for that attack and solemnly warned Israel against repeating it.

23. However, it is common knowledge that Israel, in defiance of that resolution and subsequent ones, unleashed several attacks against Lebanon which resulted in heavy loss of life, destruction of towns and villages, and disruption of the peaceful life of the Lebanese people. Those acts were in defiance not only of the Council's resolutions but also of the Charter, of the Lebanese-Israeli Armistice Agreement and of international law and morality.

24. The Council has before it the facts about a clear-cut case of an act of State piracy or State hijacking. It was conceived, planned and executed under Israeli Government orders and by units of Israel's Air Force. It violates all international norms and instruments governing the safety of international civil aviation. It constitutes a flagrant violation of Lebanon's sovereignty.

25. The assertion of the Israeli Defence Minister that his Government will undertake similar actions in the future—to achieve hidden and sinister objectives—constitutes a constant threat not only against Lebanon's sovereignty and safety of its civil aviation but also against those of other Arab and non-Arab Governments.

26. The Israeli Government is embarking on a dangerous course. It is arrogating to itself the power to establish a special law outside and above that of the United Nations. In accordance with that law it is kidnapping people in other countries and trying them for supposed crimes they have never committed. It has launched its squads of God's wrath to commit murders in different European capitals. It has resorted to the falsification of passports of several nationalities to cover the sinister activities of its agents. The international community can no longer tolerate this lawless behaviour and policy of a State Member of the United Nations.

27. Mrs. Meir has vowed to fight the Palestinians wherever they are and as far as Israel's arm can reach. General Dayan, uninhibited and unperturbed by the indignation the act of his Air Force has aroused, has promised more, similar operations. We believe that the Council has a duty to face up to this arrogant challenge to and defiance of the United Nations and international law.

28. In the face of repeated acts of aggression perpetrated by Israel against Lebanon, my Government finds no other recourse than to bring our cases before the Security Council, with the persistent hope that the Council will meet its responsibilities under the Charter and take the necessary measures to bring Israel under the rule of international law.

29. In addressing itself to the Council today, the Lebanese Government does not seek to demonstrate once more its adherence to the United Nations and its faithful belief in the Charter and the purposes and principles enshrined in it or its reliance on the new legal order that our Organization is engaged in strengthening. The position of Lebanon vis-à-vis the United Nations is well known and does not need any testimony on my part. But what I wish to stress to the Council is the fact that the resolutions which it has adopted on all but one of our complaints may have given us some temporary solace and satisfaction; they may have carried some political and moral weight—soon to vanish. But the Council knows very well the problem caused by the recalcitrant aggressor, Israel. In the face of Israel's continued defiance, the Council has failed to move beyond condemnation, warning and statements of some basic principles and has failed to adopt meaningful and decisive measures which, if taken at the appropriate time, not only would have prevented the aggressor from repeating its acts but would have stopped the constant deterioration of the situation in the Middle East and would have enhanced the

role of the Council in its search for ways and means to settle the Middle East problem.

30. The Council has wide powers under the Charter to adopt the desired measures to prevent an adventurer State like Israel from embarking on varying courses endangering international peace and security. As one of the small Members of the United Nations, we have the duty and also the right to warn that constant inaction by the Council will result in the erosion of the faith which these nations have placed in it. We do not view the Council with contempt and speak of it in derision, as do the government officials and representatives of Israel. We hold the United Nations and the Council in high esteem and respect. We look at it not as a platform for propaganda but as an organ endowed with a historic role to make peace a living reality for our generation and future generations. We would like the Security Council to be a resounding success in preserving peace so that humanity at large may be the beneficiary.

31. The Lebanese Government trusts that in the present case the Council can adopt a resolution condemning in the strongest terms the abominable act perpetrated by Israel. We feel that it should address a solemn warning to Israel to refrain from repetition of its acts and the violation of Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity. As the act under consideration constitutes an unprecedented threat to the safety of international civil aviation, the Council has the responsibility to bring the resolution it may adopt on this matter to the attention of ICAO for its consideration.

32. The PRESIDENT: I now invite the representative of Iraq to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

33. Mr. AL-SHAikhLY (Iraq): I should like first to thank the members of the Security Council for allowing me to participate in the Council's discussion of yet another Israeli act of aggression, committed in this instance against Iraq directly.

34. The complaint before the Council today concerns a government-planned hijacking of a civilian airliner in the air space of a sovereign State. A Middle East Airlines Caravelle on charter to Iraqi Airways was intercepted shortly after take-off from Beirut International Airport by two Israeli Air Force Jets on Friday, 10 August. The airliner, which was en route to Baghdad, was then forced to land at a military airfield somewhere in occupied Palestine, where the passengers and crew were forced to leave the plane at gunpoint and subjected to hours of detention and interrogation.

35. The official Zionist spokesmen have sought to justify their act of piracy by declaring that they were after some Palestinian leaders who were supposed to be among the passengers. Twenty-five years after their initial aggression against the Palestinian people, the Zionists are not satisfied with having ejected the majority of that people from their ancestral homeland and kept the remnant in subjugation as third-class persons living under occupation. The Zionist aggressors now fabricate excuses to abduct or to murder the national leaders and the intellectuals of this tenacious people which Israel has failed to eliminate from the face of

the earth and whose legitimate rights are daily gaining recognition and support, not only within the United Nations but also in the world at large. This fact disturbs the Zionist usurpers; it prevents them from enjoying the fruits of their aggression and drives them to ever-greater acts of madness and violence.

36. The abduction of the civilian airliner over Lebanese air space is not only the latest act of aggression in the long history of the Zionists' violations of the principles and purposes of the Charter and all the norms and practices of international law; it is a unique and shocking precedent that a State Member of the United Nations declares piracy as an instrument of national policy. This act of international air piracy confirms the serious and continued threat to international civil aviation by Israeli military actions. The world has not yet forgotten the Israeli attack on Beirut's International Airport in December 1968 nor the massacre of the 106 passengers on the Libyan airliner which the Israelis shot down in cold blood over occupied Sinai last February. Indeed, those criminal acts prove that militarist Israel, contemptuous of international law and defiant of the United Nations, poses a permanent threat to international peace and security.

37. The Security Council has repeatedly warned Israel over the years that its aggressions and grave violations of the Charter would not be tolerated. The Council has notified the aggressors that it would have to consider further and more effective steps, as envisaged in the Charter, to ensure against repetition of such acts. Alas, the Council has so far failed to put its words into action, and the Zionists continue their aggressions and violations with impunity.

38. There can be no doubt now that the Zionists are greatly encouraged in their aggressions by the endless support—military, political, diplomatic and financial—which they receive from Washington. This support, signifying encouragement, is the cornerstone of United States policy in the Middle East. The Zionists' total confidence that American support will be forthcoming, no matter what the circumstances or the consequences may be, was amply justified when the United States promised the aggressor a further supply of Phantoms on the morrow of the massacre of the passengers of the Libyan plane. It is obvious now that the American vetoes which prevented the Council last year from adopting a draft resolution calling for no more than a cease-fire and again, a few weeks ago, prevented the Council's condemnation of Israel's acts of aggression in the area have spurred the Zionists in their latest aggression.

39. The persistence of the Zionists in challenging the world Organization should prompt the Council to adopt not merely verbal condemnations and further warnings, but rather immediate steps for the application of disciplinary measures against this international outlaw, which has been a Member of the Organization illegally and under false pretenses for far too long.

40. Perhaps in view of the American veto, this Council no longer has the power to establish peace and security in our region, as it is the Council's primary responsibility to do. It remains, however, the duty of the Council to assert its

moral authority, notwithstanding the right of my country to adopt all appropriate measures in self-defence in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

41. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and make his statement.

42. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from French*): In taking the floor today in the very serious circumstances created by Israeli aggression against Lebanon, which threatened the security of that country and interfered with the proper operation of an international civil airliner, my delegation shares the indignation of world public opinion at this disgraceful act of state piracy committed by Israel.

43. It is certainly not our intention here to engage in polemics or acrimonious debates; we have asked to participate in this discussion because we are convinced that it is our duty to support the complaint of our brother, Lebanon, and to unmask the true face of Israel: Israel, the pirate; Israel, the terrorist.

44. The flagrant aggression which Israel has just committed against Lebanon, violating its air space with Israeli fighter planes and forcing a civilian airplane belonging to the Middle East Airlines to change its flight direction, and to land at an Israeli military airport, is an act of international piracy and new evidence of the bad faith shown by Israel towards peace in the Middle East. It is striking proof of violation of the Charter of the United Nations, and of Israel's constant challenge to the international Organization. Moreover, it is a premeditated violation of the Chicago Convention on international civil aviation,¹ and a grave attack on the part of a signatory against the development of civil aviation in the entire world.

45. These successive infringements of the Charter and of international conventions pose a threat to world security. In this connexion, the preamble of the Chicago Convention is very clear, and to prevent any abuses of this sort article 3(c) of that Convention stipulates that:

"No aircraft of any State party shall overfly the territory of another State or land upon it unless specifically authorized to do so, and only in conformity with the conditions of such authorization".

46. This act of piracy just committed by Israel against a Lebanese civil aircraft cannot be dissociated from the general situation now obtaining in the Middle East, as our brother Ambassador Odera-Jowi of Kenya said so well in the course of the discussion which took place in the Security Council following the Lebanese complaint of April 1973:

"... the complaint by Lebanon cannot be treated outside its basic Middle East context, because that would amount to the Council's trying to treat only the visible symptoms of a malignant cancer without recognizing the basic causes of the disease". [1709th meeting, para. 10.]

47. This Council therefore has the duty of eliminating the causes of tension in the Middle East so that a just and lasting peace may be established in accordance with the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations.

48. The crux of the Middle East problem is to be found in the fact that the people of Palestine have been deprived of their legitimate rights; their right to self-determination and independence has been denied them for the simple fault of belonging to Palestine. Moreover, this increasing tension in the region finds its explanation in the occupation of the Arab territories since June 1967. This state of affairs will unfortunately continue so long as Israel persists in using force to achieve its expansionist goals, so long as Israel continues to occupy Arab territories and to deny the very existence of the Palestinian people.

49. But Israel in the arrogance which has motivated it since its 1967 military aggression, forgets what an eminent French writer, Mr. Marc Hillel, wrote in his book entitled *Israël en danger de paix*, published in Paris in 1968. He said:

"Created to ensure peace and tranquility to men and women who really needed it, Israel could not, by the very nature of things, do anything other than offer them tension on their borders, an uncertain future, and war".

50. Indeed, far from ensuring peace, Tel Aviv has become the capital of all the Machiavellian plans of sadistic terrorism that are being conceived and carried out to serve its territorial ambitions against the independence, security and territorial integrity of the neighbouring States. It is the author of Arab genocide and the producer of an acute form of racism. Its field of action is no longer limited to its own territory; its tentacles extend beyond international frontiers, with no regard for custom or for international law, threatening by its subversive acts the very sovereignty of countries of such absolute neutrality as Switzerland, for example.

51. We all remember the fraudulent methods by which it obtained the plans of the Mirage on the territory of the Swiss Confederation. They are well known to all. The assassination of a Moroccan civilian in Norway, the falsification of British, Belgian, German and, most recently, Danish passports indicate the criminal character of the Zionist régime implanted in Israel and of its foreign affiliates.

52. By prosecuting in Israel a group of 10 Arab and other civilians who were kidnapped in the territories of autonomous and sovereign countries, Israel arrogates to itself the role of an international policeman without much regard for international morality or law. Its present as well as its past are heavy with countless criminal acts, which, I am sure, the members of the Council recall. Is it possible to forget the Israeli aggression against the village of Bahr El-Baquar in Egypt, where innocent school children died tragically? Can one forget the intimidation and the terrorism carried out each day by the Israeli authorities against the Arab population of the occupied territories?

53. The Council is meeting this time at the request of Lebanon, which has just become the object of a new act of

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 15, p. 295.

aggression by Israel. That aggression, which was committed by Israel on 10 August 1973 against the national sovereignty of Lebanon, against nationals of several countries and against the security of international civilian aviation, is considered as an act of State terrorism, since the perpetrators of this act of terrorism are the highest Israeli authorities, which have even tried to justify their motives. In that regard we have learned of the justification which the Minister of Defence of Israel, General Dayan, claimed to give on 11 August for this premeditated aggression. It appears that the purpose of this Zionist terrorist practice is pure genocide against the Palestinian people and all those who resist Israeli aggressive and expansionist policies in the other Arab States.

54. According to the observations submitted by States to the *Ad Hoc* Committee on International Terrorism in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3034 (XXVII), several countries, including Switzerland, have established a distinction between the terrorist behaviour of individuals and the illicit acts of violence committed by States themselves, which constitute a direct violation of international law.² The aggression perpetrated by Israel on 10 August 1973 is nothing but an act of State terrorism in accordance with that distinction. This State terrorism is the most dangerous form of violence and constitutes a threat to the security of peoples. This form of terrorism, which is practised by Israel, is the primary cause of the violence and blackmail which the world is witnessing in the Middle East. Israel makes acts of terrorism the very core of its official policy; indeed the Zionist State was founded and is maintained on this official and venturesome practice.

55. Israeli fighter planes flew over Lebanese territory on 10 August, violating Lebanese air space. They intercepted a civilian aircraft belonging to Middle East Airways, which was chartered by Iraqi Airways. The Israeli fighter planes threatened this civilian aircraft with the use of force and compelled it to land at an Israeli military airport, as described by the representative of Lebanon. This air piracy is only one example of the odious barbaric acts perpetrated by a State; it is an act of State terrorism directed against another State. This act constitutes a violation of international law; it is an infringement on the sovereignty of another State; it is a threat to the security of peoples.

56. This Israeli aggression is considered as an international crime of a unique nature, since the following elements are grouped within it: first, a premeditated violation of Lebanese air space; second, a violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon; third, a threat to international peace and security committed by a State Member of the United Nations; fourth, a hijacking of a civilian aircraft belonging to another State by the use of the armed force of Israeli fighter planes acting under instructions from the highest Israeli authorities, which is a threat to the security of international civil aviation; fifth, an illegal and totally unjustified procedure—in fact quite an extraordinary procedure—whereby a control of the passports and a verification of the identity of the passengers were undertaken.

57. This act of State terrorism committed by Israel is a flagrant violation of the purposes and principles of the

Charter of the United Nations, of resolutions adopted by the United Nations and of Conventions adopted under the aegis of ICAO concerning the protection and safety of civil aviation and, in particular, the Tokyo Convention of 1963, the Hague Convention of 1970 and the Montreal Convention of 1971.

58. The international community must co-operate in order to put an end to the criminal terrorism of Israel against the Palestinian people and against the neighbouring Arab States, some of whose territories are occupied by the terrorist forces of Israel. The crimes perpetrated by Israel against the inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories constitute the gravest source of unprecedented barbarism of international terrorism.

59. On 10 August the world witnessed a new invention of terrorism which is now added to the earlier forms accumulating in the archives of Israeli terrorism.

60. On many occasions the Security Council has condemned Israel for other aggressions and other acts of international terrorism. Other international organizations have also condemned the acts of international terrorism practised by the Israeli State. However, it appears that the resolutions, condemnations and measures adopted so far have not been sufficient to put an end to the criminal practices followed by Israel, which considers itself to be above the law.

61. The Israeli record of acts in violation of the Charter of the United Nations is considerable. The most recent illustrations are its aggression against Egypt, Syria and Jordan in 1967 and the continuation of its occupation of the territories seized during that conflict.

62. It was Israel which, on 23 June 1972, invaded Lebanese territory with its armed forces and which, in a premeditated ambush, kidnapped four Syrian officers and one Lebanese officer who were taking part in a traditional visit by officers of the Syrian army to those of Lebanon. This act was condemned by the Security Council in its resolution 316 (1972).

63. Israel's record, in its behaviour and in its attitude towards the Convention on international civil aviation, includes, *inter alia*, the perfidious attack by the military forces of Israel against the Beirut airport on 28 December 1968, the result of which was the destruction of 13 civilian and commercial aircraft. This flagrant aggression was also condemned by the Security Council, in resolution 262 (1968).

64. Israel again, on 21 February 1973, used its Air Force to destroy a Libyan civilian aircraft in the air, causing the death of 108 innocent victims. The Assembly of ICAO condemned this act in its resolution A-19-1.

65. That recapitulation shows us all that Israel is a Zionist undertaking dedicated to aggression and terrorism. Striving to become the master of the Middle East by carrying out its plans of territorial expansion, Israel indulges in crimes, piracy, robbery and terrorism and then audaciously tries to legalize its crime by using numberless vain pretexts.

² See document A/AC.160/1/Add.1.

66. The premeditated violation of Lebanese air space which was committed by Israel in order to carry out its piracy only shatters further peace and security in the Middle East, already shattered by events in progress. It only widens even more the gap which exists between Israel and the neighbouring countries. This ignoble and heinous act can in no way find justification in the international order to which we all belong. But is it not significant that this aggressive behaviour on the part of Israel occurs after the long debates in the Security Council a few weeks ago during which 14 Member States, seeking a peaceful solution, condemned Israel for the continuation of its occupation of the Arab territories invaded on 5 June 1967? Is it not equally significant that this act occurs in the wake of the United States veto—this veto which blocked the efforts of 14 members anxious to establish a just and lasting peace in accordance with the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity and in accordance with the aspirations of all those who sincerely wish to see peace in the Middle East?

67. Here are the results of the veto: Israel commits aggression, Israel has nothing but contempt for the international Organization, Israel is encouraged and its appetite has grown for the lure is enormous and its rapacity has increased. Its thirst for terrorism could be quenched only if the sources of support provided to it by the veto and by the most sophisticated weapons run dry. Such is the very clearly exposed relation of cause and effect of the act committed by Israel on 10 August.

68. Ambassador Scali, during the Security Council meeting of 26 July 1973, following the veto he had just cast in favour of Israel, said the following at the end of his statement:

“Our vote today was a carefully considered action calculated to move the United Nations away from empty judgements on the past and toward concrete, positive results in the real world.” [1735th meeting, para. 136.]

69. The logical consequence of that statement prompts us to ask the representative of the United States: In the light of the Israeli actions, what were these concrete, positive results? Piracy, robbery, kidnapping of innocent human beings, attacks against civilian aircraft in the air, State terrorism exercised by Israel—is that what the representative of the United States had in mind when he made his statement before the Council?

70. The blind and unobjective support of Israel by the United States is creating very serious and dangerous consequences and we wonder whether the United States is not in fact trying to legitimize acts condemned by international law and the Charter, to legalize the violation of the national sovereignty of the States of the Third world and the use of force for criminal ends. It is an irony of fate that the United States and its ally and protégé, Israel, which claim that they are suffering from air piracy, are in fact practising it—one as the principal author and the other as a co-author and generous supplier of the weapon used for the crime.

71. The United States is mistaken if it believes that by supporting Israel it is preserving and protecting its interests

in the Middle East. One asks of a State that Providence has blessed with such wealth and power that it be less partial and more objective in a conflict which has caused only suffering and injustice to the Arab people.

72. What are we trying to obtain from the Council? To condemn Israel is not an effective remedy to restore balance to the Middle East because the only way to prevent the aggressor from continuing his crimes is punishment, the application of the sanctions stipulated in the Charter that we are asking the members of the Council to apply to Israel—and it is the members of this Council who are responsible for the preservation of peace and international security. We are asking them to act in order to prevent the chaos which Israel is spreading in this region. We are asking them to act in order to put an end to its crimes, to its piracy and to its terrorism. We are asking them to act to prevent the dangerous recidivism of Israel. We are asking them to act in order to establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

73. I shall conclude by recalling here what was said by a great American, George Washington:

“Observe good faith and justice towards all nations and beware inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachment for others... passionate attachment facilitates the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists”.³

74. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Israel, upon whom I now call.

75. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Mr. President, I should like to extend to you my delegation's best wishes for success in your high office. Sharing the profound esteem in which you are held, I would add an expression of hope that perhaps during your term of office the Security Council might be permitted to deal with an aspect of the Middle East situation with justice and impartiality.

76. In Beirut and Damascus, in Cairo, Baghdad and Tripoli, Arab Governments are sheltering and assisting murder gangs openly engaged in the indiscriminate killing of innocent civilians at international airports, in air piracy by hijacking and blowing-up passenger aircraft, in the slaughter of athletes, diplomats and other defenceless persons. These savage atrocities are being perpetrated for the avowed purpose of destroying a State Member of the United Nations and depriving its people of the right to self-determination and independence. There is not a single precept of law and morality that these bloodthirsty murderers of guiltless men, women and children are not violating. There is not a single principle of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations that is not torn asunder by the Arab Governments which harbour, protect and connive with the terror organizations.

77. Yet these selfsame Governments object when Israel refuses to acquiesce in the persistent attacks on its life and

³ Quoted in English by the speaker.

on the lives of its citizens and takes measures to defend itself and to eradicate the scourge of barbaric terrorism. The organizers of the Lod massacre are still on the loose. The surviving murderers of the Israeli athletes in Munich have been released to the Arab States, where they were given a hero's welcome. The leaders of Fatah and its organ Black September, the Popular Front and similar organizations are still in their headquarters in Arab capitals, travelling freely from one conference to another, mapping out the slaughter of innocents. Lebanon and Iraq and Egypt feel, however, that Israel must do nothing about it. Israel categorically rejects such counsel. Those who have turned the world into a dangerous jungle cannot complain that the man-killing beasts in it are being pursued, or that the pursuit is conducted not necessarily in white silken gloves.

78. Several weeks ago a Japanese civil aircraft was hijacked by agents of the Popular Front headed by George Habash, apparently in an abortive attempt to blow it up or threaten to blow it up by crash-landing in an Israeli town. On 19 July an Arab assassin equipped with a machine-gun tried to break into a crowded El-Al office in Athens in order to massacre the passengers assembled there. On 5 August two Popular Front terrorists armed with grenades and sub-machine-guns attacked passengers in an Athens airport transit lounge, killing three and injuring more than 50. The only regret expressed by these murderers in a Greek court was that their victims were not Jews on their way to Israel.

79. In the evening of 10 August Israeli air force planes diverted an Iraqi-chartered Lebanese aircraft on a flight between Beirut and Baghdad. There was reason to believe that several terrorist leaders responsible for crimes such as those mentioned, and in particular the notorious George Habash, were on the flight. After the identity of the passengers had been checked, the aircraft, with all aboard, was allowed to proceed to its destination.

80. On the one hand, there is thus heinous premeditated murder; on the other, there is an effort to prevent murder. On the one hand, there is merciless random killing for the sake of killing; on the other, there is an attempt to seize killers but to avoid hurting the innocent. Enlightened world opinion will not fail to notice that the Security Council was convened to discuss a two-hour detention of an aeroplane for the purpose of weeding out international murderers while silence had been imposed on the Council regarding the carnage in Athens, Khartoum, Munich and Lod.

81. The Arab terrorists, operating with the permission, support and complicity of Arab Governments, stand accused of waging a persistent campaign of world-wide bloodshed directed against helpless civilians in utter mockery of the sovereignty of States and of fundamental human rights. Juxtaposed to this is the Arab charge that in the pursuit of such terrorists Israel had entered into Lebanese airspace and diverted a Lebanese aeroplane. Surely the sanctity of human life comes before the sanctity of air—all the more so when a State allows its territory and its airspace to be used for the promotion of terror warfare against a neighbouring country.

82. Only if international concepts are completely warped and principles of humanity callously disregarded can

exception be taken to the struggle against international terrorism and air piracy waged by Israel. This struggle is directed against criminals who endanger the very fabric of international relations. If others are affected, it is only an incidental occurrence that cannot override the necessity and legitimacy of the struggle. No formalistic argumentation can justify interference with efforts to put an end to premeditated, indiscriminate murder. Only if we agree to live in a world of inverted values, can international terrorism and air piracy, as carried on by the Arab murder organizations, be allowed to invoke some legal notions derived from entirely different circumstances and to seek protection behind them. The murderers of children on schoolbuses, the dispatchers of letter-bombs through the mails, the barbarians who kill men, women and children at airports and in civil aircraft have no right to refuge in town or village, on the ground or in the air. Mankind is confronted today with a situation similar to the days when pirates roamed the seven seas attacking ships, killing, maiming and taking hostages. As it was then in the case of the seas, striking today at air pirates and terrorists—enemies of mankind—is imperative and justified at all times and everywhere.

83. Measures by individual States against terrorism have become even more urgent and indispensable as a result of the sabotage by Arab States of all international action. The attempt at last year's General Assembly session to take concrete steps for the suppression of terrorism was torpedoed by Arab delegations and their supporters. They did the same in the *Ad Hoc* Committee on International Terrorism, which, in a session lasting four weeks, devoted only two days to the examination of measures against terrorist attacks and ended its discussions in dismal failure and utter helplessness. The absence of effective international action against terrorism is dramatically illustrated, for instance, by the fact that 70 of the 110 Arab terror agents apprehended in various countries, including members of this Council, have been freed without trial or punishment and allowed to rejoin their murder organizations in Arab States. These developments have undoubtedly encouraged the terror groups to pursue their nefarious crimes.

84. Israel, still warding off Arab warfare, launched against it 25 years ago, cannot forgo its right to self-defence and the duty to protect its citizens merely because Arab Governments have thwarted international measures against terrorism. Neither can Israel forgo military defence action against terrorism, said to be improper in normal international conditions, while Arab States are actively carrying on with their belligerency and permit Arab attacks against Israel to be organized and initiated from their territories. The Government of Israel has always observed, and will continue to observe, the cease-fire on the basis of reciprocity. By permitting the use of their territories as bases for armed attacks against Israel, by harbouring the headquarters and training camps of the terror organizations, by allowing leaders of the murder squads to dwell in and move freely in and out of their cities, Arab Governments are guilty of flagrant violations of the cease-fire. By making it possible for murderers such as Yassir Arafat and George Habash to operate from Beirut, to fly abroad without hindrance and then to return to Beirut, the Lebanese authorities show no regard for Israel's rights under the

cease-fire and, therefore, cannot complain that Israel does not respect their rights.

85. As for Iraq, which has joined Lebanon's complaint, it has not even accepted the 1967 cease-fire. In fact, following the 1948 Arab invasion of Israel, in which it had participated, Iraq refused to conclude an armistice and has continued ever since to negate Israel's right to independence, repeatedly rejecting all thought of peace with Israel. Iraq, through its representative, declared again today that independent Israel, a Member of the United Nations, is "occupied Palestine". Simultaneously, Iraq has been a principal supporter of terror warfare against Israel, with George Habash and his Popular Front as the objects of special Iraqi attention and assistance. The Iraqi position on terrorist activities has been expressed as follows in the Government-controlled daily *Al-Noor*:

"Seizing Israeli planes and their destruction, kidnapping Israelis and people serving the Israelis, bombing Israeli institutions and paralysing Israel's information media—this strengthens the resistance movement and its influence is no less effective than that of military operations."

86. In its attitude towards Israel, Iraq has thus completely repudiated international law and the Charter of the United Nations. It is farcical for Iraq to base any of its arguments on principles of law or provisions of the Charter. Nothing could throw more light on the situation confronting Israel than Iraq's aligning itself with Lebanon's complaint to reiterate in the Security Council the view that Israel has no right to exist. May I suggest that members of the Council ponder over this aspect of the problem before pronouncing themselves on Israel's struggle to vindicate its right to live.

87. Egypt too has joined the chorus. It is never a surprise when Egypt rushes to the defence of Arab terrorism and the Arab terrorist organizations. Without Egypt, there would have been no terror warfare in the Middle East. Without Egypt there would have been no massacres at Lod, at Munich and at Athens. After the 1948 defeat of the invasion of Israel by Arab States, headed by Egypt, it was the Egyptian Government that organized the first murder squads and sent them out on their missions of death against Israeli school children in their classrooms, against Israeli women asleep at night in their houses, against Israeli men at work in the fields. While Beirut has become in recent years the principal operational headquarters of Arab international terrorism, 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."

88. The assistance given to the terrorist groups was summed up by President Sadat 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."

89. We still remember how on 1 June 1972 the Prime Minister of Egypt publicly praised the massacre at Lod. We still remember how the Egyptian Government refused the request of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany to try to divert the slaughter of Israeli sportsmen at the Munich Olympic Games.

90. We all know that should the Egyptian Government so desire, the terror organizations would cease to exist. As long as they continue their criminal operations, Egypt will be held responsible for their bloody atrocities.

91. By now, little credence is given to the hackneyed pretexts in Lebanon's or Egypt's vain attempts to justify support for Arab terrorism against Israel. By now all know and remember that the objective of the Habashes and Arafats is not to bring about Israeli withdrawal from the cease-fire lines, but to eliminate Israel as a sovereign State and to annihilate its people. All are aware that Arab terrorism, aimed against the Jewish people's right to self-determination, began 50 years ago, and not in 1967. Those who are acquainted with the true situation in Israeli-held territories and the attitude of their inhabitants need no convincing that the paid killers operating from Lebanon or other Arab States are not representative of the Arab population of those territories or of Palestinian Arabs in Arab States. Indeed, the allegation that terrorism is the product of the Palestinian refugee problem cannot stand up to any serious examination. It is a fact that for two decades the presence of large numbers of refugees in Lebanon had not given rise to any terrorist operations on or from Lebanese soil and that such operations began only when Jordan suppressed the terror organizations and it was consequently decided to move their centres and their bases to Lebanon. The whitewashing of the terrorist groups and their notorious leaders ill-behooves the representative of a Government which only recently described them as "an army of occupation" and even had to fight off their attacks in various parts of the country, including the refugee camps of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency in the Near East. The Lebanese authorities' failure to curb this terrorist army of occupation does not change the latter's character, nor the fact that it constitutes a threat against which Israel is entitled to act.

92. This is illustrated to the full by the activities of the Popular Front and its leader, George Habash, who was thought to be on the Lebanese aircraft diverted to Israel. As a matter of fact, Habash himself has confirmed, in the meantime, that it was his intention to board that particular plane and that he changed his plans only at the last minute.

93. The following are some of the attacks carried out by him and his organization:

(a) 23 July 1968: An El-Al airliner en route from Rome to Israel was hijacked and taken to Algiers. The hijackers were immediately released by the Algerian Government, but the Israeli passengers were held as hostages. Under pressure of world opinion, the 10 Israeli women and children passengers were released on 27 July, but the 12 men were detained for five weeks until 31 August.

(b) 26 December 1968: An El-Al plane was attacked at Athens airport. One Israeli passenger was killed and a

stewardess wounded. Two of the Arab terrorists were detained by the Greek authorities.

(c) 18 February 1969: A terror squad of the Popular Front opened fire on an El-Al plane about to take off from Zurich, killing one member of the crew. The assailants were arrested, tried by a Swiss court and sentenced to terms of imprisonment.

(d) 29 August 1969: A TWA airliner en route from Rome to Tel Aviv was hijacked to Damascus by three Popular Front members. After passengers had disembarked there, an explosive charge was set off causing serious damage to the plane. Two Israeli civilians, travelling on the plane, were imprisoned by the Syrian authorities for 98 days.

(e) 17 December 1969: Two British citizens, hired by agents of the Popular Front, were arrested in the act of attempting to blow up an El-Al plane at London airport. Convicted by a court in London, they were sentenced to 10 years imprisonment. The Egyptian military attaché, who was involved in the case, left London.

(f) 21 December 1969: Two Lebanese citizens, agents of the Popular Front, were arrested in Athens and charged with conspiring to hijack a TWA airliner.

(g) 21 February 1970: Members of the Popular Front placed a bomb in a Swissair plane en route from Zurich to Tel Aviv, causing its explosion in mid-air. Forty-seven passengers and crew lost their lives.

(h) 6 September 1970: Three aircraft of Pan American, TWA and Swissair respectively were hijacked by terrorists of the George Habash group. The Pan American plane was taken to Cairo, after a stopover in Beirut. The Arab hijackers placed explosive charges on the plane. On arrival in Cairo the passengers were allowed to disembark and the aircraft was blown up. The TWA and Swissair planes were diverted to Zerqa, Jordan. The hijackers held several hundred passengers as hostages and demanded the release of all Arab terrorists detained in United Kingdom, Switzerland and Germany. On the same day terrorists of the Popular Front tried to seize an El-Al plane in flight from Amsterdam to New York, but were overpowered by members of the crew. One hijacker was killed in the struggle and the other was handed over to the British authorities, when the plane made an emergency landing in London.

(i) 9 September 1970: A BOAC airliner on its way from Bahrain to London was hijacked by a squad of the Popular Front and forced to land in Jordan, its passengers joining the others at Zerqa, already there, as hostages. In exchange for the release of these passengers, all the Arab hijackers detained in the United Kingdom, Switzerland and Germany were set free. The BOAC, TWA and Swissair planes were blown up by the terrorists.

(j) 22 February 1972: A Lufthansa airplane was seized by Arab hijackers and forced to land at Aden in the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. Negotiations for the payment of ransom to the Popular Front were then

conducted in Lebanon, and a sum of \$5 million was paid to the terror organization for the release of the plane. It was widely reported at the time that the sum of \$1 million had been retained by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Yemen.

(k) 30 May 1972: Three Japanese mercenaries trained in Lebanon by the Popular Front arrived at Lod airport on an Air France flight from Rome. With sub-machine guns and hand grenades extracted from their luggage in the passenger terminal, they murdered 24 passengers and wounded 78. Two of the attackers were killed and a third was captured, tried and sentenced to imprisonment in Israel.

(l) December 1972: A terror squad of the Popular Front left Lebanon with instructions to reach Haifa by ship with a view to perpetrating terrorist attacks or, if unsuccessful, committing suicide. The squad was discovered in Greece and its members were returned to Beirut.

94. As already indicated, the recent hijacking of the Japanese aircraft and the murderous attack on passengers at Athens airport were also perpetrated by the Habash organization. Needless to say, the other terrorist groups were also active during that period, especially in assaults on civil aviation.

95. George Habash's views could be summarized by the following excerpts from his statements which appeared in the Popular Front's organ *Al-Hadaf*, on Radio Baghdad, in *Life* magazine and in the German weekly *Stern*:

"The objective is to put an end to Israel's existence."

"It is our right to hit the enemy anywhere."

"To kill a Jew far from the battlefield has more of an effect than killing a hundred of them in battle; it attracts more attention."

"Of course we do not want peace. Peace would mean the end of our hopes. . . . We will continue in the future to sabotage every peace effort. . . . If that is the only way to destroy Israel, zionism and Arab reaction, then we want a third world war."

96. There is no question why Israel tried on 10 August to apprehend an arch-criminal like Habash, responsible for so many savage atrocities. The real question is: Why is Habash still free? Why is it that he and others like him are permitted by the Lebanese Government—in violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations—to continue to plot and perpetrate the killing of innocent men, women and children? Why is Beirut still the planning centre and staging base for terrorist operations such as the Lod and Athens massacres? Why is the 1969 Cairo agreement between the Lebanese Government and the terrorist organizations which granted the murder groups freedom of operation within the country and turned the Lebanese Government into their partner still in force? Why do Arab Governments continue to support and subsidize Habash's Popular Front and other terrorist organizations such as Black September-Fatah? Why do certain non-Arab Governments consort with the Habashes and the Arafats?

Those are some of the questions that confront the Security Council and other United Nations organs if they are to act effectively against international terrorism.

97. However, it is clear that the objective of the Arab convocation of the Council is precisely the very opposite. It is evident that, having prevented United Nations action against terrorism, the Arab States—led this time by Lebanon—seek to exploit once more the sheer weight of their numbers in order to demand action against the victims of Arab terrorism. Nothing could be more ridiculous and dangerous than focusing on Israel's act of self-defence against the continuous onslaught of terrorism and letting off scot free the barbaric murderers of Athens, Lod and Munich and the Arab Governments which are backing them. That is what has happened in Security Council debates on several occasions in the past.

98. Israel warned at the time that surrender to the Arab designs in the Council would encourage the terrorist organizations in their campaign of murder. That is in fact what has taken place. The terrorist attacks have increased and their bestiality has intensified.

99. The failure of United Nations organs to take effective steps against the plague of terrorism sweeping across the world is grave enough. This failure must not be compounded by Security Council action that would give further satisfaction and encouragement to the carriers of this plague.

100. It is Israel's fervent hope that the international community will overcome the obstacles put in its way and curb international terrorism. Israel on its part stands ready to co-operate with all international efforts to stamp out terrorism, and in particular to ensure the safety and security of international air travel. Are the Arab States also ready to pledge themselves to this objective? Are they prepared to undertake to act against the hijacking of aircraft by Arab terrorists, to act against the blowing up of planes in the air and on the ground, to act against sanguinary attacks on innocent passengers at air terminals? Will Lebanon and Iraq and Egypt give such pledges right here and now? It is on them and on other Arab Governments that will depend the security of international travel and communications. If they decide to abide by their international obligations, if they terminate terrorist operations, there will obviously be no need for defensive action against terrorism as on 10 August.

101. In the meantime what is to be done? The international community has thus far been unable to take measures against the Arab campaign of murder and atrocity. Is Israel to watch passively as the terrorists strike again and again, shedding innocent blood? Are rules of international conduct to be twisted in such a way as to protect murderers and brand their victims? Is the supreme right of self-defence enshrined in the Charter to be adulterated by the distorted concepts used by those who claim that the killing of Israelis by the Habashes and the Arafats is understandable and legitimate, but that Israel's striking back at its assailants is not?

102. Even in everyday life a citizen who calls for the assistance of the authorities against an assailant and fails to

obtain help is entitled to act on his own in self-defence and to effect what is known as a "citizen's arrest"—and this although it may involve crossing into a neighbour's courtyard where the criminal has found refuge. This is Israel's sole objective: to stop the orgy of bloodshed by Arab terror groups.

103. Israel will continue to hope that the United Nations will live up to its responsibilities and strive towards the same objective. However, self-preservation, self-defence, the protection of its people are obligations which a Government must be prepared to fulfil even if it has to act on its own. The Government of Israel will fulfil them.

104. Israel's strongest aspiration is to attain peace with its Arab neighbours. The terrorist organizations are openly fighting against peace in the most despicable manner—by indiscriminate murder of the innocent and defenceless. Those who really want peace in the Middle East will work together with Israel to put an end to this campaign of morbid bloodlust.

105. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Mr. President, before setting forth the Soviet delegation's position on the substance of the matter we are discussing today, I should like to congratulate you, Mr. Scali, on your assumption of the high and responsible office of President of the Security Council.

106. The Security Council is obliged once again to consider a new act of aggression by Israel, unprecedented in its brazenness and cynicism, committed against the peace-loving sovereign State of Lebanon. From the Security Council documents which have been circulated, and from the statements made by the distinguished representatives of Lebanon and Iraq, Ambassadors Ghorra and Al-Shaikhly, we have been informed of a new criminal act of air piracy, carried out by the Israeli militarists on 10 August—an act in which Israeli military aircraft brazenly invaded Lebanese air space, drove a peaceful civil aircraft into Israel and forced it to land at an Israeli military base. This criminal act on the part of the Israeli militarists constitutes one more link in the chain of acts carried out by Israel in recent years and aimed at ensuring that, with the use of terror and air piracy and banditry, which have been elevated in practice to the level of State policy, they can implement their predatory plans for the annexation of foreign territory and the Israelization of the Arab territories they have seized.

107. In recent years the Council has repeatedly had to consider aggressive acts by the ruling clique in Israel against neighbouring Arab States. In considering today this new act of international banditry, this gross violation of the norms of international law, we cannot fail to recall the long list of aggressive actions by Israel against Lebanon which have previously been considered by the Council and on which the Council has taken decisions.

108. Today is the eleventh time in the past four years that the Council is discussing matters related to criminal acts by Israel against Lebanon. One can only regret that, so far, the Council has not been in a position effectively to put an end to Israel's aggressive acts, to take effective measures against

them in order not only to stop Israel's piratical attacks on neighbouring Arab States but also to eliminate in general the consequences of Israeli aggression. Not long ago, on 21 April 1973, the Council adopted resolution 332 (1973), in which it condemned

"the repeated military attacks conducted by Israel against Lebanon and Israel's violation of Lebanon's territorial integrity and sovereignty in contravention of the Charter of the United Nations, of the Armistice Agreement between Israel and Lebanon and of the Council's cease-fire resolutions".

Paragraph 3 of that resolution, moreover, called on Israel "to desist forthwith from all military attacks on Lebanon". However, with its characteristic contempt for United Nations decisions, Israel has ignored that appeal from the Council—as, indeed, it has ignored many previous appeals. It has blatantly ignored world public opinion and flouted the norms of international law. Not even four months have passed since the resolution I referred to was adopted by the Council, and the Council has once again met here today to consider a new crime committed by Israel.

109. It may well be that this act committed by Israel, in its flagrant lawlessness, exceeds by far those we have witnessed in the past. The Israeli militarists ordered their air force to invade the air space of a sovereign State—Lebanon—to penetrate almost as far as its capital, to intercept a peaceful aircraft belonging to the civil airline Middle East Airlines, and to force that aircraft, under the muzzles of the guns of Israeli fighters, not only to abandon its scheduled course but also to land at an Israeli military airfield, where the aircraft and its passengers were searched. In the case of this flight, the incident did not result in any human casualties. Evidently the protests of world public opinion against Israel's destruction of a Libyan aircraft in February of this year held the Israeli pirates back from using their weapons again this time.

110. As the Soviet delegation has noted, these actions by Israel constitute an unprecedentedly brazen act of aggression against a sovereign State. In this case, Israel has violated Lebanon's State frontier—an act which in itself constitutes the grossest violation of the norms of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations and is also a threat to the security of the State of Lebanon. At the same time, this act of aggression is an act of air piracy and banditry. The Israeli air force perpetrated what amounts to an attack on a peaceful civil aircraft which was following its normal route and carrying 83 innocent passengers.

111. By attacking the aircraft, the Israeli air force threatened the operation of a civil airline and endangered the lives of passengers. This constitutes the grossest violation of existing international conventions aimed at combating the unlawful seizure of aircraft and unlawful acts against the safety of civil aviation. I refer to The Hague Convention of 1970, "unlawful acts of seizure or exercise of control of aircraft in flight jeopardize the safety of persons and property, seriously affect the operation of air services and undermine the confidence of the peoples of the world in the safety of civil aviation".⁴ All attempts to seize

or exercise control of an aircraft by means of force are firmly condemned in the Convention and declared to be an offence. Similarly, the Montreal Convention of 1971 stresses that unlawful acts against the safety of civil aviation are criminal acts.⁵

112. It should be stressed that at a time when those countries which respect international law are agreeing to co-operate with each other in order to prevent the seizure of civil aircraft—and here I should like to note and draw your attention to the fact that, a few days ago, a bilateral Soviet-Iranian agreement on this matter was signed in Moscow—Israel is engaging in piracy in the air, using its fighter aircraft to stab international air services in the back.

113. The most recent incident involving a Lebanese passenger aircraft cannot be regarded as an accidental, isolated event. Israel's entire political history consists of the use of methods of mass and individual terror, ranging from the bombing of schools and factories to barbarous air attacks on peaceful settlements in neighbouring Arab countries and the destruction in the air of civil aircraft with passengers aboard. As Ambassador Ghorra has already told us here, the brazenness and unprecedented nature of the act of air piracy committed on 10 August gave rise to a storm of indignation throughout the world, and even produced a negative reaction among certain circles in Israel itself. However, the highly placed representatives of the Israeli leadership do not wish to pay any attention either to international public opinion or to the views of citizens within their own country. They have let it be known that they will continue in future to commit acts of aggression against neighbouring Arab States and to indulge in air banditry. It was that approach which was taken by Israel's Minister of Defence, Mr. Dayan, in a statement made the day before yesterday, 11 August. All this gives us grounds for presuming that Israel does not intend to change its course, aimed at completely disregarding and violating Security Council decisions and General Assembly resolutions.

114. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, we have many times stated, and we continue to state here, in the Council, that the USSR resolutely opposes the "law of the jungle" in international relations and we therefore condemn with the greatest firmness the terrorist methods Israel uses in international politics and its practice of State terrorism.

115. The Soviet Union firmly opposes all acts of aggression and supports the complete and immediate elimination of all aggression and the consequences of aggression, including, naturally, the withdrawal of forces from the territory of a victim of aggression. On a broader scale, in the case of the Middle East, this implies the urgent need for a just political settlement with a view to eliminating conflict in that area in accordance with the well-known resolution 242 (1967) and the relevant decisions of the General Assembly. The liberation of the Arab territories occupied by Israel in 1967 and the securing of the lawful rights and interests of all countries and peoples in that area, including the Arab people of Palestine, are the fundamental conditions for the establishment of a lasting and just peace in that area. The Soviet delegation has many times stated

⁴ See document A/C.6/418, annex III.

⁵ *Ibid.*, annex IV.

and continues to state that the root of the evil and of the persistence of a situation in the Middle East which is jeopardizing peace is the fact that until now not only have the consequences of Israel's aggression against Arab countries not been eliminated but, with the support of imperialist and Zionist forces, Israel's armed forces continue to commit new acts of aggression, including the act of air piracy which we are discussing today.

116. Acts such as those which Israel has been committing over the last few years—with total impunity, as we have seen—can no longer be tolerated. If a body of such authority as the Council permits Israel to continue with its high-handed actions, committing acts of aggression, engaging in banditry in the air, threatening the lives of totally innocent aircraft passengers and ignoring the United Nations, the faith of the world community in the United Nations may be seriously undermined. For that reason the Soviet delegation believes that the Council must act quickly and decisively. We fully support the protests made by the Governments of Lebanon and Iraq with regard to this new act of aggression by Israel, and we firmly condemn Israel's policy of continuing terrorist acts of aggression against Lebanon and other Arab States.

117. In the view of the Soviet delegation, when considering precisely what the Council should do in this specific case we must, of course, take into account the fact that the Security Council has repeatedly condemned Israel for similar acts in the past. In the past, the Council has warned Israel that if it continues armed attacks on neighbouring Arab States, the question of taking the appropriate effective measures in accordance with the United Nations Charter will be considered. Is it not time to pass from warnings to concrete action? Actually, this is required not only by the case we are considering today but by the whole complex of Israel's actions in the Middle East. As we know, those acts were correctly assessed by the members of the Council during consideration of the situation in the Middle East at the Council meetings not so long ago, in June and July.

118. Time presses. The Council must adopt effective measures to put an end to acts of aggression and piracy by the Israeli militarists. The Soviet delegation is ready to support the Council in drafting and adopting effective measures, including sanctions, against Israel—a State which is systematically and deliberately violating United Nations decisions and the fundamental purposes and principles of the Organization.

119. In connexion with the statement made by the representative of Israel, the Soviet delegation would like to state that his attempts to justify acts of brigandage against Lebanon by slanderous attacks on the leaders of the Palestinian resistance movement, and also by references to alleged cases of terrorist acts committed by the Palestinian organizations, are hypocritical and groundless. Here in the Security Council—or, for that matter, anywhere else—Israel has no right, under any pretext, including the pretext of its struggle with the legitimate Palestinian resistance movement, to commit acts of aggression against neighbouring Arab States, to engage in air piracy, to threaten the safety of civil aviation or to interfere with the normal operation of air traffic between States. Israel, which for many years, in

violation of well-known United Nations decisions, has been occupying Arab lands, which expelled from their homeland more than a million Palestinians and is applying a policy of merciless terror and oppression against the Arab population of the occupied lands, certainly cannot offer moral or political justification for its acts of aggression against sovereign Arab States by making references of any sort to the Palestinian resistance movement.

120. If we look at the matter seriously and strip away the hypocritical verbiage in the Israeli representative's statement, it becomes quite obvious that we are dealing today with a situation in which the Israeli militarists are using all available means, including piracy, so that, by force of arms, at the point of a gun, by violence and by attacks against peaceful aircraft, they can strike a blow against the legitimate resistance movement of an entire people, which was driven from its lands and compelled to struggle, with arm in hand, for the restoration of its dignity and freedom. As all are aware, that struggle has been recognized as legitimate in decisions adopted by United Nations bodies, including the General Assembly. The Soviet delegation firmly rejects the attacks of the representative of Israel against the leaders of the Palestinian resistance movement. We give them their due in their heroic struggle, under clearly unequal conditions, for the liberation of their homeland and the restoration of their lawful rights.

121. One of the most vital tasks of the present day is to eliminate the hotbed of aggression in the Middle East. We must no longer permit the Israeli aggressors and adventurers to keep the whole of this huge area in an explosive state. The rights of the Arab peoples, which are victims of aggression, must be fully safeguarded. Israeli troops must be withdrawn from all the occupied Arab territories. "The peace, security and State frontiers of all countries in the Middle East", in the words of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, L. I. Brezhnev, "must be guaranteed. For our part, we shall continue to adhere firmly to that policy". With regard to the question under discussion, the Soviet delegation wishes to state that it will support any constructive proposals which would serve to punish the aggressor and put an end to its acts of provocation against the Arab countries of the Middle East.

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

123. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): I certainly shall wish to exercise my right of reply to the long statement delivered this afternoon by the representative of Israel. However, I should like to make a brief comment at this stage. In a way I feel sorry for the representative of Israel because he was carried away by a wave of emotionalism and attempted in his long tirade to heap abuse and accusations at the Lebanese delegation and Lebanon as well as other Arab delegations. The reason is very simple. Although there were no victims in the incident of the day before yesterday, Israel was caught red-handed. I can understand the anger and wrath of the Israelis because one of their major operations has been described as a failure and has been exposed to international public opinion as an example of the operations conducted by Israel in different parts of the world.

124. Israel is definitely in a bad way. The poet Milton said:

"Me, miserable! Which way shall I fly?

"Infinite wrath, and infinite despair,

"Which way I fly is hell . . .".

It is hell for Israel and for the Israeli Government to face the condemnation of world public opinion. I have cited a few examples. Ambassador Tekoah attempted to use a whole list of acts committed by individual Palestinians or others in different parts of the world as justification of an act perpetrated by his Government. This particular act of his Government, which was exposed the day before yesterday, is not the only one of its kind. As we were reminded by the representative of the Soviet Union, not very long ago the Security Council adopted a resolution [332 (1973)] condemning the operation conducted by Israeli units in Beirut when they murdered people in cold blood in their beds. The agents of the Israeli Government used falsified passports to penetrate Lebanon in order to prepare for that abominable attack. The international press has not yet finished writing about the incident in Lille Hammer in Norway, the implication of an Israeli agent in the murder of a Moroccan citizen there. I will leave it to the Norwegian Government to state at the appropriate time what kind of involvement the Israeli officials had in that murder. At the present time the Israeli authorities are trying a Turk who was kidnapped in a raid on a camp in Lebanon.

125. At this point I should like to cite *The Times* of London of 9 August, which contained an opinion on the kind of legality to which the Israel Government is resorting in order to uphold international law. Allow me to quote at some length from that editorial because it is to the point. *The Times* of London stated:

"The accusation is that the man belonged to illegal organization and was training to attack Israel. There is no suggestion that he committed an offence on Israeli territory. Even if he had done so there would be no legal justification for kidnapping him in order to bring him to trial in Israel.

"Since he has not done so, there is no justification of any kind, no matter what Israeli law has been made to say.

"It is difficult to imagine a more blatant affront to legality than to seize a foreign national in foreign territory and try him for crimes committed abroad.

"Terrorism, particularly where it involves Israel, is indeed an international phenomenon for which ordinary national laws are not fully equipped, but Israel's action opens the precedents to illegality. That is not in the interests of the Jewish people."

126. Ambassador Tekoah wanted to justify the action of his Government by the actions of individuals. He has resorted to the argument of self-defence. Let us assume that Mr. X, Y or Z—a Palestinian terrorist, a guerrilla or innocent of any kind—were to be in any one of the airports of the

countries represented around this table. Does Israel have the right to send its aircraft to your airports, infringing upon the sovereignty of your State, breaching your laws in order to capture that supposed criminal, to bring him before the courts of justice in Israel, where he is to be tried under the laws of Israel? As I said in my previous statement, Israel has arrogated to itself enactment of a law outside the United Nations and above the law of the United Nations. It is under that law that Israel is undertaking its acts of terrorism, of kidnapping, of hijacking, around the world.

127. Israel is not only resorting to its own laws; it is also bringing God into the picture. It is sending out squads, calling them "God's wrath" or "The Finger of God"—as though Israel wanted to implicate God in criminal activities.

128. Ambassador Tekoah has invited me and other Arab delegations to give, right here and now, pledges to stop the activities of the Palestinian people, to terminate what he called "their terrorist activities"; in return, Israel will terminate its defensive actions such as that undertaken on 10 August in Beirut. That is a very tempting pledge to take. But pledges should really not be one-sided. Here we are not dealing with the question of individual Palestinians. We are dealing with the hijacking of a whole people—the people of Palestine. Are we to hear from the representative of Israel, right here and now, a pledge that the people of Palestine, of which 350,000 live on the territory of Lebanon, will be allowed to return to its ancestral home? Are we to hear from the representative of Israel that the aspirations and legitimate rights of the Palestinian people will be respected by Israel? Are we to hear from the representative of Israel that the military forces of Israel will withdraw from the occupied territories of Sinai, of the Golan Heights, of the West Bank, of Gaza? Are we to hear a pledge from the representative of Israel that Israel really wants peace and wants to live in peace with its neighbours? Those are the kinds of pledges we should like to hear in the Council.

129. The atrocities Israel has meted out to the Palestinian people for 25 years; the massacres of Deir Yassin and thereafter are all fresh in the memory of everyone in the Council. I am not here now to go into the history of the whole case. We are dealing with a specific question, a very precise question: an act undertaken by the Government of Israel and its armed forces against the sovereignty of Lebanon, an act by which units of the Israeli air force have hijacked a civilian aircraft. This is the first example of its kind in the annals of the history of civil aviation. It is a matter of concern to the international community. That is why pilot organizations around the world—even in Israel—have condemned that act. The Israeli pilot association has condemned it even if—as it said—the objective were to capture Enemy No. 1. It is not merely a legal question; it is a question of morality. Are States allowed to resort to what individuals do in violation of morality and international law? That is the question before the Council.

130. This is a very clear case, and on the basis of that case, we await the verdict of the Council.

131. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Israel.

132. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): It should not be surprising that, of all members of the Security Council, it was the representative of the Soviet Union who chose to rush, at this first meeting, to the support for, and protection of, Arab terrorist organizations. You see, the machine-guns, the Kalashnikovs, which massacred men and women of various nationalities at the Lod Airport, the Kalashnikovs used in the slaughter of the innocent passengers at Athens Airport, came from the Soviet Union.

133. I think it would be of interest to the Council to point out that the representative of the Soviet Union has come especially to the support of Arab terrorist leaders such as George Habash, the head of the Popular Front. Among the trainers of the Popular Front appear the following: Brieich Alten, who today lives under the name of Ali Bellah and who during the war was an SS Commander in the western part of the Ukraine; Willi Brawer, known today as Boukashir, one of the Nazi commanding officers of the concentration camp at Mauthausen; Baumann, today known as Ben Hadad, a former SS officer.

134. I hope the Soviet press will report the fact that the Soviet Government is supporting terrorist organizations whose first organizer and spiritual father is Amin el-Husseini, who spent his war years in Berlin as an adviser of Hitler and Eichmann in the extermination of Jews.

135. I hope the Soviet press will also report that its representative in the Security Council is expressing support for murder groups which are being trained by former Nazi officers.

136. When the Soviet representative invokes principles such as consideration for the sovereignty of other States, inviolability of international frontiers, or respect for the rights of national-minority communities, then the appropriate reaction to him is: Let the USSR first apply those principles itself—

137. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

138. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): We are holding a Security Council meeting today in order to consider a complaint by the Government of Lebanon concerning an aggressive act of air piracy committed by the Israeli militarists on 10 August. The representative of Israel is, in his usual fashion and with the aim of distracting the Council's attention from the question before us today, seeking to make slanderous attacks on States Members of the Organization, to interfere in their internal affairs and to bring before us and discuss matters which are totally unconnected with the agenda of today's meeting.

139. I wish to protest against this in the strongest possible way, and I shall continue to protest. We request you, Mr. President, to draw the attention of the representative of Israel to these inadmissible methods and to call upon him to speak on the substance of the matter before us.

140. The PRESIDENT: I think that all representatives should adhere to the item on the agenda—and I mean all representatives.

141. I call on the representative of Israel.

142. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Mr. President, I was reacting to comments made by the representative of the Soviet Union regarding principles which he suggested were applicable in connexion with the item on the agenda.

143. As I was saying, the only appropriate reaction is: Let the USSR first apply these principles itself in its own behaviour, and then try to preach them to others. For instance, an interesting note sent by the Soviet Union to Japan on 20 November 1931, in answer to Japan's note of protest of 19 November 1931—

144. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

145. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Mr. President, the Soviet Union, its relations with Japan and the way in which the Soviet Union applies the well-known principles of international law in its present policies—none of these matters are on today's Security Council agenda. I do not understand why you cannot draw the attention of the representative of Israel, whom we have invited to participate in today's meeting, to the need to comply with accepted rules of debate and strictly adhere to today's agenda. If the representative of Israel again resorts to such methods, we shall be obliged to put to the vote the question of whether his participation in our discussion is legal. As you know, we did not object to the proposal to permit the representative of Israel to participate in today's debate. However, if the representative of Israel has come here to discuss the foreign policies of the USSR and not to reply to the accusations which have been made against Israel, then we shall reconsider our agreement to Israel's participation in the discussion; and, if there is one more departure by the representative of Israel from today's agenda, if he does not speak on the substance of the matter, we shall once again interrupt him and request a vote on the question of whether the Israeli representative's participation in today's discussion is legal.

146. The PRESIDENT: I again would like to appeal to all those taking part in the discussion to adhere to the item that is before us. I wish to note, however, that if one speaker or another strays far from the point at issue, it can be expected that another speaker might object.

147. I again call on the representative of Israel.

148. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Mr. President, as I do intend to read from this international document of the Soviet Union in order to make a point relevant to the item on the agenda, may I suggest that the Soviet representative should in fact decide here and now whether he should allow me to exercise my right of reply and conclude my statement, or whether he would like to apply methods to which apparently he is accustomed and put my right to freedom of speech to a vote.

149. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

150. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Mr. President, the only request the Soviet delegation is making and urging you to enforce is that the representative of Israel should adhere to the agenda of today's meeting. I repeat once again that his attempts to introduce matters which have no connexion whatever with today's meeting are unjustified and cannot, needless to say, meet with our approval. We are entitled to call upon you, for your part, to take any necessary steps, not excluding that of refusing him permission to speak, since it is a matter not of freedom of speech but of observing the Security Council's rules of procedure.

151. The PRESIDENT: We have already agreed to hear all the interested parties. I believe that members of the Council, as well as those invited to address us, are all obligated to adhere to the item on the agenda. I believe the representative of Israel is treading close to the edges, but he is only responding to lines that others have opened up.

152. I now call again on the representative of Israel.

153. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Had the representative of the Soviet Union allowed me to conclude my brief observations, he would have seen that I did adhere to the item on the agenda and did not cross the edges. I shall therefore revert to a very brief note which makes an important principle directly connected with the discussion that we are conducting today. The note in question was sent on 20 November 1931 in reply to a complaint of the crossing of the Manchurian border by Soviet armed forces, and stated as follows:

"It spite of the gross, absolutely undoubted and obvious violation of the treaty rights of the USSR, the Soviet Government did not think of invading Manchuria. Only after the repeated attacks of the Chinese and Russian White Guard units on Soviet territory did the Soviet army cross the Manchurian border in order to repel the attacks, disarm the attackers and to stop any further aggressions."

154. Now allow me, Mr. Representative of the USSR, to suggest that Israel be permitted to act against Arab terrorist squads as the Soviet Union did in the past in similar situations, and as it would undoubtedly do again were it to find itself in similar circumstances.

155. The representative of Lebanon asked whether I would be ready to pledge Israel's desire for peace, Israel's willingness to conclude peace with Lebanon. My reply is "yes", "definitely yes". We are ready at any time to enter into negotiations regarding peaceful agreement with Lebanon—

156. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Lebanon on a point of order.

157. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): I am sorry to interrupt the representative of Israel; I do so only to clarify a point. The representative of Israel is resorting to the falsification of what I stated here. I did not ask him only to give a pledge to enter into a peace agreement with Lebanon or to pledge

Israel to peace; I asked him several other questions before that.

158. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel.

159. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I think all of us noticed that at an earlier stage in the discussion the representative of Lebanon expressed his admiration of and esteem for the statement of the Soviet representative. But I do not think he should follow in the representative's footsteps and interrupt the statements of other representatives of Member States appearing here. Had he allowed me to conclude my remarks, he would have seen that I am replying to all the points made by him.

160. I repeat: In answer to the question is Israel ready for peace, for real peace, for genuine peace with Lebanon and with its other Arab neighbours? , the answer is, yes, we are prepared at any time, at any place, to enter into peace negotiations with the Governments of Lebanon and Jordan and Egypt and Syria, including the just settlement of the refugee problem, as called for in resolution 242 (1967), which is the accepted basis for the peace agreements to be attained between Israel and the Arab States.

161. I regret, however, that in answer to my question whether the Lebanese and other Arab Governments are prepared to pledge to put an end to the barbaric campaign of murder and atrocities, of killing innocent passengers, of blowing up civil aircraft, the representative of Lebanon did not give an affirmative answer. And if we speak of peace and if we ask each other whether we are ready for peace, let us remember at all times that one of the main obstacles on the road to peace is precisely the terror warfare which is being waged in the Middle East with the support of the Arab Governments and which is spreading outside the region, endangering international peace in general.

162. It is interesting that the representative of Lebanon found it necessary to come to the defence of a murderer of Turkish nationality, tried in an Israeli court. The Turkish Government did not find it necessary to protect that kind of criminal. However, as the representative of Lebanon found it necessary to make an issue of it and quote from a British newspaper, allow me to revert to the item on the agenda and also cite a London daily regarding the Israeli defence action on 10 August.

163. I read from *The Daily Telegraph* of 13 August 1973:

"Not only Israel, but many other countries have suffered from repeated murderous outrages against their citizens and their property, carried out in the air and on the ground by Palestinian terrorist organizations. Lebanon is the main country where these groups have their headquarters, make their plans and do their training. If Lebanon does not stop this, then Israel as the neighbour against whom the terrorist campaign is aimed has the right to take the necessary measures to do so . . . Lebanon should not allow the terrorists to fly in civil airliners in the cause of their nefarious business, thus endangering other passengers."

164. In recent years Lebanon has, I think, been the most active among the Arab States to defend in the Security Council the cause of Arab terrorism and Arab terrorist organizations, as Ambassador Ghorra did again today. Lebanon has been the most avid collector of one-sided resolutions which ignored the danger of terrorism to peace in the Middle East and in general and whose only tangible effect was to encourage Arab terrorist organizations to pursue their criminal operations.

165. This Lebanese policy reminds me of one of Aesop's fables: of the snake which entered a smith-shop and found a steel file and began to lick it with its tongue. It got bloodier and bloodier, but the snake continued to lick it on the foolish fancy that it was the steel file that was bleeding and that the snake had the better of it. When it could no longer lick the file with its tongue it began to bite it with its teeth until, completely covered with blood, it fell back dead. So it is with Lebanon. It seems to be enjoying the exchange of acrimony in the Security Council and the one-sided resolutions which encourage the terrorists. It seems to be sucking at these resolutions with the same satisfaction as the snake in the fable. However, it would be wise for Lebanon to bear in mind that the encouragement of the terrorist organizations resulting from Lebanese policy, actions and demands in the Security Council is causing, first and foremost, the bleeding of Lebanon itself. Indeed, these murder groups are bleeding and undermining Lebanon, and the sooner this bleeding is stopped the better, not only for peace in the Middle East but also for Lebanon itself.

166. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): In view of the lateness of the hour, I shall be brief. I listened carefully to what was said by Mr. Tekoah, and I must say that either he did not listen carefully to my statement or else he consciously distorted it. In my statement I in no way justified individual acts of terrorism. It is well known that the Soviet Union opposes individual terror as a matter of principle. Furthermore, Soviet public opinion has previously expressed its disapproval and condemnation of the terrorist act which occurred during the Munich Olympics. In my statement I said that we firmly reject slanderous attacks on the leaders of the Palestinian resistance movement and on that movement itself.

167. It is the usual practice of the representative of Israel to put on the same level individual acts of terrorism and the noble goals of a whole movement, a whole people, in this case the people of Palestine. However, such juggling with facts, such distortion of the truth cannot, of course, distract us. We understand perfectly well what this is all about. We expressed solidarity with the Palestinian resistance movement, and we paid a tribute to the heroic struggle of its members and to the activities of its leaders. That is our official position. We affirm it once again. However, it in no way follows that the Soviet Union approves of senseless acts of terrorism by individuals. I should like to note, incidentally, that yesterday, speaking on television, one of the leaders of the Palestinian resistance movement, Mr. Habash, also made what amounted to a condemnation of individual acts of terrorism. Thus, we do not want anyone to equate the goals of the broad and noble

movement of a people with the individual, rash acts of a few persons. That is the first thing.

168. The second thing is this: Since you, Mr. President, permitted Mr. Tekoah to make a long historical digression, blatantly departing from the agenda, I shall take the liberty of replying to that digression.

169. The example given here by the representative of Israel is quite inappropriate even if the event in fact took place. The example is, as the English say, a case of a self-defeating argument. Even if the Soviet Government did, in November 1931, address a note to the Government of Japan, which at that time had jurisdiction over the territory then known as Manchukuo, a puppet State under Japanese tutelage, that note contradicts Mr. Tekoah's arguments. In order to defend their territory and the territorial integrity of the USSR, the Soviet armed forces gave a fitting armed rebuff to the provocative attacks and frontier violations of armed bands of White Guards. The Soviet Government may have addressed a note to the Government of Japan warning that, in fighting armed bands of White Guards, it was compelled to cross the border of Manchukuo—I shall have to check that point of history. Throughout the history of the Soviet Union, the Soviet armed forces have always firmly rebuffed provocative armed attacks on its borders.

170. However, I should like to ask you a question, Mr. Tekoah. Did you send a note to the Government of Lebanon before you invaded Lebanon's air space? Who gave you the right to invade its air space without any warning? That action was a gross violation of the rules of international law. As you can see, making such references to historical parallels can sometimes place you in an uncomfortable position.

171. Thus we see that we have been faced with an attempt to distract the Council's attention from the matter under discussion, and my delegation wishes to make a categorical protest against it.

172. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Israel.

173. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I must say that in the course of the last exchange I felt that we were getting further and further away not from the item on the agenda, but from international realities in general. Apparently the representative of the USSR is not aware of the state of relations existing between Lebanon and Israel, and through no fault of Israel's. I wish the Government of Lebanon were ready to receive any note from the Government of Israel. As a matter of fact, we would be quite happy to transmit such notes even through the good offices of the representative of the USSR. Let him try, and let him see what the response of the representative of Lebanon or his Government would be.

174. I still remember, during the Jarring talks three years ago, when the representative of Egypt, the present Foreign Minister of Egypt, refused to receive through Ambassador Jarring an Israeli memorandum, the heading of which was "A memorandum from the Government of Israel to the Government of Egypt", and insisted on eliminating the heading.

175. But I would like to add to this observation of mine a statement made by His Beatitude the Patriarch of Antioch and the Entire East in Lebanon, Head of the Maronite Church, and reprinted by *Al Jarida* on 28 September 1972:

"I have in my possession information which proves that through international institutions Israel has frequently tried to explain to those responsible in Lebanon that Israel wishes Lebanon no harm, provided that the fedayeen withdraw from the south of the country. But how does the proverb go? To whom can one read your psalms, O David?"

176. So, you see, we have tried by various means, through different channels, to make our views known to the Lebanese Government. And our views are that we have no claims on Lebanon or against Lebanon, except the demand that the Lebanese Government abide by its international obligations and put an end to the use of its territory as a base of aggression against Israel.

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

178. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): Ambassador Tekoah has accustomed the Council to stories, fables and, sometimes, anecdotes. I do not wish to follow in his footsteps in this matter, although I could cite a few in point to describe Israeli policies, in the same fashion as he has likened our policy to the snake which was licking the steel file.

179. We do not really relish at all "licking" resolutions of the Council. I have made it very plain in my statement that many times the Council has given us moral and political satisfaction by adopting resolutions, given us certain moral solace as we walked out of this Council with those papers in our hands. We do not, however, consider it the role of the Council just to hand out pieces of paper to victims of Israeli aggression. The people who are licking their wounds are the hundreds of Lebanese families that have fallen victim to Israeli aggression. We have lost hundreds of our people, killed by the murderous attacks of the Israeli forces. Hundreds of families are licking their wounds. Fables do not hide the crimes of Israel. Do not quote fables, Mr. Tekoah; quote from the orders of your Government, which has sent its murder squads to kill innocent Lebanese civilians, destroy their homes and spread terror in many parts of Lebanon.

180. The representative of Israel has tried to draw a certain parallel between an action which took place in 1931 and the present case. I shall not go back into history, into the details of what happened then. But I want to remind the Council that we are under a new order, a new legal order established by the United Nations in 1945 in San Francisco. That is our law. The Charter, its provisions, the declarations adopted by the United Nations, the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and this Security Council constitute the order under which we are working—the legal and moral order of the new international order.

181. Yet Mr. Tekoah, drawing from the Manchurian incident, wanted to draw the right to breach this law of the

United Nations and arrogate to his Government the freedom of action of invading Lebanon, of trampling on our sovereignty and territorial integrity.

182. We do not collect resolutions, and we do not relish being here in the Security Council every now and then defending our cause against the aggressions of Israel. We would be the happiest people in the world if we did not have to appear in the Security Council, if Israel really wished to live in peace and pledged itself to give justice to a million and a half Palestinians whom it has thrown out of their homelands, and if it pledged to return the occupied lands to the Arab States. Those are the kinds of pledges that would really work for true peace.

183. The PRESIDENT: I call again on the representative of Israel.

184. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): My reply to the last statement by the representative of Lebanon will be in the words of the Head of the Maronite Lebanese Church, His Beatitude the Patriarch of Antioch and the Entire East, who, in the same interview already cited by me, said as follows:

"The Israelis do not want Lebanon. I know them well. No one knows them better than I do. I was in contact with them over a long period when I was Head of the Patriarchate of Tyre and the South. The Israelis attack us in order to drive the fedayeen out of Lebanon because they have given up all hope of ever seeing the Lebanese State itself forcing the fedayeen to quit."

185. May I suggest to the representative of Lebanon and to his Government that they follow the views of the Patriarch of Antioch and the Entire East and not the views of murderers such as the Habashes and the Arafats.

186. The representative of Lebanon spoke of a new order, of a world that is to live in accordance with and under the provisions of the Charter. Let us then do that. Let Lebanon at long last begin to abide by the Charter principles and provisions in its relations with Israel. All these principles and provisions as well as all the relevant resolutions of the United Nations regarding good-neighbourly relations make it mandatory for the Government of Lebanon to put an end to the use of its territory by the Arab terrorist organizations in armed attacks against Israel, against Israeli civilians, in sanguinary assaults on innocent defenceless civilians outside the region. When the Government of Lebanon fulfils the words of its representative, who says that he would like to see a world ruled by the Charter, of States living in accordance with their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, when his Government follows suit and takes this counsel as the guiding line of its policies and its actions, there will be no need for Israel to continue to exercise its right under the Charter of the United Nations, its right under Article 51 to self-defence. Israel would welcome the speedy attainment of a situation which would make the exercise of this inalienable right of a State under the Charter of the United Nations unnecessary.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.