

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

1501st MEETING: 15 AUGUST 1969

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1501)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 12 August 1969 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of Lebanon addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9385)	
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 12 August 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9387)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND FIRST MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 15 August 1969, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. J. DE PINIES (Spain).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Algeria, China, Colombia, Finland, France, Hungary, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zambia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1501)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 12 August 1969 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of Lebanon addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9385).
3. The situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 12 August 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9387).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 12 August 1969 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of Lebanon addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9385)

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 12 August 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9387)

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): In accordance with the decision taken previously by the Security Council, I shall invite the representatives of Lebanon and Israel to take places at the Council table.

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

2. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Council will now continue its consideration of the question on the agenda.

3. Mr. WARNER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, allow me, as the newest member of this important body, to tell

you how much I look forward to taking part in the debates of the Security Council, particularly under your most distinguished chairmanship. I have only just arrived in New York, and I came straight to this extremely important debate from an ocean liner. I do not have the experience that you and my other colleagues have in the practice and the work of the Security Council, and I hope you will make due allowance for that.

4. However, today my task is a fairly easy one, because all I have to do is repeat a policy of my Government which is well known and which has in no way changed. This is that we deplore all violations of the cease-fire in the Middle East and all acts of violence there. It is all too clear from the recent history of the Middle East that violence breeds more violence and that, so long as the spiral of attack and retaliation is allowed to continue, so long will the people of the area be denied the peace and prosperity which are their birthright.

5. My Government has watched with the greatest anxiety the progressive breakdown of the cease-fire in the Middle East in recent weeks, a situation to which our Secretary-General has drawn attention in a series of messages to this Council.

6. As the distinguished representative of France reminded us yesterday [*1499th meeting*], this unfortunate situation flows from the fact that there is still no peace in the Middle East. I need hardly repeat my Government's pledge to do all in its power to help bring about a comprehensive political settlement, based on the principles and provisions of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 and leading to the establishment of a just and lasting peace. But meanwhile it would seem to us, as evidently it does to a number of delegations which have already expressed their views in this debate, that constructive thought ought to be given to means of preventing further incidents in this sector, perhaps through reinforcing the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), or to any other means of conciliation.

7. Since my Government is opposed to the use of violence, we naturally deprecate any policy of reprisals. It follows that my Government deplores the actions complained of in both the letters which are before the Council. If it is true, as the Permanent Representative of Israel has stated in his letter contained in document S/9387, that "twenty-one attacks by shelling, firing and mining were carried out against inhabited localities in Israel", then in that case there has been provocation. But such provocation could not justify the bombing attack on villages in southern Lebanon which are described in the Lebanese letter contained in

document S/9385. My Government regrets the loss of civilian life and extends to the Lebanese Government and to the bereaved families its most heartfelt sympathy. It is particularly sad to see that the area of conflict has been extended to Lebanon, which, as we have been reminded in this debate, has been foremost in the pursuit of peace and conciliation.

8. Thus my delegation deplores acts of provocation and deplores also acts of reprisal. This specific Israeli attack, like all reprisal actions, will not achieve the effect intended. It has simply led to deepened bitterness and suffering and to loss of life among civilians. We hope that the Council will recognize that all acts of violence are to be deplored.

9. Mr. JAKOBSON (Finland): The pattern of the events that have led to the convening of this meeting is grimly familiar to members of the Security Council. Lebanon accuses Israel of unprovoked air attacks against Lebanese villages. Israel claims that Palestinian commandos have been permitted to use Lebanese territory for attacks against Israeli villages. On both sides people have been killed, among them civilians.

10. The essential facts are not in dispute. The issue of responsibility is another matter. The Government of Israel seeks to justify its air raids on the grounds of self-defence. The Government of Lebanon, while declaring its support for the cause of the Palestinian commandos, disclaims responsibility for their activities. Opinions differ on the degree of responsibility that each party in this case must bear for what has happened. But clearly both Governments have an equal obligation to maintain the cease-fire which both have agreed to respect. That, in our view, is the crux of the matter.

11. The breaches of the cease-fire that have taken place between Israel and Lebanon are serious enough in themselves. But to treat them in isolation would be to shut one's eyes to the realities of the situation in the Middle East. Fighting occurs daily, on various levels and by various means, throughout the area. The intensity and the scope of violence have increased steadily. The Secretary-General has repeatedly drawn the attention of the Council and of the parties to the dangers of the situation. He has said that there has never before been such complete and sustained disregard for a cease-fire ordered by the Security Council. He has also pointed to the unjustified risks to which the unarmed observers of UNTSO are being subjected. In fact, the present trend, if allowed to continue unchecked, threatens to bring down the entire structure of the internationally supervised cease-fire in the Middle East. If that happens, it will put an end to efforts to establish peace in the area by international action and through the use of United Nations services.

12. Of course a cease-fire by its very nature is a temporary arrangement. It is a first step towards making peace. As the months go by, the lack of progress towards agreement is bound to strengthen those on both sides who do not believe in the possibility of real peace or who do not want it. We in this Council cannot afford to despair of a peaceful solution of the conflict. The four major Powers, permanent members of the Security Council, will be continuing their talks,

thus acknowledging their special responsibility for preventing the conflict in the Middle East from endangering international peace and security. Ambassador Jarring remains ready to renew his efforts to assist the parties to reach agreement in accordance with the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. Maintenance of the cease-fire in the meantime is the essential prerequisite for progress on the political level.

13. The Secretary-General in his report of 30 July [S/9368, para. 8] appealed to the members of the Security Council, both individually and collectively, to do all within their power to influence events in the Middle East in a new direction. We now have an opportunity to respond to that appeal. My delegation believes that we can best do so by making it clear that no violations of the cease-fire can be condoned or justified and by calling upon the parties to co-operate constructively in the efforts to reach a peaceful settlement.

14. Mr. KHATRI (Nepal): The Government of Lebanon has requested that the Security Council meet to consider the Israeli air attack on its territory on 11 August 1969. The Council meets in the wake of increasing violence in the Middle East. The drift of events is unmistakably towards a serious aggravation of the situation. Long-term interests of peace in that region are apparently sacrificed in order to gain immediate political advantages which are, at best, illusory and short-lived. Public statements attributed to highly placed officials appear to be at variance with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, and specifically with the peace formula set forth in the November 1967 resolution of the Security Council. It is sought to obstruct the peace efforts undertaken in terms of that resolution. The cease-fire effected by order of the Security Council is violated daily, particularly in the Suez Canal sector. Repeated appeals by the Secretary-General for respect for the cease-fire are disregarded. Targets of violence include not only military installations but, more often than not, civilians and objects of public utility.

15. The motives and policies of the Governments are explained in terms of the concepts of self-defence, self-determination and national security—concepts which are seemingly unimpeachable. But, judging from the prevailing situation, it would appear that the actions of most Governments in the Middle East are far removed from the normal standards of conduct. Much as they have acted in the very name of those time-honoured concepts, they have regrettably failed to contain the situation, much less improve it.

16. With regard to the present case, as evidenced by the statements made by the representatives of Lebanon and Israel and their letters to the President of the Security Council in documents S/9385 and S/9387, the facts of the matter before the Council are simple enough.

17. The Government of Lebanon accepts that commando fighters have their bases of operation against Israel in Lebanese territory but maintains that it should not be held responsible for their activities.

18. As for the Government of Israel, it accepts responsibility for the 11 August air attack on the commando

encampment in Lebanese territory, but insists that the attack was a measure of self-defence carried out in answer to the series of hostile armed activities from across the border.

19. Those facts may be simple, but my delegation feels that the Security Council is confronted with two basic questions arising from them.

20. First, is a Government justified, in the name of self-defence, in launching air attacks on hostile encampments in a foreign State whose official participation in the hostile activities has been disowned?

21. Second, can a Government claim immunity from responsibility for the hostile armed activities carried out from its territory against a foreign State?

22. We deplore acts of violence and express our deep sympathy for the victims of those acts, more particularly for the innocent civilians. But in spite of our feelings of repugnance for the violence and sympathy for its victims, we in the Security Council cannot avoid seeking answers to these basic questions. We may appreciate the motives which guide the behaviour of the Governments and peoples of the Middle East, but so far as the delegation of Nepal is concerned we are inclined to answer both questions in the negative.

23. Violent actions on the part of a Government carried out in an excessive concern for security cannot be justified, as it would seem that the 11 August air attack on foreign territory was far in excess of the strict requirement of self-defence. We also think that no Government should allow its territory to be used for armed activities against a foreign State and that it cannot escape a measure of responsibility for those activities.

24. The concern of the Security Council for peace in the region cannot, in our opinion, be limited to the recent charges of violence and counter-violence between Lebanon and Israel. The matter must be viewed in the broader context of the worsening situation in the Middle East. We must insist on absolute respect for the cease-fire and all other resolutions of the Security Council. We must all direct our efforts towards attaining an honourable peace in the area. The formula for this honourable peace is contained, in the most objective manner, in the 22 November resolution 242 (1967) of the Council, which fulfils all essential requirements, including the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied territories, an end to the claim or state of belligerency, and the right of each State in the area to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries. The duty of all of us is to assist in the peace efforts currently being made with a view to the implementation of that resolution.

25. In the conflict in the Middle East, we have always regarded the Government of Lebanon as a follower of a policy of moderation least likely to aggravate the situation. Lebanon is a small, non-military State and poses no real threat to the security of any State. Therefore, we are particularly sorry and concerned that this State became involved in the continual state of warfare in the area and

felt it desirable to bring the complaint concerning the Israeli air attack before the Security Council.

26. Because of the foregoing considerations, and with the highest regard for the views of the Government of Lebanon, as well as those of the Government of Israel, we feel that the present discussion in the Council will contribute to the vital peace efforts if we renew our call for scrupulous respect for the cease-fire and faithful implementation of the decisions of the United Nations.

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

28. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): We in the Lebanese delegation are most grateful to the representatives seated around this table who have shown their concern about the developments in Lebanon, and particularly for the sympathy which they have extended to the innocent victims of the Israeli attack against villages in southern Lebanon. We are also grateful to the various delegations that have extended their support to Lebanon.

29. The Lebanese delegation stated in its opening remarks [*1498th meeting*] that Lebanon had scrupulously abided by the Armistice Agreement of 23 March 1948 and the cease-fire, and it still abides by them. The Armistice Agreement is still valid in law; we respect it, and we respect our obligations under it. Members of the Armistice Commission are still welcome and free to perform their duties on Lebanese territory. But Israel has unilaterally nullified the Agreement and obstructed the carrying out of the duties of the members of that Commission.

30. In the discussion in the Council much emphasis has been laid on the cease-fire. The cease-fire, in our opinion, was not meant to freeze the lines of Israeli occupation of the lands of free Arab States. Rather, it was meant to be a prelude to a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. More than two years have elapsed since the adoption by the Council of resolution 242 (1967), which called for such a settlement.

31. The Israeli representative does not cease to repeat before the Council—and he has done so again in the present case—that the intention of his Government is to teach a lesson to the Arab countries. The teaching of a lesson by the self-centered and arrogant Israeli power has had only one effect so far: to sharpen the resistance of the Arabs against the ominous and criminal acts of Israel. It tends to widen the area of conflict and increase the dangers to the peace and security of the Arab people. The indiscriminate bombing of economic projects, towns and villages, the raining of death and terror and napalm and destruction upon the civilian population can only heighten their anger and their determination to resist, for self-protection and defence.

32. Israel has to come to its senses and realize once and for all that its acts of terror and intimidation will not yield peace. Only by desisting from aggressive acts, by respecting the edicts of this august body and this body itself, by collaborating with the Powers seeking tirelessly to find a

peaceful solution to the whole problem, can Israel hope to see the beacon of peace which it claims it is searching. The Security Council by resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 has opened the way to reaching that goal, but Israel keeps shutting the door and stifling every effort in that direction. A declaration on its part that it would be ready and willing to implement and facilitate the implementation of that resolution would clear the way for an over-all settlement on the basis of peace with justice for all—and primarily for the most injured party: the Arab people of Palestine. Let Israel remove its road blocks from the path to negotiations; let Israel stop its ominous calls for annexing this or that part of the occupied territory; let it state emphatically its readiness to withdraw from the occupied territories; let it heed the admonition of this Council that territorial conquest and expansion by war are inadmissible under the rule of law of the United Nations. Then a real atmosphere for peaceful settlement will be created. Lebanon has done everything in its power to promote that atmosphere for peaceful settlement.

33. But the crux of the matter is that Israel still refuses to submit to international legalities, to moral laws and to United Nations decisions and resolutions. If any United Nations Member State ought to comply most scrupulously and devotedly with them, that Member State is Israel, for Israel owes its very existence to this Organization. It is the only State which did not have any territorial, political or legal existence or status before the partition plan of 1947. That plan fictitiously carved out of Arab Palestine an area historically and legally belonging to the Christian and Moslem Arabs of that land, and turned it into what has become a springboard for Israeli expansionist plans in the Arab Middle East. It follows that if Israel were really acting in good faith towards its creator or its *raison d'être*, the United Nations, it would be the first to adhere to the principles and provisions of the United Nations Charter and to heed the calls and warnings to desist from a repetition of its acts of violence against the Arabs and its practices against the Arab people in the occupied territory which violate their human rights.

34. The Palestinian liberation movement sprang and still springs from the masses of Arab Palestinian refugees numbering 1.5 million. It also springs from the Arab people inside Israel. The valiant resistance fighters are being joined by their brethren everywhere; the movement is spreading and growing stronger every day. The Palestinian people have strong grievances. A great injustice has been done to them.

35. It has been argued during the debate that the rounds of diplomatic talks which have taken place in the last few months were essential in order to find a formula by means of which the security of Israel would be guaranteed. But what about guarantees for the security of one and a half million Christian and Moslem Arab Palestinians? What security is being sought for their future? Are they to rely on the few miserable millions handed out year after year by United Nations charity? Are they to rely on seven cents a day per person for subsistence in the hope of a better, a decent, future?

36. The Security Council, and especially the four big Powers, which have assumed special responsibility for peace

and security, will do well to look at the root of the whole Palestinian problem, at the sufferings and fate of the Palestinian people, the rightful owners of the land, the cities, the villages, the farms and the orchards which they built and cultivated there, through a long lineage back through history, with their blood, sweat and toil.

37. The latest attack on villages in southern Lebanon—seven open, defenceless civilian villages—was unprovoked by the Lebanese Government and people. As we have stated before, we have done everything, and we are doing everything, in our power to promote conditions of peace in our area. If Israel had any valid reason for complaint it should have brought its complaint earlier to the attention of the Security Council and not waited until Lebanon submitted its complaint.

38. We have great faith in the Security Council. It is by its action in dealing with such murderous, wanton and unprovoked attacks against Lebanon that the Security Council can strengthen our confidence, at the same time creating the atmosphere which is essential for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

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

40. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): The Council's deliberations on the Israeli and Lebanese complaints are now in their third day and the facts that have emerged are clear. Irregular terror forces which have established their bases on Lebanese soil, and caused no few problems for Lebanon itself, have in recent weeks unleashed a campaign of armed attacks against Israel. These attacks have consisted frequently of shelling Israeli border villages and towns from Lebanese territory. There has also been a series of ever-increasing saboteur and mining raids directed primarily against the civilian population of Israel.

41. Despite attempts made to impress upon the Lebanese authorities the need to put an end to these grave violations of the cease-fire, the acts of aggression have continued. The Government of Israel, responsible for the safety and security of its citizens, found itself constrained to act in self-defence against the attackers.

42. What is the Lebanese reaction to these facts? There was no reaction at all available in the statement made today by the representative of Lebanon. In his opening statement on 13 August [*1498th meeting*], the representative of Lebanon was allowed to ramble freely from the question under consideration to attacks on the Jewish people for supporting Israel, to abuse against Governments which feel that Israel's defences against continuing Arab aggression should not be allowed to falter, and to similar other ventures in wanton hostility. On the subject matter on the agenda there was in fact only one Lebanese reaction: a ridiculous denial that armed attacks from Lebanese territory against Israel have taken place and a somewhat cautious attempt to disclaim knowledge of the existence of the terror bases in southern Lebanon. This is a method of argument devoid of both seriousness and honesty. It is not the first time that the delegation of Lebanon has employed

it in the Council. Indeed, President Helou of Lebanon himself testified that the Lebanese Government used this method in the Security Council in the debate in December 1968. The Beirut daily, *Al-Hayat*, wrote on 1 July 1969:

“President Helou said *inter alia*: ‘On 3 November 1968 the number of saboteurs in Lebanon did not exceed a few hundreds and we were then dealing with their problem. But suddenly they began issuing propaganda publications against us and their numbers rose over several thousands.’ The President added: ‘Lebanon had stressed in the Security Council that there were no saboteur bases on its territory in order to obtain a condemnation of Israel by the Council.’”

43. In the light of President Helou’s revelation, what credulity can be attached to Lebanese denials and claims in the present debate? In coming to consider the conclusions from our deliberations, members of the Security Council will undoubtedly weigh the facts as they are on the one hand, and the frivolous attempts of the Lebanese representative to mislead the Council, on the other.

44. The existence in southern Lebanon of the encampments of terror organizations has been widely recorded and reported. In addition to the eye-witness accounts and statements cited by me on this matter on 13 August, I should like to refer to a lengthy and detailed list of all the terror bases in the area of Israel’s action, published on 12 August—three days ago—in the Lebanese daily, *Al-Hayat*:

“The Saiqa group is concentrated in the Shiva fortress which is used by the local population in winter time as a school. The fortress is on a plateau looking towards Israel and it contains fortified rooms. It is surrounded by buildings; most of them are under the supervision of the saboteurs or local residents supporting their actions.

“The Fatah group is concentrated mainly in Ein Kania near Shuya, each of the villages 30 kilometres from the Israeli border. Three days ago the Fatah group transferred a part of its anti-air-craft guns to the Shiba farm, after it was known that Israel might attack from the air. The farm Shiba is on Lebanese territory.

“The bases of the Palestine Liberation Front are in Rashia area.”

Then the Lebanese newspaper adds: “The Palestine Liberation Front on both its factions is concentrated in most of the localities which were bombed by Israel.”

45. These are the localities which the Lebanese representative chooses to describe as “innocent villages”.

46. On 12 July 1969 the Beirut daily *Al-Hayat* reported a statement by the former Lebanese Minister, Raymond Edde, in which he said:

“The saboteurs had entered Lebanon in a small number (sixty men) before the formation of the Cabinet of Four of which I was a member. The problem of the saboteurs was raised during the term of that Cabinet, but the Prime Minister, Abdallah El-Yafi, refused to expel them by

force. There was no way of raising the issue in the open since Lebanon had submitted a complaint against Israel to the Security Council in which Lebanon insisted on the argument that there were no saboteurs in Lebanon.”

47. Among the arguments put forward by the representative of Lebanon, in an obvious manoeuvre to veil and distort the truth, is the allegation that, for some inexplicable reason, the Israeli defence action of 11 August was directed not against the bases of the attackers of Israel, but against civilian villages. As I indicated in my statement of 13 August by quoting from communiqués of the terror command, the saboteur organizations do not share the Lebanese representative’s qualms about admitting that they—not civilian villages—were the targets of the Israeli defence action. The Lebanese press itself has made no attempt at all to conceal this fact. Thus the daily, *Al Nahar*, of 12 August reports:

“People who came from the villages in the Aroub area said that the Israeli attack against the terrorist bases took place whilst the saboteurs were having their lunch.”

48. It seems that while the representative of Lebanon tries to mislead the Security Council, as he did in the debate of December 1968, the Lebanese public knows the truth.

49. As for the denial by the representative of Lebanon that the attacks on Israeli towns and villages along Israel’s northern border were carried out from Lebanese territory, suffice it to refer again to the communiqués published almost daily by the various terror organizations and broadcast by Radio Beirut, Damascus, Cairo and Amman—for instance the “Voice of Al-Fatah” broadcast on 13 August over Radio Cairo, a statement in which, as in the past, no attempt at all was made to conceal the presence of their military bases on Lebanese territory and their responsibility for the attacks on Israel settlements and towns. The Al-Fatah declared, *inter-alia*: “Our reply was given in the attack against Qiryat Shemona before the blood of our fighters in the hills of Lebanon had dried up.”

50. The facts are clear; the facts are undeniable; and the question that still remains open is whether the conclusions drawn from them will contribute to the observance of the cease-fire or, regrettably, weaken it even further.

51. There is one important point on which the Lebanese and Israeli delegations appear to be in agreement, as evidenced by the Lebanese statement on 13 August and again the one made today: Terror warfare, we agree—or operations by *fedayeen* units, as the Arab Governments prefer to call them—are not new; they have always been part of the twenty-year conflict and the Arab warfare waged against Israel since 1948. The Lebanese representative chooses to explain away this type of warfare by presenting it as the action of disgruntled refugees from Palestine. This is, however, an old and rather unconvincing claim. It was used by Egypt with reference to the *fedayeen* in the fifties, until, for internal reasons, President Nasser began to speak freely and openly of the fact that *fedayeen* units constituted an integral part of the Egyptian armed forces. And the same argument was put forward in the Security Council in the sixties by Syria. That was belied by

the open, official support, training, financing and operational direction given to the Syrian Al-Fatah terror squads by the Government and army of Syria.

52. The Lebanese admission that terror warfare has been pursued against Israel for two decades, coupled with the allegation that it has been carried on by Palestinian refugees opposed to Israel's very existence, has, of course, a sinister connotation. And this is, in fact, the philosophy of the Shukairy's and such nazi collaborators and war criminals as Hajimeen El-Husseini. The world must take note of the fact that this is now an argument officially put forward by Lebanon. Particular gravity must be attached to it, in the light of a statement by the President of Lebanon, broadcast on Radio Beirut only last month. Mr. Helou declared on 5 July: "I have not been pondering, during the last two years, the idea of a political solution. The conflict between Israel and the Arabs does not concern territory or policy."

53. Now, that indeed is not mincing words. We are in fact at the grass-roots of the conflict: Arab denial of the Israel people's right to independence and sovereignty. It is evident, if this is the attitude, that efforts to settle the conflict and to move from the state of cease-fire to a state of lasting peace will be faced with considerable obstacles. Members of the Security Council will undoubtedly ponder over these facts before reaching a conclusion, for a conclusion that could lend itself to an interpretation of being an encouragement to a misrepresentation of facts, disclaimers of responsibility, unbridled hostility and continued warfare may prove of the utmost gravity in the present situation in the Middle East.

54. As for the remarks made today by the representative of Lebanon concerning a peaceful settlement, it is superfluous to engage in an abstract debate on the degree to which the respective parties desire peace. Lebanon knows full well that it can have peace with Israel right here and now. All it has to do is sit down at the peace table with Israel. Lebanon also knows that it can have tranquillity on the border whenever it so decides. All it has to do is to abide scrupulously by the cease-fire.

55. Mr. MUUKA (Zambia): As Zambia makes its intervention in this debate, we should like to be guided by the following very important considerations: first, Zambia enjoys fraternal relations with both Israel and Lebanon. We cannot therefore but share in the miseries and successes of both—a position quite untenable when the one is lodging a serious complaint against the other. In the circumstances, my Government can only adhere to the principle it always cherishes: namely, to judge the case purely on its merits.

56. The second consideration stems from our equally firmly held conviction that force solves no problems; rather, it aggravates situations. We believe that for there to be peace among nations it is imperative for States to desist from the use of force, in whatever manner, against others. Also pertinent to the matter before the Council are two statements made by the representatives of Lebanon and Israel respectively, as follows:

"The Arab countries and peoples have sought, and sincerely seek, peace; for in peace they can use their

tremendous economic resources and apply their capabilities to raise the standard of living of their peoples.

"... One thing may help the Jewish people of Palestine—to resolve within themselves sincerely and wholeheartedly to live in peace with their neighbours—and then not a single aircraft will be needed." [1498th meeting, paras. 28 and 37.]

"It is not too late to secure observance of the cease-fire between Lebanon and Israel. It is not too late for the Security Council to call on Lebanon to abide by its cease-fire obligations. Such a call may well prove of cardinal importance to future developments in the area." [Ibid., para. 87.]

And indeed, only this morning we heard statements in the same vein.

57. The two statements I have quoted, whatever be the positions adopted by the persons who made them, when put side by side are seen to have a very important strand running through them: the desire for peace between the two countries. That is our third consideration.

58. The fourth inevitable consideration is that one of the parties to the conflict has reiterated before this Council its respect for and adherence to the Armistice Agreement between Israel and Lebanon. In the words of Mr. Ghorra:

"The Lebanon civil and military authorities have done everything in their power to abide scrupulously by both"—that is, the Agreement and the cease-fire—"and to maintain and promote peaceful conditions on our southern border." [1498th meeting, para. 21.]

In short, machinery recognized by this Council does exist for settling any conflicts between the two, provided both are prepared to use it instead of resorting to arms.

59. The final consideration stems from the fact that this conflict comes at a time when the Big Four, with the blessing of this Council, are seriously searching for a solution to the whole Middle East crisis. Is it appropriate now to extend the theatre of war to the Israel-Lebanese border, where a degree of relative tranquillity has been apparent for a long time?

60. Mr. President, I remain mindful of the very wise counsel you gave yesterday: that this debate should not degenerate into an unhelpful general one. Furthermore, I am equally convinced—in the words used by my Ambassador when addressing this Council on 1 April 1969 when it was examining the Jordanian complaint against Israel: "that the tragedy before us needs cool heads, and whipped-up emotions are certainly not likely to be in the interests of peace in the area". [1472nd meeting, para. 24.]

61. After carefully listening to all the arguments, my delegation is extremely perturbed to see that one of the parties to the conflict continues to believe in a policy of reprisals across international boundaries and that it executed it. Israel continues to hold its neighbours fully responsible for any action on the part of uprooted

Palestinians to regain their inalienable rights, irrespective of whether those neighbours are involved in any such action. It should be of interest to know what Israel would say if its neighbours in turn pointed an aggressive finger at those countries whose Jewish communities have been financing its policy of so-called reprisals. However, perhaps this is of academic interest. What is more disturbing is that Israel has resorted to arms when it could have complained about those twenty-one incidents to the observers under the Armistice Agreement or to the Security Council itself.

62. The Israeli air attack, severe as it was, becomes even more unpardonable when one realizes that napalm was used—and on civilian villages. Apart from the tragic loss of innocent lives such an attack usually causes, it is bound to harden the feelings of the Lebanese people. Having seen the pattern elsewhere, the inhabitants of southern Lebanon would naturally fear that this was a prelude to Israeli annexation and occupation. For this reason the Council must look beyond the tragic events of Monday, 11 August. While we deplore the loss of civilian life and property, we should strive to restore the confidence of the Lebanese people in the world order the United Nations stands for.

63. Lebanon is a small country and certainly not a militaristic one. We note that even in the hour of this outrage it has still raised its voice for peace with Israel. For a country with at least 150,000 Palestinian refugees within its borders, that is no mean task. When the combined effort of the world community cannot provide for the basic needs of the refugees in the area, Lebanon is sacrificing everything, including its own security, to answer the United Nations call for assistance to refugees. Surely we cannot fail it, particularly as it has made humble demands at this

particular juncture. Besides, not to support it would be tantamount to our acquiescing in the extension of the area of conflict when our efforts should be displayed in the opposite direction.

64. Zambia for its part remains firmly committed to the search for a lasting, just and secure peace—just to both Jews and Palestinians and secure to all the States in the area within their true boundaries. In accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, we remain opposed to the use of force in international affairs. This Council, we feel, should lend its support to the desire of all peace-loving countries, especially weak ones, to live without fear of attack from their militarily strong neighbours. In that regard, Israel should be warned to use the available internationally recognized methods for settling conflicts instead of resorting to force on the slightest pretext. We also hope that it is not too late for it to do so; for in doing so it will be helping to reverse the trend of unhappy events in that area.

65. Concerned as my country is with the escalation of the conflict and desirous of assisting rather than frustrating the peace efforts, we cannot but find Israel gravely at fault in attacking Lebanon.

66. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): If no other representative wishes to speak, I wish to announce that, following the usual consultations, it has been agreed that the Council will reconvene next Monday, 18 August, at 3 p.m. Of course, all the intervening time may be used to conclude the consultations now in progress.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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