

UNITED NATIONS

UN/STC/CONF/1
S/1504
UN/STC COLLECTION



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

1504th MEETING: 26 AUGUST 1969

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1504)	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 FOURTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 26 August 1969, at 4 p.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/1504)

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 previously taken by the Council, I shall now 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*): During the past few days, the members of the Council have held intensive consultations on this question. I am pleased to announce that, as a result of those consultations, agreement has been reached on the text of a draft resolution which

represents a consensus of opinion among the members of the Council. The text of the draft resolution appears in document S/9410, which has been circulated to the members of the Council.

3. If I hear no objection, I shall declare that draft resolution unanimously adopted.

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.*¹

4. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I shall now call first on the members of the Council.

5. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): This is no time to repeat what has been said already. I wish, however, to reaffirm that my Government has whole-heartedly supported the Secretary-General's proposal that United Nations observers should be stationed on both sides of the Israel-Lebanon border. I do not need or wish to go over what representatives of my delegation have said in this debate or in earlier debates about breaches of the cease-fire on one side and about reprisals on the other. We do not forget, and we must certainly deeply regret, what they mean in terms of loss of life and bereavement and suffering on both sides.

6. I would only add that as I have read the records of the earlier debate and remembered the previous similar debates in the past I have wearily reflected that we are making no progress. On the contrary, I fear that we are going backwards; we are losing ground. Every month that passes and every outbreak of violence on one side and every reprisal on the other represents a setback—a most serious setback to our hopes of peace.

7. There is a second frightening preoccupation, I am sure, in all our minds at this time. Hopes of peace seem to disappear over the horizon. Intense feeling mounts. It tends to drive out rational judgement and constructive thinking. Some fear that the time for making peace has run out, that we have missed our chance, that we have delayed too long. But there is another reaction to recent events—a reaction which, I am glad to say, has been expressed in a number of previous speeches. You yourself, Mr. President, emphasized the same reaction when you spoke to us on behalf of your country. All of us, I trust, join in believing that a just and lasting peace can still become a reality.

8. I ask how we can best stop the bloodshed and the suffering. Not by superior exhortations or lofty condem-

¹ See resolution 270 (1969).

nations. Not by threats or curses. All of us know that there is only one way to stop the sickening slide to enveloping conflict. It is by working confidently and urgently for a peaceful and lasting settlement. If we abandon that effort, then no verbal resolutions will save the peoples of the Middle East from utter calamity—from a disaster which may come slow or may come quick but will surely come, a conflict on a terrible scale.

9. As we disperse I trust that every one of us will resolve, in spite of all discouragements, to turn without further delay to the task of pursuing peace, to the only alternative to violence and bloodshed.

10. I believe that I can speak for all members of this Council when I say that all our concern, all our endeavour, should be directed to perseverance in that initiative. We must every day be working, not waiting. I pray that we shall not have to look back in future years and reproach ourselves for having failed to pursue our joint and agreed initiative when we still had time and when there were still favourable factors—chief among which is that we in this Council have unanimously declared and reaffirmed the principles and purposes of a just peace.

11. I believe I speak for all of us when I say that there is no hope for the future, no hope of stopping bloodshed and no hope of escape from the vicious circle of violence, unless we renew and redouble our efforts to make the lasting settlement proposed in the resolution of November 1967 a reality—and unless we work for that purpose without reservation, not only as something which is ultimately desirable but as something which is desperately and increasingly urgent now.

12. Today we have acted unanimously. I warmly congratulate all those who made that possible. Especially, if I may, I would pay tribute to your part, Mr. President in achieving that result, and to the part played by the Ambassador of Lebanon. I trust that our unanimity today can give us some hope for the future—a hope that will be betrayed unless we have faith that peace is possible and have courage in working for it.

13. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for the kind words he addressed to me.

14. Mr. YOST (United States of America): My delegation has joined in supporting the resolution that the Council has just adopted in the interest of ending the violence that is seriously impeding the efforts towards establishment of peace in the Middle East. As I indicated in my statement on 14 August [*1500th meeting*], the essential task of the Security Council and of the parties at this time is to create and maintain an atmosphere favourable to the success of the diplomatic efforts now in progress looking towards agreement on a just and durable peace, to which the representative of the United Kingdom has just so eloquently referred.

15. As he has pointed out, violence along cease-fire lines in the Middle East has unfortunately been increasing in recent months. The inevitable result is that passions are height-

ened, rigid negotiating positions become even more rigid, and margins for compromise and accommodation, on which an agreed settlement depends, become even narrower. We are particularly concerned that violence is extending to the frontier between Israel and Lebanon, which has hitherto been relatively free of it. It is because we wish strongly to condemn the extension of fighting to that area that we have joined in voting for this resolution.

16. In several respects, the resolution that we have adopted is not what we should have preferred. It does not deal in as balanced a fashion as we should have wished with the cycle of provocation and reprisal which are responsible for extending the violence to that frontier. Nevertheless, the resolution does make clear the Council's strong disapproval of all violations of the cease-fire, from wherever they may emanate. The resolution refers not only to acts of military reprisal by one of the parties but also to violent incursions launched across the frontier from the territory of the other party. Thus the operative paragraphs of the resolution reaffirm strict obligations on all concerned to avoid violations of the cease-fire.

17. We would also have much preferred that there be no reference in the resolution to the Israel-Lebanon Armistice Agreement because its status and continued validity is contested by the parties concerned. However, we do not consider that its being recalled in this resolution prejudices the position of either party in regard to it and we have therefore agreed that it might be referred to along with the cease-fire which both parties have accepted.

18. Of course what the Council is seeking here and elsewhere in the Middle East, as clearly set forth in its resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, is a just and lasting peace and not merely restoration of armistice situations. We must continue to pursue that overriding goal and to move beyond armistice agreements and cease-fires to genuine peace.

19. Mr. MORALES SUAREZ (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): The delegation of Colombia voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted for the Council's consideration, precisely, because the terms of the resolution entirely correspond to the views it has expressed on the matter.

20. My delegation expressed condemnation of any acts of reprisal and opposition to any unilateral and arbitrary punitive operation.

21. My delegation also stated that violations of the cease-fire under any circumstances whatever, encouraged or committed by either regular or irregular forces, are condemnable, that they are contrary to the interests of peace and alien to a final and just solution of the problems in the Middle East.

22. Mr. CAWEN (Finland): To the Finnish delegation the unanimous decision just taken by the Security Council is cause for satisfaction. We are well aware that long and delicate negotiations were necessary to achieve this result. We wish to express our appreciation to those who were most immediately involved in those negotiations. Only by acting unanimously, as it has done today, can the Council

expect to make its influence fully and effectively felt. This is particularly true in the context of the situation in the Middle East.

23. By this decision, the Council has made it clear that it can neither ignore nor condone any violations of the cease-fire regardless of whether they are committed by regular Israeli forces or by irregular forces crossing the cease-fire lines. The Council's resolution should thus have the effect of strengthening respect for the cease-fire on the frontiers between Lebanon and Israel and of contributing to the re-establishment of calm and quiet in the area. A major step towards the prevention of any recurrence of the violence of the kind we have recently witnessed would be the acceptance by the parties of the Secretary-General's proposals to place United Nations observers in the area on the basis on which the proposals were made and without prejudice to the legal positions of the parties. The Finnish Government strongly supports the Secretary-General's proposal.

24. I should not conclude my statement without paying a special tribute to the representative of Lebanon for the restrained and constructive manner in which he dealt with a question which understandably is a matter of the most serious concern for his Government. The consideration of this question has clearly shown the respect and sympathy which the Council has for the efforts of the Government of Lebanon to ensure security for its people, whose wish to live in peace is well known to us all.

25. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): At the 1502nd meeting on Monday, 18 August, I set forth the views of my delegation on the questions now before the Security Council.

26. In the light of that statement, the reasons for the vote my delegation has just cast in favour of the draft resolution submitted to the Council might be considered to have been explained.

27. Nevertheless, in accordance with specific instructions given to me, it is my duty clearly to state the meaning my delegation attaches to certain provisions of the resolution adopted; these are provisions which might be opened to different and perhaps even conflicting interpretations regarding their scope and significance. I refer particularly to operative paragraph 2 and to the expression "other grave violations of the cease-fire", in operative paragraph 4.

28. The Security Council, by earlier decisions which are still as much in force and valid today as when they were adopted, has unequivocally established the obligations of the States which are parties to the conflict and defined their responsibilities, especially with regard to the scrupulous observance of the cease-fire, truce or armistice.

29. Pursuant to those decisions, any breach of the cease-fire or any act violating it implies disobedience to the high authority of the Council. Moreover, each of these acts adds new grave elements to a situation which in itself is grave enough already.

30. Therefore, all such acts violating the cease-fire, truce or armistice, whatever their source, are equally to be

condemned. That is why we believe that the word "condemn" could well have been used in operative paragraph 2 of the resolution, especially in view of its relation to the fifth preambular paragraph.

31. We interpret this resolution as follows: we believe it covers all the violations of the cease-fire reported in this debate, particularly by the provisions found in the second operative paragraph and the relevant parts of the fourth.

32. My last words must be to express appreciation to the representatives who participated in the consultations which enabled us to arrive at this unanimous decision in the Security Council, and to the representative of Lebanon in particular.

33. Mr. AZZOUT (Algeria) (*translated from French*): The Algerian delegation, in its concern to strengthen the authority of the Council, voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document S/9410.

34. Naturally, my delegation would have liked the Council to go beyond the warning it addressed to Israel in paragraph 3 of its resolution 262 (1968)—in other words, that it should have taken concrete measures to put its decisions into effect. The Security Council once again unequivocally condemns the policy of reprisals systematically pursued by the Tel Aviv authorities. It may be noted that this resolution is, from end to end, addressed solely to Israel and that the interpretations which the States allied with Israel have not failed to provide are and remain outside the resolution. It is true that attempts have always been made in this Council to put the Palestine national liberation movement in the dock. Is it not enough to prejudice the legitimate rights of a people but must you try to thwart their rebirth as well? The Palestine people feel in no way concerned, directly or indirectly, by the resolutions of an Organization which moreover—need I remind you? — is responsible for this tragedy.

35. It was on this understanding—minus the interpretation of the text given by the representative of the United States—that the Algerian delegation voted in favour of the resolution.

36. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): I have asked for the floor in order to explain the position of my delegation on the resolution which has just been adopted unanimously by the Security Council.

37. My delegation has consistently maintained that any assertion by Israel of the so-called right of reprisal against Arab States is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and to all rules of international law. While, therefore, we have supported the resolution in document S/9410, my delegation reserves its position on operative paragraph 2, which "Deplores all violent incidents in violation of the cease-fire". Our reservation stems from the same considerations that I set forth in my statement at the 1407th meeting in relation to operative paragraph 3 of resolution 248 (1968), the first sentence of which is identical with operative paragraph 2 of the present resolution. I stated then:

"In the view of my delegation, the inclusion of this paragraph does not in any way imply that the sporadic

acts of terrorism alleged by Israel are to be equated with the large-scale military attack by Israel on 21 March. Operative paragraph 3 does not in any way qualify the condemnation in operative paragraph 2." [1407th meeting, para. 61.]

I further said:

"We cannot permit an interpretation of operative paragraph 3—that is, of resolution 248 (1968)—“that would, in the event of any future incident, enable Israel to claim the freedom to launch any military attacks against Jordan or any of its other neighbours.” [Ibid., para. 62.]

38. Again on 28 March 1969, I stated:

"We fully realize that the dictates of realism, balance and restraint cannot be disregarded. But it is not balance to equate the grave violations of the cease-fire committed by Israel with the actions of the Arab resistance organizations." [1468th meeting, para. 53.]

That remains our position.

39. In conclusion, I should like to support the eloquent plea of Lord Caradon, the representative of the United Kingdom, for a renewed effort to promote a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

40. I have confined my remarks to the issue before the Council, but I can hardly conclude without referring to the grief and the anguish that all of us have suffered as a result of the extensive damage caused by arson to the Al Aqsa Mosque, one of the holiest shrines of Islam. To that issue of transcendental importance I shall address myself at the appropriate moment.

41. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Security Council has just adopted a resolution in which it condemned Israel's aggressive actions against Lebanon and issued another warning to Israel. The consideration of this question in the Security Council and the decision adopted by the Council are yet another moral and political defeat for Israel, demonstrating the bankruptcy and hopelessness of Tel Aviv's adventurist, militarist course.

42. It is no accident that, during the discussion in the Security Council, Israel's actions against Lebanon were unanimously condemned by all the members of the Council. Even those who tried to shield the aggressor and place his criminal acts on the same level as the legitimate liberation struggle of the Arab people, even those delegates could not bring themselves to deny Israel's guilt and expressed their censure of its action.

43. This is an extremely serious political event. It indicates that the extremist policy of the present Israeli Government is increasingly accentuating its international isolation. The persistence of the Israeli ruling circles in their aggressive policy, Israel's sabotage of a political settlement in the Middle East based on the well-known Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967—all this is fraught with dangerous consequences for the cause of peace.

44. This new condemnation by the Security Council of Israel's aggressive course is not an isolated one. It is another in the long succession of condemnations of Israel. It is added to the just reckoning which the Security Council and the peoples of the world are presenting to the aggressor.

45. The decision adopted by the Security Council today contains a number of minimum provisions: condemnation of Israel for its aggressive actions against Lebanon and a stern warning to the aggressor not to continue such actions.

46. The Soviet delegation shares the view of those who consider that it would have been in the interests of the struggle against Israeli aggression and of the achievement of a political settlement in the Middle East based on the well-known Security Council resolution for the Security Council to adopt a stronger decision. Nevertheless, the Soviet delegation considers that the resolution adopted just now is a necessary step. It serves the interests of the struggle against Israeli aggression and may promote a political settlement in the Middle East.

47. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): No other member of the Council is entered on my list of speakers.

48. If no other member of the Council wishes to speak, I shall call on the representative of Lebanon.

49. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): By coming before the Council Lebanon did not subscribe to Dante's admonition when he said, "All hope abandon, ye who enter here." We manifested our trust in and our reliance on the Council in the several statements we made here when the Council dealt with the Israeli premeditated attack on the international airport of Beirut in late December 1968, and when it dealt with the present case. In both cases we had hoped that the Council would, in the light of the heavy record of Israel's acts of aggression against its Arab neighbours, take effective measures to deter it from its recalcitrant acts, to curb its unbridled designs and expansionist ambitions. In both cases the Council stopped short of adopting those measures. In their absence Israel can feel free, as the representative of Pakistan just said, to believe that it can continue, without punishment, its aggressive acts and its threats of the use of force.

50. The Council assumes a grave responsibility in that respect. Our requests and warnings should not go unheeded for the sake of achieving unanimity amongst members of the Council and of preventing any division at a time when quiet diplomacy is pursued in an earnest search for means to achieve a final settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. But quiet diplomacy, whether bilateral or quadrilateral, has been slow and is in fact still slow in coming to grips with the explosive situation of the Middle East. While diplomacy was apparently on holiday, many grave developments took place in the Middle East as a consequence of repeated Israeli aggressive acts.

51. Israel persists in levelling unfounded charges against Lebanon. Those charges have not been substantiated. We reiterate what we have already stated on many occasions here in the Council: that these alleged incidents could very easily have been verified had Israel accepted that United

Nations observers attached to the Mixed Armistice Commission should operate on its side of the border. In his letter to me, our esteemed Secretary-General recently said:

“There is only token United Nations observer representation on the Lebanese side and none at all on the Israeli side. It has not been possible, therefore, for me to provide the Council with accounts of incidents in that sector, including the most recent ones which have given rise to the present meetings of the Council. This lack of verified information cannot but affect adversely the consideration of the question in that body.” [S/9393.]

52. We take it that the Secretary-General had in mind the incidents alleged by Israel to have taken place on its side of the armistice line. As for the massive and premeditated air attack against several villages in southern Lebanon, there was an open opportunity for everyone to verify it. Such a verification was not even necessary. The Israeli representative admitted that attack in writing, and here in the Council. Furthermore, in our reply to the Secretary-General's letter of 16 August 1969 we stated emphatically that we still adhere to the Armistice Agreement and honour our obligations under it. The observers of the Mixed Armistice Commission continue to be stationed on our territory. We stated that should the need arise Lebanon would agree to the strengthening of the Commission machinery. In his evasive reply of 25 August 1969 the representative of Israel claimed that the armistice period “is now behind us”. [S/9393/Add.2.]

53. The Council has in its wisdom adopted the resolution contained in document S/9410. If by its unanimous adoption all our hopes were not realized, at least some of them were. Our delegation is gratified that the resolution has been adopted unanimously. Another reason for our satisfaction is that the Council has in the second paragraph of the preambular part taken into consideration Lebanon's complaint contained in document S/9383 dated 11 August 1969 and rejected the counter-complaint of the representative of Israel contained in document S/9387 of 12 August 1969. As some representatives of the Council have already stated in one form or another, the resolution must be read in the light of that paragraph. It constitutes the factual and juridical basis for the main paragraph. We are also gratified that the resolution recalls Security Council resolution 262 (1968), which was also unanimously adopted by the Council following the premeditated and massive air attack against the airport of Beirut by Israeli aircraft.

54. We are also pleased with the Council's recalling the Armistice Agreement of 23 March 1949 between Israel and Lebanon. That Agreement, in our view and in the view of an abundant body of opinion here in the United Nations, is still alive and valid. Israel has made many attempts to free itself of its obligations under that Armistice Agreement. On 7 June 1967, an Israeli plane was shot down over the Syrian territory adjacent to Lebanon, and its pilot, bailing out, landed safely on Lebanese territory. Israel requested his release, through the Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission. On that occasion, that is 9 June, Israel inquired of the Government of Lebanon, through the same channels, whether or not it considered the Armistice Agreement to be still valid. The Lebanese Government in its

reply confirmed the principles of international law and the decisions of the Security Council regarding this matter. On 13 June 1967, the French newspaper *Le Monde* reported that Mr. Eshkol, the then Prime Minister of Israel, had declared in the Knesset that Israel no longer recognized the Armistice Demarcation Lines except those with Lebanon. It was then clear that Israel did not consider the Lebanese reply as a denunciation of the Armistice Agreement. The one who very clearly denounced it was Mr. Abba Eban, the Israeli Foreign Minister, when he declared, on 14 August 1967—and I shall quote him in French—that:

[The speaker continued in French.]

“There was an Armistice Agreement with Lebanon. On 5 June, Lebanon declared war on Israel by the old, classical method of a declaration of war. Under international law, the declaration of war conclusively terminates armistice agreements; for this reason, there is no longer any legal framework for our relations with Lebanon and we should like to have a peace arrangement with it.”

[The speaker continued in English.]

Israel cannot resort to this fallacious argument that Lebanon has declared war on Israel according to the classical way of declaring war. That allegation has no substance in fact; it exists only in the minds of the Israeli authorities; it is motivated only by their bad faith. The Armistice Agreement remains valid.

55. I would like here to put on record what our esteemed Secretary-General mentioned in the Introduction to his annual report [A/6701/Add.1, para. 43],² covering the period 16 June 1966 to 15 June 1967, part V, paragraph 43: “On the other hand there has been no indication either in the General Assembly or in the Security Council that the validity and applicability of the Armistice Agreements have been changed as a result of the recent hostilities or of the war of 1956; each agreement, in fact, contains a provision that it will remain in force ‘until a peaceful settlement between the parties is achieved’. Nor has the Security Council or the General Assembly taken any steps to change the pertinent resolutions of either organ relating to the Armistice Agreements or to the earlier cease-fire demands. The Agreements provide that by mutual consent the signatories can revise or suspend them. There is no provision in them for unilateral termination of their application. This has been the United Nations position all along and will continue to be the position until a competent organ decides otherwise.”

56. The obligation of Israel to respect its adherence to the Armistice Agreement is supported also by Article 103 of the Charter. That Article stipulates, as we all know, that

“In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the Members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present Charter shall prevail.”

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 1A.*

We maintain that there is no actual conflict between the obligations deriving from an Armistice Agreement and those of its signatories under the Charter. On the contrary, the obligations under that Agreement are consonant and in full accord with their obligations under the Charter. The Armistice Agreement is the more binding on Israel because it has been entered into under the aegis of the United Nations and its stipulations support the principles and objectives of the Charter. Israel cannot release itself from its obligations under both and put itself outside the law of nations.

57. I am sorry, Mr. President and members of the Council, to have to detain you a little further, but there are certain points which my delegation and Government felt we should put on the record of the Security Council.

58. In the discussion today we have heard some mention of cease-fire lines. My delegation does not subscribe to that expression. I think that there has already been a debate in the Security Council about that matter, and Lord Caradon, the representative of the United Kingdom, will recall that the opinion of the Security Council is that there is no such thing as a cease-fire line; there is a cease-fire. The cease-fire is a call from the Security Council to the parties concerned to desist from firing; it is a prohibition upon them, that they not resort to warring. The cease-fire is not, in our opinion, a substitution of the Armistice Agreement. It does not supersede it. The contrary is true. The jurisprudence of the United Nations confirms this point of view. In 1949, when the Security Council adopted its resolution [72 (1949)] of 11 August of that year, the principle was established, and it has subsequently been upheld. Our esteemed Under-Secretary-General, Dr. Ralph Bunche, who was then the Acting Mediator, can testify for this point of view.

59. The resolution just adopted by the Council stipulates, in operative paragraph 1, a condemnation of "the premeditated air attack by Israel on villages in Southern Lebanon, in violation of its obligations under the Charter and Security Council resolutions". Our delegation is satisfied with that language, although we had hoped it would reflect the language used in resolution 262 (1968).

60. Nevertheless, we have our reservations about operative paragraph 2, which "deplores all violent incidents in violation of the cease-fire". The cease-fire, which was accepted by Lebanon, was a call by the Council to the warring parties of that time to cease firing. Lebanon has respected its obligations under the Armistice Agreement and the cease-fire; it has not taken any action to breach the cease-fire. On two occasions Israel has undertaken massive military acts to breach the cease-fire: by attacking the International Airport of Beirut and, recently, by attacking seven villages in Southern Lebanon.

61. In operative paragraph 3, the Council "deplores the extension of the area fighting". We agree with the Council in its deploring of the extension of the area of fighting because, by its attack against Lebanon, Israel is extending the area of fighting.

62. The Lebanese Government, as we have said before, has done and is doing all in its power to maintain conditions of

peace on our southern border. It is determined to do so despite the threats that we continually receive from Israel. In the last two days alone, Israel has been repeating its charges and threats against Lebanon. We should like to bring this to the attention of the Council at this stage. Should Israel repeat its attacks against Lebanon—the kind of attacks it has undertaken on the last two occasions—Lebanon will have no recourse but to come before the Council and face the Council squarely with its full responsibilities.

63. In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to thank you and those members of the Council who have helped in bringing about the adoption of this resolution, which, although it does not fully satisfy us, at least meets some of the points we have made here in the Council.

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

65. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I am obliged, at this concluding meeting of the Security Council's debate, to draw the Security Council's attention to the sombre realities of the situation. Even as the Council pursued its deliberations and member States consulted on an appropriate form of words for a draft resolution, armed attacks against Israel were continuing from Lebanon, in flagrant violation of the cease-fire. Israeli towns and villages were being shelled, and the lives of innocent civilians put in jeopardy.

66. In the last three days alone, three serious acts of aggression have taken place.

67. On 23 August at approximately 10 p.m, two Israeli villages—Dafna and Shear Yashuv in Upper Galilee—were attacked from Lebanese territory by 130-millimetre Katyusha rocket fire.

68. Yesterday, at approximately 2.30 a.m., the village of Kefar Yuval north of Qiryat Shemona was attacked with bazookas and small arms from Lebanese territory.

69. Again, at approximately 3.15 a.m., bazooka and small arms fire was directed from Lebanese territory on the village of Metula.

70. It is regrettable that the resolution now adopted joins a long list of similar texts which have reflected, again and again, the chronic disability of the Security Council to address itself to the Israel-Arab conflict with the necessary equity and effectiveness. The facts of the situation discussed by the Council are unmistakably clear. In recent months Lebanese territory has become a base for terror operations against Israel. The last few weeks have witnessed a grave intensification of these attacks, directed primarily against the civilian population of Israel. Terror warfare of this kind is an old method employed by the Arab States, in violation of international law and the United Nations Charter, throughout the twenty-year Arab war on Israel.

71. Faced with the duty to protect its citizens from armed attack, the Government of Israel resorted, on 11 August, to its inherent and inalienable right of self-defence and took

action to disable encampments of the irregular forces in Southern Lebanon, from which the acts of aggression against Israel were being carried out.

72. These facts have been fully confirmed by published statements made on behalf of the joint command of the terror organizations; they have been freely announced by Lebanese personalities and the Lebanese press, widely reported by international media of information, and are fully established by many eyewitnesses of unimpeachable integrity. The Lebanese representative has made only perfunctory attempts to question these facts, and when he does question them, as he did today, he finds himself at odds with reality.

73. For instance, according to the Beirut daily *Al Nahar* of 18 August, 42.4 per cent of the Lebanese citizens questioned in a special Gallup poll consider the presence of saboteur groups on Lebanese soil and their operations against Israel as the cause for Israel's action on 11 August.

74. The resolution of the Security Council inexplicably ignores these facts. A number of members of the Council have condemned unequivocally the armed attacks carried out from Lebanon against Israel, and rejected the Lebanese Government's denial of responsibility for violations of the cease-fire. However, the resolution, although it proscribes all violent incidents in violation of the cease-fire—and, therefore, obviously the armed attacks by irregular forces from Lebanon—fails to single out those attacks for strong and specific censure. On the other hand, it does censure the Israel defence action against those attacks.

75. Now, such a double standard may encourage the aggressor. It will strengthen the defender in the opinion that the Security Council is, unfortunately, unable to recognize the defender's legitimate rights, whatever the understanding, and indeed knowledge, of some of its members may be.

76. Matters have reached such a point that even a formal reference in the preamble of the resolution to the Lebanese letter to the Council cannot be balanced by a similar reference to the Israeli letter; and at the same time room is found in the preamble to recall the ghost of the armistice régime, nullified by the Arab refusal to respect it and finally voided by Arab aggression. The defects of the resolution are further expressed in the fact that, while terror organizations and the Lebanese press and Lebanese leaders have openly admitted that Israel's action was directed against saboteur encampments, the resolution speaks of reprisal on Lebanese villages; and the exclusion at Arab insistence of a direct and explicit call by the Security Council to the parties to observe the cease-fire is a striking example of the resolution's inadequacy.

77. Here I would observe that my Government's reluctance to invite the Security Council to consider Israeli grievances flows from considerations such as these and not from those repeatedly alleged by Arab spokesmen, including the representative of Lebanon, and their supporters. Members of the United Nations and the representatives in the Council who know of the high esteem and personal friendship in which we hold them will undoubtedly

understand that resolutions on the Middle East adopted by the Council in these circumstances must be regarded as being primarily a reflection of the arithmetical vagaries of the vote, always dominated by the fact that of fifteen members of the Council no less than six have no diplomatic relations with Israel or deny Israel's right to independence and sovereignty.

78. The difficulties which the Security Council faces in producing balanced, equitable, realistic resolutions on the Israel-Arab conflict are becoming a matter of increasingly grave concern to the Council itself and to all to whom the ideals of the United Nations Charter are dear. These internal difficulties, however, do not affect basic tenets of law and justice, and their unhappy results cannot be interpreted as prejudicing the legitimate rights of a State which has been continuously resisting implacable aggression for more than two decades. Surely it cannot be expected that any sector of the cease-fire line would remain undefended, any village or town left open to attack, and the security of a single Israeli civilian or soldier sacrificed or the aggressor allowed to go unpunished, because of a text resulting from such failings. There is no place for any illusions concerning Israel's determination to resist all aggression and to agree to supplant the cease-fire with nothing less than true, lasting peace. The persistent refusal by the Arab States to recognize Israel's rights and terminate their lengthy war on Israel may well have been nurtured by some such illusions and by the tendency to accept propaganda slogans as a substitute for real understanding. For example, Arab aggression against Israel since 1948 has been fed on the slogan that the Jewish people returning to their homeland are strangers. In fact no people in the world has proven its attachment to its land throughout the ages with greater strength, dedication and sacrifice than the people of Israel. Arab aggression has sought desperately to vindicate itself by the slogan of the alleged injustice to the Palestinian Arab refugees. In reality the only difference between the Arab refugees and an almost equal number of Jewish refugees from the Arab States is that the latter, being an integral part of the Jewish people, have been accepted and fully integrated in the Jewish State while the Arab refugees, for political reasons, have been abandoned by their brethren, and many still live on international charity.

79. The spurious claim that Arab terror warfare is a consequence of the refugee problem would be no different from a suggestion that the Israel Government should have organized and waged warfare against the Arab States because of the destitute Jewish refugees from Arab lands who had fled to Israel. Today Arab warfare looks for additional succour in the slogan of strife against Israeli occupation and of an alleged movement of national resistance, ignoring that there have never been agreed boundaries between Israel and its neighbours, that the present cease-fire lines result from Israel's repulse of an all-Arab attempt in 1967 to destroy it, and that the terror warfare carried on from the Arab States at present is a continuation of a method of harassment resorted to by the Arab States for no less than two decades. It is a method of aggression openly decided upon, organized and conducted by the Arab Governments by means of irregular forces specially trained in the contemptible pursuit of indis-

criminate murder of men, women and children. It has never been, nor is it today, anything that even remotely resembles or deserves the title of a national movement of resistance.

80. The new fashionable Arab slogan, that Israel can be forced to retreat from its legitimate objectives of peace and security by a war of attrition, belongs to the same trash-can as similar flourishes of bellicosity in the past. A people that has resisted attrition by history's overpowering storms for 3,000 years will not be weakened by another hour of trial. On the contrary, in the dangers and difficulties of the present they are already finding additional strength, resilience and inspiration—even as Arab aggression continues, and the people of Israel pursue their work of construction and creation. It is time, for their own good and for that of their people, that the Arab Governments realized that violence against Israel is today as futile as it has been in the past and that only real peace can bring happiness to both Arab and Israeli. Indeed, escapist subservience to the slogans of propaganda and the refusal of the leaders to face the truth have only brought disaster to the Arab States and catastrophe to their peoples.

81. It is regrettable that Lebanon as well should have entered on this path and brought about an extension of the area of fighting. It is regrettable, yet perhaps not entirely surprising, for as far back as May 1967 Lebanon made it clear that it identified itself entirely with the campaign of aggression that was being launched at the time against Israel under the aegis of Egypt. On 30 May the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lebanon declared in the Security Council:

“Lebanon supports this exercise by the United Arab Republic of its sovereign rights over the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba. We still stand by the United Arab Republic. . . . In a total war the Arabs will use all means to defeat their enemy” [1344th meeting, paras. 18 and 21].

82. The debate here and the Security Council resolution are diplomatic events which, like similar ones preceding them, regrettably are of little effect in efforts to resolve the Middle East conflict. This episode is now over. Lebanon and Israel are left, however, to live with each other as neighbours. They will continue to have to grapple with the realities of the security situation and the duty of every government to protect the lives and property of its citizens.

83. Israel's policy will continue to be scrupulous observance of the cease-fire. Lebanon will continue to face the question whether it will abide by its obligations under the cease-fire. It cannot evade a decision whether to allow its territory to remain a base of aggression from which armed attacks are being launched against Israel or to take effective measures to put an end to these attacks. On this decision and on the measures the Lebanese authorities will adopt to terminate violations of the cease-fire from its territory will depend whether tranquillity will prevail on the border or whether the armed attacks will continue, leaving Israel with no alternative but to defend itself against them. Indeed, only faithful observance of the cease-fire can bring us closer to the objective which should be common to us all: true, just and lasting peace.

84. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Lebanon.

85. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon): It is not the intention of my delegation to detain the members of the Council for any length of time. The members of the Council are by now accustomed to hearing the type of statement just delivered by the representative of Israel each time the Council adopts a resolution condemning Israel for its continued premeditated attacks. However, there are certain points in the statement just made by the representative of Israel that my delegation cannot pass over without exercising its right of reply in order to put the record straight.

86. The Council has no doubt heard that the representative of Israel was clearly making allegations about new incidents, which he claims, have taken place as a result of people, as he again claims, crossing from the Lebanese border. The representative of Israel said this after the Chairman of the delegation of Lebanon had informed members of the Council of formal threats that the Government of Israel has levelled against Lebanon over the last forty-eight hours. What the representative of Israel seems to be proposing to the Council is this: he will level accusations against Lebanon in order to prepare in the shortest time possible another wanton attack against Lebanon. It is my delegation's duty to draw the attention of the Council to that fact.

87. Even as he was about to end his statement, the representative of Israel said that the reaction of Israel will depend on the measures that Lebanon will adopt. That is, no decision adopted by the Security Council, no warning, no directive will be heeded by Israel. He was just informing the members of the Council that he would reserve for himself and his Government the right to react and the right to make the adoption of reprisals a norm of international law.

88. We again express regret that the Council did not see fit to take more effective measures at this stage of its consideration of Lebanon's complaint against Israel. More effective measures would put an end to the type of statement that the representative of Israel so likes to make—although such statements would not harm anyone if it were not for the certainty that the Government of Israel is preparing for another attack on Lebanon. That is a very serious matter that the members of the Council should bear in mind.

89. Again, the representative of Israel referred to the Armistice Agreements by calling them “the ghost of Armistice Agreements”. My delegation has on many occasions put its views on record as far as the Armistice Agreements are concerned. I do not think that there is a need to emphasize further our position in that regard, but we would have this to say: We consider that the Security Council, in adopting its resolution today and in recalling in that resolution the Armistice Agreement between Lebanon and Israel, pronounced itself to the effect that it considers the Lebanon-Israeli Armistice Agreement to be still valid and applicable, and no other interpretation will be accepted by my delegation.

90. In recalling its resolutions on the cease-fire, the Security Council has consolidated the validity and applicability of the Armistice Agreement by emphasizing an underlying obligation, an underlying undertaking on the parties and by the parties, namely, to observe the cease-fire. In this spirit we interpret the insertion in the same preambular paragraph of the reference to the cease-fire resolutions and to the Armistice Agreement.

91. Above and beyond all these considerations and above and beyond the terror of this debate and in another demonstration of our good faith to the members of the Council, my delegation wishes, as the Council is about to conclude its consideration of our complaint against Israel, to submit—for a better understanding and a full appreciation of our position—the following statement, which I shall make in French.

[The speaker continued in French.]

92. Above and beyond all the considerations and all the arguments which have been advanced in the course of these discussions, I should like respectfully to ask the distinguished members of the Security Council to ponder on the quite exceptional case of Lebanon.

93. Lebanon is a small country which, at home, has fraternal and peaceful co-operation among the different communities composing it and, abroad, is one of the countries most open to the world, to all that is human and universal. This small country is on the edge of the Palestinian tragedy, whose dire repercussions it suffers at the political, military, economic and social levels. There are 300,000 Palestinian refugees living on our territory, whom we cannot repatriate and whom, for humanitarian, political, moral and fraternal reasons, we cannot drive out of our territory. If some of these refugees or their brothers see that, after all the trials they have endured, nobody has yet been able to ensure their exercise of the rights which the international community has so often recognized, including the right to return to their homes, and if they try to exercise that right directly, to take the law into their own hands and, in short, to apply the resolutions repeatedly adopted by the highest international bodies, Lebanon cannot prevent them from doing so.

94. Nor can Lebanon always prevent all their activities. If, because of this situation, the Lebanese population has to be exposed to bombing, and particularly with napalm, the result will be that this country, which is in no way responsible for the unleashing of the tragedy or for the turn it has taken, may find not only its internal and external security but also its national unity in jeopardy.

95. I hope these considerations will be constantly borne in mind by each member of the Security Council. To be sure, it is easy to adopt a resolution, as the Security Council has just done, whose wording seems satisfactory from the technical standpoint; but we must get to the bottom of the situation, foresee all its possible consequences and avoid

jeopardizing a successful human experiment and condemning it to all kinds of upheavals and disruptions.

96. For almost three months, as everybody knows, Lebanon has been going through the most acute and serious political and governmental crisis in its history, precisely because of the Palestinian tragedy. It is in nobody's interest to aggravate our difficulties. In saying this, we appeal to the sense of responsibility of every member of the Security Council and to your conscience as men. The harmonious human synthesis achieved by Lebanon has a significance which transcends its borders. In short, it represents the supreme longing of all human beings for an era of brotherly understanding and co-operation. When we really think about it, surely one of the goals to which the United Nations aspires is precisely to make such progress feasible on an international scale? Possibly, this plea does not seem remarkable to some. From the historical viewpoint, however, the case of Lebanon undoubtedly represents a stage and criteria which can lead either to progress or to regression.

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

98. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I have no intention at all to engage in a debate with the representative of Lebanon. He painted here a touching picture of a little country. I should like to assure him that we ask of his little country only one little thing: abide by your international obligations, stop armed attacks against us, and there will be tranquillity on the border.

99. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Lebanon.

100. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon): The 300,000 refugees are in Lebanon because of Israel. That is the only reply I wish to make.

101. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I should be grateful if representatives would help us, if possible, to hasten the conclusion of the debate.

102. I call on the representative of Israel.

103. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I have only one observation on the last remark of the representative of Lebanon. We are fully aware of the presence of a number of refugees from Palestine on Lebanese soil. The Lebanese Government is undoubtedly aware of the fact that in Israel there are about 600,000 refugees—Jewish refugees from Arab States.

104. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Council has concluded its consideration of the item submitted for its consideration in the past few days. Therefore, I shall now adjourn the meeting.

The meeting rose at 6.05 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 distribidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
