

UNITED NATIONS

UN/SA COLLECTION



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FIFTH YEAR

1540th MEETING: 14 MAY 1970

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1540)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 12 May 1970 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9794)	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 12 May 1970 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9795)	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 FORTIETH MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 14 May 1970, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Jacques KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET
(France).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Burundi, China, Colombia, Finland, France, Nepal, Nicaragua, Poland, Sierra Leone, Spain, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zambia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1540)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 12 May 1970 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9794).
3. The situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 12 May 1970 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9795).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 12 May 1970 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9794)

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 12 May 1970 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9795)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with decisions taken previously by the Council [1537th meeting], I invite the representatives of Lebanon, Israel, Morocco and Saudi Arabia to participate in the debate without the right to vote. In accordance with the practice followed in the past, I propose to invite the representatives of the parties directly concerned, that is, the representatives of Lebanon and Israel, to take seats at the Council table. The other representatives will be invited to take the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber on the understanding that they will be invited to sit at the table when it is their turn to address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. E. Ghorra (Lebanon) and Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel), took places at the Security Council table; and Mr. A. Benhima (Morocco), and Mr. J. M. Baroody (Saudi Arabia), took the places reserved for them.

2. Mr. MWAANGA (Zambia): I should like to state very briefly the views of the Zambian delegation on the serious matter of which the Security Council is currently seized. We have condemned Israel's policy of punitive reprisals against its Arab neighbours in the past and we wish to condemn in no uncertain terms Israel's latest attack on Lebanon in the Mount Hermon area. We view the incident of 12 May, which was terminated yesterday, with the utmost concern. Not only does it constitute a clear and undisguised violation of the cease-fire resolutions, not only does it represent added disrespect for and utter disregard of the authority of the Security Council, but it also confronts us with renewed difficulties, with a new burst of animosity and hatred along the path to a permanent peace in the Middle East. It also sets a very dangerous precedent for our own situation which could have untold consequences.

3. I wish to state the anxiety and disquiet of my Government that for all the time that the Security Council has been dealing with this matter we have succeeded only in getting ourselves bogged down in a dangerous exercise of marking time and waiting for diplomatic miracles to happen.

4. It is sad to note that since 22 November 1967, when resolution 242 (1967) was unanimously adopted, no appreciable progress has been made, and that the situation remains as dangerously dead-locked as before, if not more dead-locked than before. To say that no appreciable progress has been made is not to criticize those who have been engaged in a search for peace on our behalf. The dedication of the Secretary-General to the cause of peace in that region is only too well known and, likewise, the untiring, patient and skilful efforts of Ambassador Jarring are universally recognized and admired.

5. However, I must state my concern that since the four major Powers assumed the special responsibility—which rightly belongs to them—of assisting the promotion of a settlement in the area, the situation has visibly deteriorated. As things stand now, we run the risk of making the same historical error made during

the time preceding the June 1967 war: the error of leaving things to drift towards tension, confrontation and conflict. To the representatives of the Big Four—France, the United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet Union—I should like to make an urgent appeal for a serious and deliberate effort aimed at achieving peace in the Middle East.

6. The special role and responsibility of the permanent members in this peace-keeping effort is too obvious to require any detailed elaboration on my part. Let it suffice to say, gentlemen, that you have the key in your hands; you have the means to end this tragic loss of human life, and that, above all, you are capable of influencing the course of events in that region. I appeal to you to use that influence in the name of mankind.

7. Each report emanating from the Middle East always makes a point of stating that "the latest fighting is the biggest Middle East battle since the June 1967 War"; and this trend has been maintained at a fairly regular pace, with no immediate end in sight.

8. The latest invasion of Lebanon by Israel has raised new and grave violations of the cease-fire. We cannot but feel a deep sense of sorrow over the loss of human life and the material damage caused by Israel in Lebanon. As a humanist State, we regard the death of a Palestinian, the death of an Israeli and the death of an Arab as an irredeemable loss to humanity. We are a small country and, unlike others, we have no desire to extend our influence in the Middle East. However, we have a genuine desire to see peaceful coexistence between all the peoples of the Middle East, within the framework of resolution 242 (1967). The unanimous adoption of that resolution acted as a reasonable basis for this kind of peaceful coexistence. We do not lack the will to see a just and lasting settlement to this problem: what we seem to lack is the unanimous will to see this will transformed into practical action.

9. It is in our interest, and in the interest of all the people of the Middle East, that we should encourage and help Ambassador Jarring—whose duties have been temporarily suspended—to resume his duties without much delay. We should help him follow up every sign of hope and every gesture of conciliation that may appear on the horizon. We should exert our influence on the parties concerned to co-operate faithfully in the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the principles and provisions of resolution 242 (1967).

10. While we remain ready to join with other members of the Security Council in strongly condemning the latest Israeli act of aggression against Lebanon, we remain equally insistent that there should be full respect for the cease-fire resolutions of 1967. I may recall here that those resolutions were agreed to by all the parties concerned. No peace can be built on the freezing time of history. No peace can be built on the basis of the acquisition, invasion and occupation of territory by military conquest.

11. There is an old saying that reads: "There is so much good in the worst of us, and so much bad in the best of us, it isn't right for any of us to criticize the rest of us." That simply means that if we look around we can find a great deal of good in all human beings and, given that goodness, there is no reason why we should not be able to achieve a permanent peace in the Middle East.

12. Those are the principles which will guide my delegation in its consideration of any draft resolution which may be put forward in the course of this debate. My delegation cannot and will not condone Israel's arrogant use of power against its Arab neighbour.

13. Mr. KULAGA (Poland) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has refrained from speaking so far. I confess that it has not been an easy thing to do, because of the repeated acts of verbal aggression on the part of the representative of Israel, who, in that way, supplemented the military, ideological and political aggression which have become the guiding principle of Israeli policy. Therefore, we did not speak during the first part of this debate. We considered that in a situation of extreme urgency and gravity and in the face of the delaying tactics which we had been witnessing, the important thing was to proceed to action as quickly as possible, since time was a very valuable factor for the aggressor. By our vote we indicated quite clearly our condemnation of the act of invasion committed by Israel against Lebanon. We supported the draft resolution submitted by Spain and seconded by Zambia as a provisional measure dictated by the urgency of the developments in the situation.

14. Today my delegation would like to state its position on the substance of the problem. In so doing we shall base ourselves on two premises. The first is to concentrate on the question which is now before us, that is to say, the request of Lebanon for the Security Council to examine urgently the situation created by the Israeli invasion. We mention only the Lebanese request because we share the views already expressed in this debate with regard to the counter-request, of Israel, which was submitted to the Council, in the very words of the representative of Israel himself, not out of conviction, but for purely tactical reasons. We intend to examine the problem before the Council in all its aspects and with all its consequences, regional and multilateral. Our second premise is similar to the thesis put forward by the Ambassador of Morocco, that is to say, the need to call things by their proper names and without equivocation. We believe that to be all the more necessary because yesterday we heard statements, even rather long ones, in which the very subject of the item on our agenda was hardly mentioned.

15. Just a few days ago Israeli propaganda presented to the world a picture of peaceful demonstrations on the occasion of the anniversary of the creation of Israel. It stressed in particular that Israeli armed forces were taking no part in those demonstrations. In the light of the events of the night of 11 to 12 May, that absence can easily be explained. The Israeli army had other things to do: to prepare for the invasion of a part of

Lebanon, no doubt as the first act of the twenty-third year of the existence of Israel. What we have to deal with is an unmistakable case of aggression. In his statements the representative of Lebanon gave us the details. In spite of the limited nature of the information presented to us by the Secretary-General, at least these facts were confirmed for us. The report of the Secretary-General speaks about the use of armour, artillery and Israeli aircraft in Lebanon. The representative of Lebanon spoke to us with an emotion which it is easy for us to understand, and we should like to assure him, incidentally, that we commiserate with him in the loss of human life and the destruction. We have therefore before us all the typical and unmistakable characteristics of an act of aggression.

16. For our delegation, the Israeli invasion is first and foremost one of the links in the chain of aggression committed by Israel every day in the Middle East: militarily, as demonstrated particularly by the air raids and the massacre of civilians and children, the systematic raids against the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria; politically, as demonstrated particularly by the refusal of Israel to withdraw its troops from the occupied territories; its refusal to carry out the provisions of the resolutions of the Security Council; ideologically, by the orchestration of an unscrupulous propaganda campaign in an attempt to win over to Israel all possible elements, whether it be in the form of an appeal to the community of race, an appeal to the community of religion, an appeal to anti-communism, an appeal to anti-Arabism, an appeal to the natural sympathy for the weak when it appears desirable to the leaders of Israel to represent their country as small and weak, or an appeal to chauvinism when the political circumstances require Israel to be presented in the light of a successor and heir to the nazi military theory of the *blitzkrieg*; and finally, humanly, as demonstrated by the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Human Rights Commission concerning the treatment of the Palestine population by the Israeli occupiers. The list is long and the facts are established in many documents.

17. But the Israeli invasion of Lebanon is not just a new manifestation of what the representative of Israel described as a desire for peace. And if I were not a Marxist I would say, "God protect us from such a desire for peace". It signifies a qualitative change in Israeli tactics. Hitherto what we have had to deal with have been acts of aggression denied by Israel, in spite of all the evidence, in spite of the protests and in spite of the resolutions adopted by the United Nations. What Israel seems to want to have believed in this organ, which bears, as all members know, the major responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, is the argument that an act of aggression, provided that it is committed rapidly, can be claimed not to have taken place because it has been consummated before the Council has had time to take any measures. For that is precisely what the representative of Israel sought when he said, in a formula whose pomposity served only to emphasize its cynicism:

"If this draft resolution were to be adopted, the Security Council would have achieved a singular accomplishment which even alchemists have never aspired to: turning the past into the future." [1537th meeting, para. 82.]

18. We could not possibly remain silent about the new attempt made in that statement to mislead the Council, for the representative of Israel later acknowledged that Israeli troops were staying in Lebanon overnight because—with what unexpected humanity: Israel wanted to avoid possible incidents during the night—and that after having inflicted losses in human life and property of which Mr. Tekoah himself painted the picture.

19. In the notes and statements presented to the Council by Israel, we note, among others, such terms as "a clearing-out operation", the purpose of the operation was to rid the region of terrorists" and "the Israel defence forces will leave the region once their mission has been accomplished".

20. The analogy between the Israeli invasion of Lebanon and the American invasion of Cambodia inevitably suggests itself I would say in an entirely objective spirit. The language is the same. Listening to the representative of Israel, I got the impression that the word "fedayeen" was the only thing that made his war communiqué different from the communiqués of a similar kind published by the Pentagon. The scale of the booty claimed in each case is obviously different, but this can only reflect the difference that there is between a major aggressive Power like the United States and a small aggressive Power like Israel.

21. But the policy is the same. One might wonder all the more whether Israel was calculating that its invasion of Lebanon would be less noticeable in the wave of protest, against the American invasion of Cambodia, or whether the Israeli action might have the purpose of relieving the burden of world indignation directed against the United States, and thus obtain for it the reward of the additional Phantoms and Skyhawks required by the Israeli militarists.

22. For me, the important thing is not to decide who is copying whom, or even what are the tactical considerations of the countries I have mentioned. The important thing, the essential thing, is that in both cases we are witnessing the same phenomenon, aggression; the same tactics, namely those of justifying the unjustifiable; the same attempt to establish a new imperialist formula in international law and an attempt to have world public opinion—and even this Council—take it seriously. Our discussion of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, in the context of its international implications, thus acquires in our eyes—and I stress this—the importance of a test. That is why I have taken particular note of the numerous statements dealing with this problem, particularly the statement of the representative of Morocco.

23. That is why my delegation considers that the Council is in duty bound to take energetic and effective

measures to condemn the aggression of Israel and to put an end to its geographic and qualitative expansion. The Council is in duty bound to take such measures, both from the point of view of the substance of the item before us and from the point of view of its international implications.

24. Our discussion could not fail to touch the very roots of the problem in the Middle East, namely, that of the implementation of the principle of the inadmissibility of the occupation by force of foreign territory, and hence the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the territories which it occupied by force, as well as the implementation of resolution 242 (1967).

25. Mr. President, speaking yesterday as the representative of France, you pointed out that:

“... if, from this debate, a strengthening of resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council in all its provisions and its means of implementation were to emerge, we would then have made serious progress towards a peaceful settlement.” [1539th meeting, para. 88.]

26. In so far as the Polish delegation is concerned, we maintain our attitude towards a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict. We continue to believe that the primary and essential condition for such a settlement is the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories occupied after the aggression of June 1967, and a final cessation of the acts of aggression of Israel.

27. Mr. YOST (United States of America): Before turning to the subject on our agenda, I should like to comment briefly on remarks addressed to me yesterday by the representatives of Syria and the Soviet Union.

28. The representative of Syria paid me the compliment of calling me a historian. One of my first ventures into history during my recent retirement was to try to determine the origins of the war of June 1967. My principal conclusion was that, contrary to epithets so loosely bandied about at this table, there was in that war, as in a great many others, no single “aggressor” solely responsible for starting it. On the contrary, there were several Governments which shared that responsibility and I believe that any impartial historian who has studied the background would be obliged to admit that a large share of that responsibility rested with the Government of Syria.

29. Moreover, I think it is also fair to say that, of all the States directly involved in that tragic war, Syria has subsequently made the least effort, indeed practically no effort at all, to bind up the wounds and work towards a peaceful settlement. It has rejected resolution 242 (1967); it has refused to receive the Secretary-General’s Special Representative; it has repeatedly incited and assisted others to break the cease-fire.

30. With all due respect to my Syrian colleague, I should like to remind him that those who live in glass

houses should not throw stones and that, if he and his Government wish to be heard when they call upon others to make efforts for peace, they should temper their own bellicosity, first of all, by following the example of their Arab brothers directly concerned by accepting resolution 242 (1967), not just as it applies to Israel, but also as it applies to themselves.

31. To turn to Ambassador Malik’s remarks, he made the curious allegation yesterday that the United States, despite the fact that it accepted resolution 242 (1967) two and a half years ago and has been striving for its implementation ever since, does not accept the principles of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war. Of course we accept the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war, just as we accept a just and lasting peace, withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied territories, the establishment of secure and recognized boundaries, and all the other parts of the resolution.

32. Secretary of State Rogers and other United States spokesmen have said that the United States supports the principle of withdrawal of Israeli forces from territories occupied in June 1967 in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and is fully committed to the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war. We continue to do so and Ambassador Malik knows it. He also knows that the United States also believes that the parties to a settlement should have the possibility of agreeing mutually, if they should so desire, on insubstantial alterations or minor rectifications of the boundaries which previously existed between them. Since any such rectifications or alterations would be subject to the agreement of both sides, they would in no way do violence to the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war or the obligation for Israel to withdraw in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

33. When this Council met in August 1969 to consider the action brought about by a series of guerrilla-type attacks on Israel launched from Lebanese territory and Israeli air strikes on several villages in Lebanon aimed at the source of these attacks, I not only expressed the profound regret of my Government for the death and suffering caused but voiced concern that the accumulation of such incidents might—gradually undermine the hope we all cherish for a lasting peace in the Middle East.

34. We are brought together again on this occasion because tragically the situation which gave rise to our debate last August has not only continued but has been further exacerbated. Not only have further and recently more frequent fedayeen attacks been carried out from Lebanon against Israeli villages, resulting in the death of a number of Israeli civilians, but Israel, in addition to air strikes, has mounted a major military operation into Lebanon in an effort to bring a halt to these attacks. Once again there have been death, destruction, and suffering on both sides, to innocent civilians as well as military and other combatant personnel. We deplore and deeply regret the loss of life and injuries that have

occurred, whether in Israel or Lebanon. I cannot emphasize too strongly that my Government continues to oppose all acts of violence across frontiers in violation of the cease-fire from any source.

35. Despite the efforts that have been made to control and bring to a halt the cycle of violence on the Israel-Lebanon border, it is all too evident that no effective means have yet been found. All of us can now see all too clearly how the hope for peace is being undermined and how, with the continuation of the present situation, the dangers of increased violence mount. There is no escaping the conclusion that the only way to end this violence which brings no solution is for all involved, directly or indirectly, to make an all-out effort to bring about a peaceful political settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict encompassing all States in the area.

36. As a first step in this direction there must be an end to attack and counter-attack and a reinstitution of an effective cease-fire on the Lebanese-Israeli border. My Government has long held the view that United Nations observers can, with the co-operation of those directly concerned, help achieve this necessary purpose. At the outset of our debate the Secretary-General noted his past efforts to this end. On 16 August 1969, he proposed to the Governments of Israel and Lebanon that "United Nations observers, in adequate number to observe effectively, should be stationed on both sides, with the function of observing and maintaining the Security Council cease-fire" [S/9393]. The United States strongly supported this proposal. We continue to support it. We do not pretend to believe that observers would automatically end all violence and bring a solution to the broader question of a permanent peace, but we do believe that it might limit the number and severity of incidents, reduce tensions and help to create a climate in which efforts towards a lasting settlement could go forward with a greater hope for success. My Government has been disappointed that past efforts to activate a strong United Nations observer force along the Lebanese-Israeli border have been unsuccessful. We welcome the indications that Lebanon remains interested in such a step and that Israel also wishes to work for the effective reinforcement of the cease-fire. We would urge, therefore, that there should be renewed consultations between the parties and the Secretary-General in an effort to work out a mutually acceptable arrangement, without prejudice to the legal positions of those involved, by which UNTSO could carry out an effective observer operation in this sector.

37. The more fundamental questions are, of course, more difficult to deal with, the more so since the present situation is not of Lebanon's making but in part results from cynical disregard of its territorial and political integrity. Lebanon has outlined in letters to this Council the difficult situation it now faces and with which we strongly sympathize. It has exerted efforts to control the situation which gives rise to Israeli reprisals but these efforts have led to violent confrontations and, in the end, it has also had to endure this most serious of Israeli reprisals. This dilemma has led to months

of political crisis within Lebanon during which, as was pointed out in Lebanon's letter of 18 March [S/9713] Palestine refugees have become armed combatants through no fault of Lebanon. On the other hand Israel is justifiably concerned over its own security and, in similar communications to the Council, has pointed out the international obligation of a State to prevent the use of its territory for actions against a neighbouring State.

38. As my Government's spokesmen have said in the past, the United States has long enjoyed a warm friendship with Lebanon and its people. We continue to attach very great importance to its independence and territorial integrity. We could not condone and would view with great concern any threat to that integrity from any source. That, of course, is why we voted for resolution 279 (1970) calling for immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces. We welcome the withdrawal which has in fact occurred. We also strongly support the independence and territorial integrity of Israel and the right of its people to live in peace. That is why we have repeatedly counseled both Governments to do all in their power to bring quiet to their border. The considerable efforts we have exerted to this end in recent days regrettably were in vain.

39. Nevertheless, my Government will continue to use its influence with all parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict to bring about reduced violence and tensions and to make much more serious efforts for a lasting peace. We have accepted a responsibility for helping those directly involved to find a way out of their dangerous situation, a responsibility which we share with other major Powers which have an influential role in the area and with other members of this Council. In exercising this responsibility we must look beyond the latest incidents between Lebanon and Israel and concern ourselves with the entire region of conflict.

40. My Government believes that, as a first step, all in the area should contribute to a reduction in tensions and in the level of hostilities and facilitate the search for a lasting settlement in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967). We believe that there must be a stricter observance of the cease-fire and fuller co-operation with the United Nations to increase the effectiveness of military observer operations. At the same time, we believe that all States in the area should make clear by actions as well as words their desire for the achievement of a just and lasting peace under the terms of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and their acceptance of that resolution in all its parts without reservation. Only through such a course do we see a solution to the legitimate concerns of all those who are touched in their daily lives by the Palestine problem.

41. We believe that it is incumbent upon all the parties to the conflict to re-examine their attitudes towards what sort of peaceful settlement they are prepared to accept. We appeal to them to do so and, we trust, to draw the obvious conclusion that the long-term prolongation, even less an aggravation, of the present con-

flict serves the security and the long-term national interests of no one. Indeed, it places the interests of all in more and more deadly jeopardy. The only salvation for everyone lies in peaceful settlement and the only basis for settlement is conciliation and compromise. There can be no peace in the area until each of the parties concerned is prepared to abandon his maximum demands and agree on compromise solutions that serve the interests of all. The same applies to those outside Powers which have influence in the area.

42. For its part the United States has followed such an approach in its efforts to help bring peace to the Middle East. Not only has the United States put forward new compromise positions in the bilateral and four-Power forums, notably on 28 October and 18 December 1969, after months of bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union, but it has shown a willingness to heed and accept the suggestions of others on many points even though they were not identical to our own. In addition, we have proposed or supported interim measures designed to reduce and contain the tension and conflict in the Middle East, such as a cease-fire linked to Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and talks on arms limitation. We have exercised unilateral restraint as well, notably when the Secretary of State announced, on 23 March 1970, that President Nixon had decided not to respond favourably to Israel's request for additional aircraft.

43. We had hoped that such actions on our part would inspire similar actions by the USSR, permitting us to move closer towards a solution to the Middle East situation. I regret to say that so far they have not done so. The USSR has refused to go along with suggestions that the cease-fire should be more strictly observed in the Middle East and has refused to discuss the question of arms limitation. Indeed, it has not only continued to move additional and more advanced weapons into the area, but has also introduced a large number of its own military personnel directly into the area of conflict. Such a development cannot but involve very grave risks and dangers. We strongly urge that this trend of events should be halted and reversed.

44. I appeal to the Soviet Union, to Israel and its Arab neighbours, and to the Palestine Arabs to join my Government in a redoubled effort to bring about a just settlement to all the problems of the Middle East. If all of those involved are prepared to work constructively and positively for peace, and are prepared to make mutual concessions for this purpose instead of standing rigidly on their maximum positions, I am confident that progress can be made.

45. Mr. MAGENGE (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, the first meeting over which you presided, which dealt with the problem of Bahrain, and the agreement at which we very happily arrived on that matter, as well as the exemplary position adopted by their Majesties the Sovereigns of Iran and the United Kingdom were constructive acts which led me to remain silent and to refrain from making a statement which I felt would be superfluous.

46. This did not mean that the delegation of Burundi was indifferent to your nomination as the new Ambassador of France to the United Nations and to your assumption of the Presidency of the Security Council for this month.

47. My delegation wishes to take advantage of this opportunity to renew its warm welcome to you and to assure you of our sincere collaboration, the result of the friendship which Burundi and France have cultivated and have just brought to a head, no later than in the month of April, with a general agreement on co-operation in university education. As far as you yourself, Sir, are concerned, not only do you represent a friendly country but you are also the symbol of an accomplished diplomat and a great friend of Africa, a continent that you have only recently left.

48. The feelings of admiration that the delegation of Burundi feels towards the representatives of Colombia and Finland, who preceded you as Presidents of the Council, need no further proof. We are particularly gratified at the way in which they led the debates in the last two months.

49. Unfortunately, a mere few hours after the solemn and peaceful meeting which inaugurated your Presidency of the Council, an unusual morning telephone call awakened us and reminded us that we did not have the right to sleep in the morning since security had been disturbed on the Israeli-Lebanese frontier. Very speedily and with the wisdom that characterizes this body, the Security Council adopted the very reasonable resolution 279 (1970), but one of the belligerents seemed to reject it.

50. The Republic of Burundi recognizes Israel but we can never endorse the annexionistic views that it holds. My delegation cannot share that newly inaugurated policy and carefully followed plan of disproportionate reprisals. The policy of the conquest of territories, and that of the infinite extension of war, cannot guarantee peace but only disturb it deeply.

51. I cannot conclude my statement without offering the sympathy of my delegation to the people that was the victim of aggression and without repeating the demand addressed three days ago to Israel to go home.

52. Mr. KHATRI (Nepal): My delegation gave its full support to Security Council resolution 279 (1970) because we believed that it was absolutely right that the Security Council should, as the very first step, demand the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli armed forces from Lebanese territory. Yesterday [1539th meeting] we heard a communication received from the Prime Minister of Israel informing the Secretary-General that all Israeli armed forces involved in the action against Lebanon had returned to their bases [S/9801].

53. This is a welcome course of events, but however much we may feel satisfied with that development we cannot condone the action of a Government of a Member State of the United Nations in mounting a

large-scale military incursion inside the territory of another Member State on the ground of military reprisal. The consequences of such action in international relations are all too obvious. Such action does not help contain the conflict, much less resolve it. On the contrary, it aggravates the deep-rooted feelings of hatred and enlarges not only the areas but also the causes of that conflict.

54. Since the June war of 1967, the Security Council has condemned punitive military actions on several occasions. Other violent incidents involving the loss of life and property have also been deplored. Most delegations, including my own, have repeatedly stated their respective positions with regard to various aspects of the conflict in the Middle East. In conformity with those positions, many delegations would undoubtedly be prepared in this case to vote for one more condemnation or one more reprimand. While that condemnation would imply moral judgement by the Security Council, it would not in itself achieve anything worth achieving. As far as possible, we should avoid running the risk of losing track of the goal to which the main thrust of our efforts should be directed. Our goal has been clearly set forth in Security Council resolution 242 (1967), an admirable resolution which scrupulously safeguards the basic interests of all the parties concerned. That resolution represents a truly United Nations expression, embodying as it does the fullest measure of equity and reason.

55. The overriding duty of all members of the Security Council in the circumstances is to support and encourage the process of reconciliation and peace. However protracted and slow-moving, the continuing talks between the four permanent members of the Security Council in our view represent that process. Those talks are carried out with a view to assisting the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in finding generally acceptable means and methods for the effective implementation of the resolution 242 (1967).

56. In this connexion, I might say that we listened with great care and interest to the exchanges of views that took place between three permanent members of the Security Council at our 1539th meeting. Those exchanges were sharp but instructive—more instructive, if I may say so, than the meagre information periodically imparted to other members of the Security Council by the Four on the progress of their talks. Beneath the heat of yesterday's debate we could detect, for the first time, some formal indications of the progress being made in the talks of the Four. We could learn, for example, that definite proposals on some vital aspects of the problem had been submitted; that the positions of the participants with regard to those vital aspects of the problem had been more precisely defined; and, lastly, that the talks were being pursued with all seriousness. Apart from this, we also noted the statement by the British representative who strongly suggested that Ambassador Jarring should be enabled to resume his mission in the very near future. My delegation looks forward to the resumption of the peace mission with a great deal of hope and expectation.

57. We were deeply moved yesterday by the eloquent appeal made by the Lebanese representative for a return to sanity in this twenty-fifth year of the United Nations. Let every Member State be tested for peace. Surely there would be no better way of commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary than by exerting ourselves to the full towards making the peace efforts of the United Nations concerning the question of the Middle East successful.

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

59. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I regret to inform the Council that further attacks in the long series of acts of aggression perpetrated in recent months from Lebanon against Israeli border towns and villages occurred again in upper Galilee last night and in the early hours of this morning. At approximately 2100 hours local time a unit of irregular forces which had penetrated from across the Lebanese border opened bazooka fire on the village of Manara. The fire was returned. Four of the attackers were killed. Klatchnikov rifles and a number of bazookas were found on them.

60. At 2340 hours the village of Kfar Blum was attacked by Katyusha rockets fired from the direction of the Lebanese villages of Blaide and Hula.

61. This morning at 0050 hours Katyusha rockets were fired from the same positions on the village of Ramot Naftali, causing considerable damage. The fire was returned in the direction of the attackers in Blaide and Hula.

62. At 0230 hours a squad of irregular forces from Lebanon attacked an Israeli border patrol, wounding one policeman.

63. These are acts of hostility of the kind that have brought about the grave deterioration of the situation along the Israeli-Lebanese border and caused the virtual breakdown of the cease-fire. These are acts of aggression of the kind that compel Israel to take defensive actions to protect its territory and its citizens, as any other Government would do in similar circumstances. Like any other nation Israel has the right to life and the right protect its life.

64. At a previous meeting I indicated why past experience in Security Council discussions on the Middle East situation bars Israel from initiating debates. Israel has, however, kept the Security Council fully and constantly informed of the growing intensity of aggression from Lebanon. The members of the Security Council are aware of the facts. The international media of information have given wide publicity to the terror warfare waged against Israel from Lebanese territory. The indiscriminate murder of Israeli men, women and children by attackers from Lebanon is a matter of general knowledge. We in Israel and all who are concerned about the present situation and the future course of events are following with attention what is being said around this table, what is passed over in silence and what will be done at the conclusion of our deliberations about the shedding of innocent Israeli blood.

65. Mr. ORTEGA URBINA (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation supported resolution 279 (1970) of 12 May 1970, and heard with satisfaction the reports officially submitted to the Security Council by Israel that that resolution had been complied with and that the Israeli troops had immediately been ordered to withdraw.

66. I only hope that this willingness to comply with the resolutions of this Council may turn out to be the first step towards negotiations and agreements that will allow us to find a comprehensive solution to the problems which have unfortunately beset the Middle East for a number of years, and which affect the economy and the normal development of the countries of the region.

67. I have listened with great attention to the statements made by the parties directly concerned and also to the statements made by the members of the Security Council who spoke before me. From all those statements I think I can gather that there do exist mutual accusations of violations of international law, violations which, if appropriate measures are not adopted in time, might tend to affect international peace and security.

68. We all know that to enter the territory of any State with armed forces constitutes at first glance an act of aggression, and we also all know that it is an international obligation incumbent upon States to prevent their territories being used as a base from which to disturb the peace of another State. Non-compliance with this international norm or inability to comply with it has always caused tension and at times even unleashed bloody wars.

69. A great Latin-American hero, Benito Juárez, many years ago stated that among individuals, as among nations, respect for the rights of others is the definition of peace. The first right that must be respected is physical integrity, because both persons and nations have the primary obligation of preserving their existence, and respect for that right must be mutual.

70. My delegation would be very gratified in the present case—for this new conflict is related to or even forms part of the entire conflict in the Middle East—if the contending parties were able to overcome their suspicions and resentments and thus create an atmosphere conducive to dialogue and negotiation, through the intermediary of Ambassador Jarring, the Secretary-General's Special Representative.

71. We do not believe that partial solutions to resolve single aspects of a more complex problem can effectively contribute to the establishment of a lasting peace in the region.

72. Therefore we should be very pleased if in the resolution to be adopted by this Council the parties were to be urged to resort to the means established by international law for the peaceful settlement of disputes, for when possibilities for discussion are closed off the doors to violence are thrown wide open.

73. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Lebanon.

74. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): I promised the Council to keep it informed in due course about the extent of the loss of life and damage resulting from the Israeli aggression against southern Lebanon. Further to what I have already stated here in the Council, I should like to correct some of the information and add the following.

75. In the area that was occupied by Israel, three civilians were killed, and three other civilians were injured. I stated before that seven Lebanese soldiers had been killed and eight injured. The fact is that eighteen Lebanese soldiers were injured. In Kfar Haman, Kfar Shuba, El Habariya, Fredis and Rachaya el Fakhar, the Israeli aggressors blew up the water mains, the electrical installations and the telephone installations. They also blew up thirty-nine houses belonging to the peaceful inhabitants of those villages. Their air force bombed and destroyed the bridge of Hasbeiya and the intersection of the main roads between Kfar Shuba, El Habariya and Kfar Haman. Vast damage to our roads and agricultural fields also resulted.

76. The Israeli representative has attempted to mislead the Council into believing that the attack was against bases of the freedom fighters of the Palestinian people. I have already dealt with that point, but I can assure the Council that the Lebanese Army was engaged. It has valiantly fought back against the aggressors. Some of our sons have shed their blood in the defence of our sacred soil. Israel has wantonly breached our territorial integrity, brought war to our land, extended still further the area of fighting and conflict and threatened still more the precarious peace in the Middle East. That was to us a very grave matter. We, as a faithful Member of the United Nations, have come to this Council, as we have come on previous occasions, because we believe in the principles of the Charter and its objectives. We believe in the sense of fairness and justice of this Council. There is a very cynical contrast between that and the declarations made by the representative of Israel himself here when the Council was dealing with an extremely urgent matter, the adoption of a resolution calling for the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli troops from Lebanon.

77. The record of the Council shows that the representative of Israel said:

"I already emphasized in my statement this morning that no contribution to peace in the Middle East can be made by the adoption of one-sided resolutions" [*1537th meeting, para. 80*].

78. Naturally, if the Council had decided to give a free hand to the aggressors in Lebanon to enlarge their aggression, to inflict more damage on our towns and villages and more killings on our people and on our soldiers, if the Council had condoned that action, the Council's action would be a welcome one for the representative of Israel.

79. We already know the attitude of the Israeli Government towards the United Nations organs and the Security Council itself. Allow me to communicate and register in the records of this Council the contents of a dispatch that was reported by Reuters on 13 May. I quote the following from this dispatch:

"Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir today strongly condemned the United Nations Security Council as an 'incompetent institution' following its discussion of Israel's raid against guerilla bases in Lebanon yesterday.

"...

"Mrs. Meir said during a visit to Jerusalem's Wailing Wall, the last remnant of the Second Temple and Jewry's holiest shrine—there at the wall she lamented—'The ugly history of the Security Council shows that it is an incompetent institution and that there is no hope of expecting any justice from it.' "

She added:

" 'We do not have to get excited by its decisions and resolutions.' "

80. Mrs. Meir's opinion is shared by many newspapers in Israel. The Reuters message states:

"Israeli newspapers today gave all editorial space to yesterday's action and some commented bitterly about the Security Council's resolution.

"*Hatzofe*, the national religious daily, wrote, 'It is the helplessness revealed by the Security Council which has aggravated tension in the Middle East over the past years ...'

"The Trade Union Daily *Davar* said, 'Israel's restraint served only to encourage continuation of aggression. The Israel Army's action yesterday was mainly of a warning nature. In this regard, the Security Council's resolution was totally superfluous, proving once again the lack of balance which has become the tradition in the Security Council's resolutions concerning the Middle East.'

"*Al-Hamishmar*, a left-wing daily of the Mapam Party condemned the Security Council for 'rebuking the defenders rather than the aggressors'."

81. I am sad, very sad indeed, to be obliged to repeat those words in the presence of the Security Council and its members for whom we have great respect and in whom we have great confidence. Naturally, if, as *Al-Hamishmar* said, the Council had rebuked us—the Lebanese, the "aggressors"—then the Security Council would have been a wonderful institution to be lauded for its praiseworthy action. We have unmasked those tactics many times in the Council. They reveal the contempt of Israel for the United Nations, for international law, for the Security Council and for its decisions and resolutions. This is comparable to the situation

in any court of justice in the world; when a criminal is condemned there is always an outcry, an outburst from the criminal against the just decision of the court.

82. Some important statements were made today here in the Security Council. I am not yet in a position to comment upon them. I reserve the right of my delegation to do so at a later stage.

83. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Three delegations have asked to be allowed to speak to exercise their rights of reply: the delegations of Syria, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Israel. I shall call upon them in due course, but first I wish to state that the Secretary-General has informed me that he has received from the Acting Chief of Staff of UNTSO a message which I shall request the Secretary of the Council to be good enough to read. I call on the Secretary of the Council.

84. Mr. CHACKO (Deputy to the Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs): Mr. President, the text of the message to which you referred reads as follows:

"The Acting Chairman of the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission informs that:

'The complete withdrawal of the Israel forces from Lebanon is officially confirmed by the Lebanese authorities.

'Official time of completion of Israel withdrawal was given as 1030 hours GMT on 13 May 1970.

'This time has also been announced by the Lebanese Minister of Defence in a public statement.' "

85. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): The representative of the United States has indeed honoured me by opening his statement this morning with a reply to my statement of yesterday, ending it with the analogy concerning the fact that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones. Unfortunately, the whole world today is living in a glass house, including the United States and if this debate has proved anything, it has proved what Toynbee wrote on 10 May. I quoted it yesterday and I repeat it now: "Today America has become the world's nightmare" [*1539th meeting, para. 102*]. So, if there is anybody living in a glass house it is primarily the United States of America and its Government.

86. In Syria there are no department stores being blown up by bombs, no campuses being occupied by the national guard, no students being killed for protesting; but that exists in America and perhaps that is a sufficient reminder to the representative of the United States that, unfortunately, the Government he represents is living in a glass house.

87. The representative of the United States said that I had referred to him yesterday as a historian. I did not, but if he wants to be called a historian I will go along with him, and indeed he is a historian. Starting

from that point, and going back to the events of 1967, he said that the larger share of responsibility rests on Syria. Needless to say, when he says so as a representative of a great Power while we are debating and condemning an attack by Israel on peaceful Lebanon, those words are a green light to Israel to go on attacking Lebanon, Syria, the United Arab Republic and Jordan.

88. I shall go back to the representative of the United States, and I should like to be permitted to call him by his name—Mr. Yost—because now I shall speak of him as a historian. Prior to assuming his functions as representative of the United States, Mr. Yost had devoted his time to writing, and produced some very illuminating pieces of history. In the January 1968 issue of *Foreign Affairs* there is an article written by Mr. Yost on the six-day war, entitled: "*The Arab-Israeli War: How it Began*". Now I shall let Mr. Yost the historian answer Mr. Yost the representative of the United States, for here is his article. I wish that time allowed me to read the whole of it, but that is impossible; I highly commend it, as a great piece of history indeed, to both the Security Council and to the United Nations. In his article Mr. Yost says:

"On the same day, May 11, Israeli Prime Minister Eshkol was saying in a public speech in Tel Aviv that his Government regarded this wave of sabotage and infiltration gravely. 'In view of the fourteen incidents of the past month alone' he said, 'we may have to adopt measures no less drastic than those of April 7'."

89. The drastic measures adopted by Israel on 7 May against Syria were an attack on civilian villages, using napalm against schools and villagers and farmers, and engaging the Israeli air force over Damascus on 7 April, an attack which was started by Israel. Then he goes on to say:

"Indeed there is evidence that Israeli officials were at this time"—speaking about May 1967—"disseminating their warnings rather widely. *The New York Times* correspondent, James Feron, in Tel Aviv reported on May 12: 'Some Israeli leaders have decided that the use of force against Syria may be the only way to curtail increasing terrorism. Any such Israeli reaction to continued infiltration would be of considerable strength but of short duration and limited in area. This has become apparent in talks with highly qualified and informed Israelis who have spoken in recent days against a background of mounting border violence.'"

Mr. Yost the historian goes on to say:

"Nevertheless, it should also be noted that in the May 19 report referred to above the Secretary-General remarked: 'Intemperate and bellicose utterances . . . are unfortunately more or less routine on both sides of the lines in the Near East. In recent weeks, however, reports emanating from Israel have attributed to some high officials in that State statements so threatening as to be particularly inflammatory in the sense that they could only heighten emo-

tions and thereby increase tensions on the other side of the lines.' Press accounts of these statements also seemed so inflammatory to U.S. State Department officials that they expressed concern to Israeli authorities."

90. That is what Mr. Yost the historian wrote. It would take me too long to quote everything—perhaps he will say I am misquoting—but I again recommend the reading of the whole article. He goes on to say: "No conclusive judgement can be pronounced on these two lines of argument" meaning thereby: whether the Israelis or the Arabs were responsible.

91. Then, at the conclusion of the article, he mentions five points in which he details the events that led to the war of 1967; to the best of my understanding, among the five summaries that he gave us, in three he puts the responsibility on Israel, and in two on Syria, the United Arab Republic and other Arab countries. The conclusion is very illuminating:

"There will be no peace there, no security for its inhabitants or for the great powers involved there, until the Arabs recognize that Israel, however unjust its creation appears to them, is a fact of life. . . ."

I would underline "however unjust", and on a humane basis I would ask Mr. Yost: suppose a great injustice were done to him. Who is the judge of the injustice: the one who suffers it, or the one who plays the fiddle while Rome is burning?

92. Mr. Yost reiterated—and that is not strange—what Mr. Tekoah had said and what he says time and time again so that it has become a sort of scratched record which its owners might do better to change: he reiterated that Syria did not accept resolution 242 (1967). Well, I read yesterday the statement of General Weizmann, the Minister of Transport, member of the Herut Party, who is not a member of the Knesset; I read yesterday of Moshe Dayan saying that we should let the whole world know that we reject resolution 242 (1967). I also read yesterday another statement by General Dayan in which he said:

"People abroad ought to realize that, quite apart from their strategic importance to Israel, Sinai, the Golan Heights, the Tiran Straits and the hills west of the Jordan lie at the heart of Jewish history. Nor has the restoration of historical Israel ended yet. Since their return to Zion a hundred years ago, a double process of colonization and expansion of frontiers has been going on. We have not yet reached the end of that road. It is the people of Israel who will determine the frontiers of their own State." [1539th meeting, para. 106.]

93. What does Mr. Yost the historian, what does Mr. Yost the representative of the greatest and strongest Power, think of those words and how does he evaluate them in terms of the Charter of the United Nations? The Charter is the greatest multilateral treaty that humanity has known so far. Here is a responsible

member of a Government declaring that it is only the people of Israel that can set the limits to Israel. And Mr. Yost says that Syria did not accept resolution 242 (1967). But within the context of the deliberations of the Security Council itself, let me ask Mr. Yost in a very straightforward manner what he thinks of resolution 235 (1967), adopted on 9 June 1967, after Israel attacked Syria, which I have already mentioned in this debate and which states:

"The Security Council,

"Recalling its resolutions 233 (1967) of 6 June and 234 (1967) of 7 June 1967,

"Noting that the Governments of Israel and Syria have announced their mutual acceptance of the Council's demand for a cease-fire,

"... "

"1. Confirms its previous resolutions about immediate cease-fire and cessation of military action;

"2. Demands that hostilities should cease forthwith forthwith."

94. That was a resolution adopted unanimously by the Security Council, including the delegation of the United States. Two days later, the representative of Israel was helped by the representative of the United States, Mr. Goldberg at that time, and the representative of the United Kingdom, Lord Caradon, as I was reporting to the Council and as the Secretary-General was reporting to the Council from UNTSO and General Odd Bull that the Israeli army was penetrating deep into Syria. It was 11 o'clock at night, 10 June, and Lord Caradon himself turned and said, "We are not sure; we have to wait for more reports".

95. It is now for Mr. Yost the historian to realize those facts and to know that his Government and the United Kingdom Government were in military collusion with Israel to let Israel occupy the Golan Heights.

96. Resolution 236 (1967) was adopted by the Security Council at 2.20 a.m. on 11 June 1967, again unanimously. Yesterday I quoted paragraph 4 of that resolution. In paragraph 3 the Security Council:

"Affirms that its demand for a cease-fire and discontinuance of all military activities includes a prohibition of any forward military movements subsequent to the cease-fire".

In paragraph 4 the Council:

"Calls for the prompt return to the cease-fire positions of any troops which may have moved forward subsequent to 1630 hours GMT on 10 June 1967".

97. Ambassador Yost has asked me about resolution 242 (1967), which was adopted after those two resolutions, and I ask him, did he, as representative of the United States, ask Israel what it did with those two decisions of the Security Council? Israel is now in occu-

pation of Syrian territory in contravention of those two unanimously adopted resolutions of the Security Council.

98. If Mr. Yost really wants to be a historian, I humbly ask him to read again the records of those debates in those dramatic days and to see who is the international brigand, who is the robber-baron State and who ought to be brought to the bar of justice.

99. Let me come to the present. There is a cease-fire. Last year's total of violations by Israel against Syria, including firing on Syrian territory, as reported to the United Nations military staff, amounted to 509. The number of violations against Syria from 1 January 1970 until 18 March 1970 amounted to 1,045. I have with me nineteen reports from General Odd Bull on the situation in the Israeli-Syrian sector which covered the period 8 April 1970 to 7 May 1970. I want to put them on record and to ask the representative of the United States and the other members of the Council please to read those reports. Typical of them is the following, dated 8 April 1970:

"(a) OP X-Ray. Between 1148 and 1150 four Israel forces Mirage aircraft crossed the limits of the forward defended localities indicating the cease-fire lines from west to east and recrossed from east to west. During overflight ack-ack fire by Syrian forces." [See S/7930/Add.639.]

100. I could go on reading all these reports. The Council will find in them that the Israeli army started the firing, as reported by General Odd Bull and the military observers.

101. When the representative of Israel, in his cynical debased manner, speaks about the destruction of villages, I will answer him with this report from General Odd Bull, contained in document S/7930/Add.667, dated 24 April 1970. The report reads:

"United Nations military observers at OP Three ... reported that at 0604 GMT Israel forces were firing from Tel El Farass. ... and from map reference 310-2650, target being village of Aache" [in Syria]. "Many fires started in this area and one house in Aache village was burning for three hours. At 0617 GMT one military truck and one military ambulance, arriving from the east on the main road, stopped near the burning house and at least five people were seen rushing out. The vehicles stayed there for about one hour. Between 0617 and 0639 GMT one Israel forces tank was moving and firing" [on civilians] "in Aache village. Machine-gun and mortar fire impacts were seen north-west and south of village. At 0726 GMT an Israel forces helicopter was seen flying in area of Tel El Farass."

102. In all these reports it will be found that the one party that is initiating fire, destroying houses, bulldozing villages, killing civilians, is the Israelis and Mr. Yost, the historian, in his fair sense of judging history, addresses the question to an Arab victim of aggression about the acceptance or non-acceptance of a

resolution. I should like to refer to what the representative of Finland said yesterday and in order to be accurate I shall quote his own words. How accurate indeed are the words of the representative of Finland. When speaking about the discussions here, he said that they were "becoming more and more divorced from the violent realities of the Middle Eastern conflict" [1539th meeting, para. 65]. Those are very great words indeed and they apply to what Mr. Yost said today in light of the facts I have stated.

103. The resolutions condemning Israel for violations of the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949¹ in occupied territories, and of human rights, as well as the published reports of Amnesty International and the reports of the Red Cross, are all documents of history, and the historian is supposed to look into them before he can judge others and suggest that they live in a glass house when his whole house is made of glass.

104. Finally, I give a warning to the representative of the United States, a warning in the light of United States aggression in Viet-Nam, in South-East Asia, and in Cambodia, a warning that should be brought home to him as the result of the burning of villages, campuses, houses, and streets, with explosions all over the United States. It is nothing but a civil war. I should like to remind the United States representative, who is really living in a glass house, about this. The warning is this. The United States is not only trampling on peace in the Middle East, but is sapping the very foundation and vital interests of America in the Middle East and especially and more categorically its oil monopolies.

105. We are sure that the Americans concerned with those interests, and more particularly the oil companies, are not expected to stand with arms crossed in view of the continuous stupidity being shown by the United States Government, for no other reason than to get votes. In this connexion, I would remind the Council of what the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia said to the Council two days ago [1538th meeting]. If the United States Government and those which have interests in our area cannot achieve any positive action to stop the international brigand, the robber-baron State, Israel, from continuing its criminality, then the Arab people—and let the United States representative heed my advice—will be absolutely free to think about ways to guarantee that its own resources shall be exploited by the Arabs in the best possible manner.

106. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Thank you, Mr. President. From the statement made today by Mr. Yost, as interpreted into Russian, I gained the impression that Mr. Yost stated that the United States of America was in favour of the full withdrawal of Israeli troops from Arab territories. I would emphasize that this is how I understood his statement from the interpretation. Secondly, I understand that the United States supports the inadmissibility of the acquisition of foreign territory

by force, in other words it is in favour of not allowing territory seized by an invader to remain in the latter's hands. If the interpretation was correct, if that is really the position of the United States of America, then the USSR delegation would like to inform this meeting of the Security Council officially that it is in favour of continuing the dialogue in our four-Power consultation meetings and that it considers that on this basis there is a possibility of reaching agreement regarding the agreed formulas which might form the basis of a recommendation to Mr. Jarring to resume his mission. We are in favour of continuing this dialogue on the understanding that Mr. Yost stated that the United States supports full withdrawal and the inadmissibility of the acquisition of foreign territory by force. This position will provide a basis for continuing the dialogue. If this is so, then it marks a step forward by the United States.

107. The representative of Israel is smiling ironically; obviously this is not the case.

108. Mr. Yost has, however, made a very substantial reservation in this connexion. He touched on the question of the alteration of the boundaries, that is, the question of altering the line of 5 June 1967 or the 1949 line—they are almost the same. He called this "alterations" or "rectifications". That is already two steps backwards. For, according to the United States delegation, these alterations must be achieved through negotiations between the parties to the conflict. That at least was how I understood Mr. Yost's statement from the interpretation. But by this the United States, on the one hand, is giving its blessing to Israel, is giving Israel *carte blanche* to demand alterations of the boundary and, on the other hand, it is betting on the parties not being able to agree on such a question among themselves without the participation of the United Nations, without the pressure of the Security Council, without the influence of the four Powers which are participating in the consultations regarding a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. This is the real situation today.

109. How does Israel understand the question of the alteration of the boundaries or of the 1967 line? This is very well known to us all. Only recently, the President of the United Arab Republic, speaking on 1 May on the occasion of Labour Day, spoke of this directly. He touched on the question of Israel's request, actively supported by the United States, for "direct negotiations" between Israel and the Arab countries, in other words between the parties to the conflict. In *Pravda* of 3 May 1970 President Nasser is quoted as saying that "Israel is trying to secure not peace but the expansion of its territory" and, furthermore, that "even before such negotiations began, the Government of Israel declared that the Golan Heights, the towns of Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Hebron and the Gaza Strip could not be the subject of negotiation".

110. That is how Israel interprets "alterations" or "rectifications", or, as one might say in Russian "the delimitation of the boundaries". A nice delimitation! Seizing foreign territory in defiance of the principle,

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75 (1950), Nos. 970-973.

set forth in resolution 242 (1967), of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. And Israel stated in advance that the Golan Heights, the towns of Jerusalem, Bethlehem and Hebron and the Gaza Strip were not even subject to discussion, that they already belonged to Israel. I ask you, Mr. Yost, do you really believe that it is possible to reach agreement on this basis when Israel, which has committed the aggression, has made such expansionist and imperialist claims and demands. The word "aggression" does not please the representative of Israel, but in Russian there is a proverb, which he knows since he speaks Russian very well, to the effect that you can't change the words of a song. And it is a sad song: Israel has committed aggression against the Arab countries and now claims that important parts of the territory of the Arab countries should be left in its hands.

111. I do not think that such an experienced and learned historian as Mr. Yost, as Mr. Tomeh described him today, could be so naive as to admit the possibility of agreement being reached between the parties to the conflict regarding such "alterations". I do not believe that those whom Mr. Yost represents here are so naive. Accordingly, what conclusion can be drawn? It is not naïveté. It is a completely intentional aspiration and desire, covert but quite obvious, to help Israel to achieve the aims of its seizures of territory. It is contrary both to the Charter of the United Nations and to resolution 242 (1967) and to the main principle contained in that resolution, for which all the members of the Security Council, including the four permanent members of the Security Council—the United Kingdom, the United States, France and the Soviet Union—voted, namely, the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of foreign territory by force.

112. What reaction has there been to the position of the United States? Not a single genuine advocate of peace in the Middle East can agree with that position. This is the crux of the matter, this is the difficulty facing the United Nations and the Security Council.

113. In his statement, Mr. Yost touched on the question of arms deliveries from the USSR to the Arab countries, in particular to the United Arab Republic, and on the question of the assistance given to those countries by the Soviet Union in the form of military advisers. He tried to suggest that the United States was in favour of refusing such deliveries and that the Soviet Union was against refusing them. But how is the United States refusing to assist Israel, the aggressor? In the first place, it recently offered Israel a \$100 million loan. This economic and financial assistance to Israel is now more necessary than arms for it is quite natural that if a country has been in a state of war for almost three years its financial and economic situation is strained to the limit. What is such a gift to Israel from the United States if not assistance? This is real assistance to an aggressor.

114. Has the United States really refused to deliver arms to Israel? No. Deliveries are continuing under earlier contracts and agreements and an abundant flow of arms is going to Israel. Has the United States really

refused to deliver aircraft to Israel? No, it has only postponed such deliveries for tactical reasons and is waiting a little while; it has suspended deliveries, not refused them. The fifty Phantoms and the large number of military helicopters officially promised to Israel by the United States and the further twenty-five Phantoms and 100 Skyhawks which have been promised have not yet been delivered; their delivery has been delayed.

115. This is direct assistance to an aggressor and an encouragement to further military adventures, one of which we are currently considering in the Security Council. According to the generally recognized rules of international law, this constitutes complicity in aggression. Both the Charter of the United Nations and international law forbid the giving of assistance to an aggressor. Israel, as we know, is over-supplied with arms. The Israeli generals have repeatedly stated that they have so many arms that if, for example, during any given year Israel did not receive a single bullet from abroad, it would still have enough arms to wage war against all the Arab countries. That is the situation in which poor Israel finds itself, poor Israel about which United States propaganda makes so much noise here, saying that the balance of military forces between the Arab side and Israel has been upset. The latest statement of the Israeli generals refutes this myth created by United States propaganda. Israel is over-supplied with arms.

116. What is the position of the Soviet Union in the matter of assistance to the victim of aggression? Yes, the Soviet Union is supplying arms and assistance in the form of military advisers. Recently, at a Press Conference in Moscow reported by *Pravda* on 5 May 1970, the head of the Soviet Union, Aleksei Nikolaevich Kosygin, replying to a question on this point put by Mr. R. Bernheim, a correspondent of the Swiss newspaper *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, stated:

"We have an agreement with the Government of the United Arab Republic that our military advisers should be with the troops of the United Arab Republic. The proper functions of our military advisers are agreed with the Government of the United Arab Republic. This is being done in order to repel Israeli aggression, which is enjoying wide support from the United States. The United States is in fact supplying Israel with the necessary arms and is protecting and supporting its aggression against the United Arab Republic."

117. Those are the facts, that is the reality. Our assistance—I might say, incidentally, that I have said this to Mr. Yost on several occasions but he stubbornly reverts to this question; I have obviously not convinced him, so I should like to try to convince him in a wider forum and perhaps this might succeed—our assistance is assistance to the victim of aggression and this is the fundamental difference between our assistance and yours. You are assisting the aggressor while we are assisting the victim of aggression. Under international law and the Charter of the United Nations it is permissible for assistance to be given to a victim of aggression. This is just and is permitted by all the rules of international law.

118. In one of my statements here, I recalled that the United States had helped the victims of aggression during the Second World War; it gave broad assistance to the United Kingdom and also helped the Soviet Union, although less broadly—I do not at present have the exact data as to whether it helped General de Gaulle and the French who were fighting to liberate their homeland—but it did indeed help the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom. This noble assistance to the victims of aggression was in accordance with all the rules of international law. As far as I know, the United States did not assist Hitler by supplying arms; perhaps some United States monopolies secretly supplied the Hitlerites with arms too, but that is another matter. Officially, the United States assisted the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union as the victims of aggression, but did not assist Hitler as the aggressor.

119. Now the position of the United States has changed completely. It is rendering assistance to the aggressor and is attempting to prevent assistance being given to the victims of aggression. This is unacceptable. Such a demand is aimed at disarming the victim of aggression and leaving the Arabs without arms in the face of the military superiority of Israel which is over-supplied with arms and which is continuing to receive assistance in the form of arms from the United States. Such an approach, such a policy is aimed at preserving the military superiority of the aggressor and disarming and weakening the victim of aggression. This is absolutely unacceptable.

120. What conclusion can be drawn from all this? Mr. Yost, I appeal to you: persuade your Government to put an end to its military assistance to the aggressor; secondly, persuade your Government that in the consultations between the four Powers in the next few days agreement should be reached regarding joint formulas to the effect that all Israeli troops should be withdrawn immediately and unconditionally from all the occupied Arab territories and should return behind the line of 5 June 1967. If we reach agreement on this fundamental question, this main and crucial question, I am almost certain that we shall easily reach agreement on all outstanding questions: on the question of peace, on the question of free navigation, on the question of the United Nations presence in the explosive areas of the Middle East and on the question of military observers, in short, on all questions relating to a settlement in the Middle East which would form a kind of "package deal". I think this would present no difficulty.

121. If we reach agreement on a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East, then we could begin talks about arms deliveries, then we would be ready to hold talks with you and with other members of the Security Council—with the United Kingdom, with France and with others—on the question of arms, particularly since this would coincide with the general policy line of the Government of the Soviet Union regarding general and complete disarmament. Then there would be a proper atmosphere for talks. The talks now concern the cessation of arms deliveries and assistance to the victim of aggression—that is a policy

designed to assist the aggressor and encourage him to undertake further military adventures. This is what is wrong with such a policy, with such a position and with such an approach.

122. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now call on the representative of Israel to exercise his right of reply.

123. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): We have just heard another Soviet apology for the USSR's policy of incessant support for Arab aggression, for the continuation of Arab terror warfare against Israel and for the Arab repudiation of the cease-fire. We have not heard, however, from the Soviet representative a single word about the Soviet Union's willingness to mend its ways, the Soviet Union's readiness to see the Arab States agree to negotiate peace with Israel, as all States do when they have to terminate war between themselves. As long as the Soviet Union pursues its present policy of encouragement of Arab belligerency and increased direct military involvement in the Middle East conflict, no phraseology can conceal the nefarious and dangerous character of the Soviet attitude and of Soviet actions in the region.

124. The representative of Lebanon, in presenting statistical information to the Council regarding the results of the Israeli defensive action, added little to the information submitted by me at a previous meeting. However, he omitted two cardinal facts. The few casualties which he defined as "peaceful civilians" were in fact members of the terror organizations which, unlike the great majority of their comrades, did not lay down their arms in response to Israeli loudspeaker appeals. The structures demolished were structures used by the irregular forces. Nevertheless, what he has omitted to say the terror organizations themselves have confirmed. Press communiqués issued yesterday by at least three of them—El Fatah, the Syrian-controlled El Saiqa and the Peoples Democratic Front—state unequivocally that the Israeli operation was directed against them, that they were the forces which engaged the Israeli army in battle, that they suffered the casualties and that they would rebuild the structures used by them and demolished by the Israeli forces. In fact—and this deserves to be placed on record—the murderers of Israeli women and children, glorified in the Arab world as heroes for being able to sneak up at night and open fire on sleeping villagers, showed their true mettle by immediate surrender or escape.

125. For the Council's information, sixteen camps and bases of the terror organizations, as well as their headquarters and depots in six different villages, were captured and dismantled in the operation. In the village of Kfar Haman two members of the irregular forces were caught and admitted that they had taken part in the firing of Katyusha rockets in the town of Kiryat Shemone which killed several Israeli civilians. A third terrorist captured in the same village revealed that he and his comrades had installed nine launchers of Katyusha 122-millimetre rockets and aimed them at Kiryat Shemone. These were immediately located and destroyed by the Israel forces.

126. It seems that everyone everywhere knows what has been going on in the Fatah land established by the irregular forces in south-east Lebanon and what happened on 12 May. For some reason the representative of Lebanon refuses to take cognizance of reports on this in the international information media. He could find exactly the same information in the Lebanese Press and radio and in the statements of Lebanese leaders. Indeed, it is interesting that while the representative of Lebanon attempts to misrepresent and exaggerate the events of 12 May, his powerful Minister of the Interior, Mr. Jumblat, came out with a declaration the day before yesterday advising that the scope and nature of the Israeli action should not be exaggerated.

127. The most cogent retort to the Lebanese representative's arguments at the Council table is to be found, however, in the words of the leader of the National bloc in the Lebanese parliament, a former Minister and Presidential candidate, Mr. Raymond Edde, who on 13 August 1969 stated:

"One cannot anticipate promising results from complaints to the United Nations. As long as the Lebanese Government approves Fedayeen activity from Lebanese territory, it must also agree to ultimate military action on the part of Israel resulting from such activity."

128. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Lebanon.

129. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) (*interpretation from French*): I shall not reply now to the statement made by the representative of Israel. I have already placed some information before the Council on the damage suffered in the regions occupied by the aggressive Israeli troops.

130. I have just received further information on the incident that took place this morning. A Lebanese military spokesman stated that Israeli forces shelled the villages of Hula and Blida in the district of Marjayoun. It lasted for half-an-hour, from 5.00 to 5.30 local time. In Hula three civilians and one little girl were killed. One man was injured and a number of houses were damaged. In Blida a number of houses were damaged considerably and this increases the list of murderous Israeli acts and adds to the number of victims among the Lebanese population.

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

132. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I should simply like to express regret and concern that the representative of Lebanon is not following the course of our debate this morning. As a matter of fact, earlier today I informed the Security Council of the developments in the course of the night and early this morning, when several attacks from Lebanese territory against Israeli villages along the frontier occurred. I indicated that Katyusha rockets were fired from positions in the Hula and Blida village areas in Lebanese territory against two Israeli villages causing extensive damage and that Israeli

forces returned the fire in the direction of those positions. I should like to express regret that as a result of this additional attack from Lebanese territory, Lebanese citizens have suffered loss of life. It indicates once again the grave dangers involved when peaceful civilian Lebanese villages are allowed to become bases of aggression, aggression which is carried out in violation of the cease-fire against a neighbouring State.

133. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Lebanon.

134. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) (*interpretation from French*): The families of the victims will not be consoled by the shedding of crocodile tears.

135. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In my capacity as the representative of FRANCE, and to reply to an incidental question that was asked by Ambassador Malik, I should like to say that as far as United States assistance to the French Resistance during the Second World War is concerned, France will never forget the part that the United States played in the liberation of our country.

136. Nor shall we forget the immense sacrifices made by the people and the army of the Soviet Union in the struggle against Hitlerite aggression. We also recall that at a tragic moment in the history of the world Britain stood alone in bearing the burden of the fighting.

137. It is precisely that solidarity—and perhaps in this year of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations it may be a good time to remember it—that allowed the achievement of the victory of freedom and peace, and we hope that that solidarity will be found again today in order to establish a peaceful settlement.

138. The representative of Morocco has asked to be allowed to address the Council, and as President, I invite him to take a place at the Council table for that purpose.

139. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): This morning there were statements made which have an important bearing on the debate of the Security Council. When you have decided on the date of the next meeting of the Council, Mr. President, I intend to come and ask to be allowed to speak on them. However, I have asked for the floor to make a brief statement now, for it appeared to me that the statement made by the representative of France called for an immediate comment.

140. To hear someone who himself participated in the resistance in his own country pay, on behalf of his Government and the French people—which added to the pages of its history that of four years of resistance, four of the most glorious years of modern times—a tribute to the resistance, on the one hand, and, on the other, express gratitude to those countries that assisted it is, I think, the best reply to the Israeli representative's disdainful reference to "heroes who sneak in during the night to kill sleeping people".

141. It seemed to me that that point could not be overlooked, I am happy that the representative of France paid tribute to all resistance movements and thanked all those who assisted them, for, in this debate in the Council, where Lebanon has been attacked because it assisted the resistance movement, it belies the accusations made by Israel and is also a reply to those around this table who feel that they should espouse the point of view of Israel regarding resistance and the Government and people of Lebanon that assist it.

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

143. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I am certain that all of us present at this table remember the grim years of the Second World War and the nature of resistance. I have no hesitation at all in saying that the resistance fighters, the freedom fighters, who fought against nazi occupation and oppression did not kill women and children in their sleep as Arab terrorists are doing today.

144. I should not like to speak, however, on behalf of the resistance associations. They have had their say already, and they have rejected categorically and with contempt the attempts of Arab propaganda to compare, to associate, Arab terrorism directed against Israeli civilians with the glorious resistance against nazi oppression.

145. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): The memories of all of us are quite fresh about the nazi crimes committed by Israel only very recently, when its air force deliberately and knowingly bombarded schools in the vicinity of Cairo, in the United Arab Republic, where thirty children were killed, and before that when eighty workers going to their factories in the morning were also killed. Speaking about terrorists, I would remind the representative of Israel of a great body of literature on organized terror. The Israeli-Zionist terror in the thirties and forties, the Palmach, the Irgun Zway Lyumi, the Haganah, the Stern gang, those who killed Lord Moyne at Cairo—those are the real terrorists, and there is a great amount of literature about them. I advise him to read in Hebrew the story of Palmach in two volumes. I advise him to read the book of his cabinet minister, Menachim Begin, *The Revolt*. I advise him to read *The Lady was a Killer* and *Women of Violence*. All that took place in the thirties and the forties—the massacre of Arab civilians, women and children.

146. As I look at it, I do not want to dignify a criminal by a reply, but simply to set the record straight for the Security Council because I consider it beneath my dignity to reply to the representative of Israel.

147. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall call upon those who have asked to speak. I should, however, like to point out—and I think that in the interest of the Council I should do so—that it is not necessarily those who speak last who have the last word.

148. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I am not seeking to be the last. I should merely like to express my gratitude to you for the reminder in your brilliant statement on those four difficult years of the Second World War when the countries of the anti-Hitlerite coalition, on the basis of the principle of struggling against aggression, carried on a noble fight and not only saved mankind from the terrible threat of fascist enslavement with which Hitler menaced the whole world, but also brought about the creation of the United Nations itself, of which we have the honour to be Members and whose twenty-fifth anniversary we shall celebrate this year. It is true that the situation which is developing in the world in connexion with acts of aggression in two regions is extremely unfavourable for celebrating an anniversary.

149. Now, we, the people of the Soviet Union, the Soviet State, also appeal to all peace-loving States to unite on the basis of the principle of struggling against aggression and to promote peace throughout the world and friendship among all peoples.

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

151. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I have no claims, as the representative of Syria apparently has, to being a historian, but neither do I lay any claims to the right to distort history.

152. As the representative of Syria referred to the origins of the Israel defence movement in Palestine under British mandatory administration in the thirties, I would simply try to recall to his memory that that movement was organized in response to Arab terrorism that began to take the toll of lives of innocent civilians as far back as the twenties. The originator of that terrorism was a gentleman called Haj Amin el-Husseini. Haj Amin el-Husseini found the right place to spend the war years. When all peace-loving and freedom-loving peoples were resisting Nazi capture and oppression, he spent his war years in Berlin as an adviser to Hitler, as an adviser in the genocide of the Jews of Europe. Today, Haj Amin el-Husseini, who succeeded after the end of the war in escaping from the allies, who declared him an international war criminal, is in the Arab States inspiring the movement of Arab terrorism, continuing in the spirit of the Hitlerite persecution and genocide of Jews.

153. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): I referred to the few books written by Israeli-Zionist terrorists, including Menachem Begin. This is what is to be found on page 3 of his book *The Revolt*:²

“While we were engaged in educating the youth and organizing their repatriation to Eretz Israel—without British permits—there arose in Eretz Israel, as a herald of Jewish national re-birth, the

² New York, Henry Schuman, 1961.

first beginning of Hebrew power: the Irgun Zvei Leumi* . . .

Then he goes on to say that the Irgun Zvei Leumi was formed in 1920, even before the Mandate was given to Britain over Palestine.

154. *Sepher Ha-Palmach*, in Hebrew, which is about the Haganah, acknowledges that the Haganah was formed in 1913, before the Balfour Declaration.

155. Then there is the real character of the Jewish-Israeli-Zionists—and the three words should go together, because “Jewish” should not be identified with “Zionists” or with “Israeli” completely. After the assassination of the messenger of peace, Count Folke Bernadotte, for which assassination the Security Council condemned Israel on 18 September 1948 [*resolution 57 (1948)*], the Council then voted another resolution on 19 October 1948 requesting Israel to give a report about the assassination of Count Folke Bernadotte [*resolution 59 (1948)*]. I ask the Council whether that report has been given. Those who assassinated Count Folke Bernadotte became members of the Israeli Knesset. However, concerning these assas-

* “The Irgun Zvei Leumi—National Military Organization—was called into existence (April, 1937), by the teachings of Vladimir Jabotinsky . . .”

sinations, the following will be found in the records of the Security Council as having been said by no less a man than Dr. Ralph Bunche, who is present at this conference table now. This is what he said:

“These assassinations constitute a critical challenge from an unbridled band of Jewish terrorists to the very effort of United Nations to achieve, by means of mediation, a peaceful adjustment of the dispute in Palestine. In a broader sense, they give evidence not only of contempt for the actions of the Security Council, but also of a cynical disregard for the United Nations as a whole. It is clearly imperative that urgent measures be taken to ensure that the aims of the United Nations in Palestine should not be frustrated by criminal bands or by any individuals or groups who might hope to profit from acts of such bands.”³

156. Regrettably, there are individuals and groups that have benefited and that are benefiting from those acts of terrorism, including Mr. Tekoah at this conference table.

The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.

³ *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, Supplement for October 1948*, document S/1018.

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. Находите 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.
