



UN/SA COLLECTION

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SEVENTH YEAR

1650th

MEETING: 26 JUNE 1972

COPY:
DO NOT REMOVE
FROM ROOM
L-201 (WVVR)

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1650/Rev.1)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 23 June 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10715);	
(b) Letter dated 26 June 1972 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10720)	
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 23 June 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10716)	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.

SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 26 June 1972, at 6.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Argentina, Belgium, China, France, Guinea, India, Italy, Japan, Panama, Somalia, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1650/Rev.1)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Letter dated 23 June 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10715);
 - (b) Letter dated 26 June 1972 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10720).
3. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 23 June 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10716).

The meeting was called to order at 8 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

1. The PRESIDENT: The provisional agenda for this meeting of the Security Council is contained in document S/Agenda/1650/Rev.1. I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the fact that item 2 of the agenda, entitled "The situation in the Middle East", now consists of two letters. The additional letter, dated 26 June 1972, is from the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic and is addressed to the President of the Security Council. This letter has already been circulated as document S/10720.

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Letter dated 23 June 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10715);
- (b) Letter dated 26 June 1972 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10720)

The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 23 June 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10716)

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with a previous decision of the Council, I propose to invite the representatives of Lebanon and Israel to participate, without the right to vote, in the Council's discussion of the matter inscribed on the Council's agenda.

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

3. The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection, I shall invite the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic also to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. G. J. Tomeh (Syrian Arab Republic) took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken by the Council at the 1649th meeting, I invite the representatives of Egypt, Kuwait and Jordan to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that they will be called to the Council table when it is their turn to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. E. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. A. Y. Bishara (Kuwait) and Mr. A. H. Sharaf (Jordan) took the places reserved for them.

5. The PRESIDENT: The Council will now continue—after a delay caused by extensive consultations today—its discussion of the matter inscribed on its agenda. As we had ample opportunity at our last two meetings for an extensive debate on the issue before us, and in view of the consultations prior to this meeting, I would very much hope that this meeting will be the conclusive one, and that we shall be able to take the necessary decision; that, as I understand it, is the prevailing wish of members. Consequently, I hope that we shall be able to avoid—and this is my earnest appeal—any unnecessary repetition of the debate we have already had. In this I am guided not by any intention to deprive anyone of his rightful opportunity to express his views, but solely by the desire to have us all co-operate as much as possible in enabling the Council to take an important, necessary step in an urgent situation that calls for us to act as promptly as we possibly can.

6. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): In my statement of Friday last [1648th meeting] I

informed the Council of the initial reactions of my Government to the operations carried out by the Israeli armed forces on the territory of Lebanon. I stated in the clearest terms our disapproval of all acts of violence and said that we condemned all reprisal operations, whatever the reason for them. Finally, I expressed the hope that military operations would end immediately and that the massacre of innocent people would be stopped.

7. Before commenting on the draft resolution that has just been submitted by Belgium, France and the United Kingdom [S/10722], I should like to emphasize certain aspects of the matter we are considering.

8. This matter is but the regrettable continuation of all the others that, since the events of June 1967, have prompted the Council to meet repeatedly. Despite the resolutions adopted by the Council—most often unanimously—the situation in the region has constantly deteriorated, creating a hotbed of tension which constitutes a real threat to international peace and security. It therefore becomes necessary for the Council to pronounce itself clearly and without further delay on what happened on 21, 22 and 23 June on Lebanese territory.

9. We all know the facts and I do not think it useful to dwell on them. In any case, the representative of Lebanon has given us all the needed and specific information regarding the loss of human lives and the very substantial material damage suffered by his country. The representative of Israel, for his part, attempted to justify those operations by invoking the right to legitimate self-defence; he mentioned actions carried out from Lebanese territory by Palestinian commandos, as well as actions carried out against international civil aviation, in particular on 31 May at the airport of Lod.

10. In this connexion I should like to establish a distinction. As I have just said, my Government disapproves of all acts which affect the lives or the goods of innocent civilians, and in this spirit we have not failed formally to condemn the terrible massacre at Lod. That unprecedented attack, carried out in cold blood against a defenceless crowd by individuals who have been unanimously disavowed in their own country, aroused a feeling of indignation in the world, but must such acts, however unwarranted, necessarily lead to operations of reprisals which in turn cause even greater losses and damages and are inevitably followed by other reactions? Our British colleague, Mr. Jamieson, has very well defined the nature of the Israeli operations: if they were reprisals, they were in any case condemnable; if this was the exercise of the right of self-defence, the Israeli reaction was obviously out of proportion.

11. For my part I do not believe that the operations carried out by Israel against a peaceful country, which has been plunged despite itself into a conflict which it in no way created, can facilitate a return to peace in that region. Of course, it is up to the Lebanese Government to control as best it can the activities of the *fedayeen* based on its territory, but we all know perfectly well that that is a *de facto* situation which is the direct result of the occupation by Israel of territories conquered by force and due to the lack of settlement of the conflict.

12. That need for a settlement which might bring a just and lasting peace to the Middle East has been profoundly felt by my Government. Accordingly, since 1967 it has never ceased to work in that direction, recalling on each occasion before the Council or in the General Assembly that the principles contained in resolution 242 (1967) constitute the basis for such a settlement. That is why it took the initiative of a meeting among the permanent members of the Council, feeling that this could facilitate the task of Ambassador Jarring. In brief, my Government has spared no effort to promote the establishment—and here I shall use Mr. Maurice Schumann's expression—of "a peace whose durability is guaranteed by respect for justice."¹

13. As we see it, one of the conditions for this lasting peace is respect for the integrity and independence of Lebanon, that little country with such a wealth of human values with which—need I remind the Council—France has always maintained close relations born of an age-old friendship. It is essential that calm return to the Israeli-Lebanese frontier as soon as possible if it is desired to avoid any new explosions of violence leading to an escalation of aggressions and retaliations which would further remove any chance for peace in the region.

14. On Friday, at this table, mention was made of a lessening of tensions in the world, whose signs we have very happily noted in the course of the last months. France deeply desires that we succeed in eliminating tensions everywhere. France wishes it particularly in regard to the countries of the Middle East. We sincerely hope that the peoples of that region of the world, which is so rich in history and civilization, will one day be able to benefit from this lessening of tensions which is a condition for the establishment of a real peace.

15. It is in that spirit that, in association with the delegations of Belgium and the United Kingdom, the French delegation has submitted the draft resolution the text of which is before the Council. This was intended as a European draft resolution. If the Italian delegation did not join in sponsoring this draft resolution, it is not, as Ambassador Vinci will tell the Council, because it did not agree with the terms of our text, but simply for constitutional reasons.

16. The text which, with my colleagues from Belgium and the United Kingdom, I submit to the Council, is an attempt to give this debate an appropriate conclusion. What we wish, first of all, is to see a final end of all military operations against Lebanon and to have Israel respect previous resolutions of the Council. On the other hand, we deplore all acts of violence and all reprisal operations. We particularly condemn the recent attacks by the Israeli forces on the territory and the population of Lebanon. We insistently request that the persons kidnapped from the territory of Lebanon by the Israeli forces on 21 June be freed as soon as possible. If the negotiations undertaken to that end do not lead to a positive result, we believe that the Council should meet without delay to reexamine the question and take other measures.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1942nd meeting, para. 70.

17. The draft resolution, as submitted, is doubtless not perfect. Yet, we feel that this draft resolution, none of the elements of which can be dissociated from the rest, meets the essential concerns of all the members of the Council. We sincerely hope that it will meet with the approval of the Council and that, if possible, it will be adopted unanimously.

18. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Israel to whom I now give the floor.

19. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I shall comment at the appropriate time on the inequitable draft resolution submitted by the representative of France. Some of his remarks have, unfortunately, further highlighted the one-sided character of the text. I shall only make one observation. If I understood the representative of France correctly, he alleged that the terror warfare directed against Israel is due to the situation that has developed in the area since 1967.

20. As far back as 19 April 1955 a representative of a Member State spoke of similar terror attacks carried out at the time against the civilian population of Israel. The statement was made before the Security Council, and I quote from it:

"These are serious and inexcusable facts which, if they continued, the Council would be bound to condemn formally. The Council cannot ignore the seriousness of both these factors—infiltration and mine laying—which are responsible for the present tension..." [698th meeting, para. 106].

That statement was made by the representative of France, Ambassador Hoppenot.

21. On instructions of my Government, I should like to refer to the letter submitted to the Council today by the representative of Syria [S/10720] informing it that Syria is a party to the Lebanese complaint before the Council. This is motivated, obviously, by the detention by Israel of five Syrian officers taken prisoner in the course of a clash between a Lebanese military convoy and an Israeli patrol on 21 June.

22. The Syrian representative and his supporters have tried to allege that the officers in question were at the Israeli-Lebanese frontier almost on a picnic. Though in years past I have met many Syrian army officers and broken bread with them, I do not know what they would normally consider to be a picnic.

23. If the Syrian officers in question were in fact on a picnic, it was a picnic of death. The documents found on them indicate clearly that they had two missions: to prepare guidelines for further terror operations from Fatahland, which they visited on their alleged picnic, and to establish military and civilian targets on Israeli territory for future attacks. It is odd to hear the representative of Syria passionately concerned about the five high-ranking officers. For several years now Israel has been detaining 45 Syrian and 60 Egyptian prisoners of war and has called repeatedly on Syria and Egypt to exchange them for 13 Israelis detained by the Syrians and by the Egyptians. These efforts

have been of no avail. Is it because the Syrian officers belong to a higher social class that the progressive conscience of Damascus has been suddenly awakened?

24. Syria comes plaintively to the Security Council to seek the immediate release of five Syrians. But what is Syria's own record? How has Syria treated Israeli prisoners? On 21 December 1963, 11 Israelis, some of them kidnapped from Israeli territory, were freed by Syria. Among them were Israelis who had spent 15, 14, 12, 11, 8 and 5 years in Syrian gaols. Three of them had been abducted from a village near the Lake of Galilee on 13 July 1963. Until their release, the Syrian authorities had persistently denied that these men were even in Syrian hands. For years these men rotted in barred cages enveloped in complete darkness. No representative of the Red Cross was allowed to see them. All communication, all correspondence between them and their families was prevented. After years of torture these helpless prisoners returned to Israel as physical and mental cripples. The aim of their sadistic gaolers apparently was to return them as madmen or corpses. Nine years have passed since then and Israeli physicians have succeeded in restoring to health only one—I repeat, only one—of these unfortunates.

25. The following story illustrates in all its grimness the treatment meted out to prisoners by Syria. A young man, Yacov Mashiach, was abducted by the Syrians while he was conducting a botanic tour near the kibbutz of Mayan Baruch in Upper Galilee in 1966. His family and the Government of Israel appealed again and again to General Bull of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), to the Chairman of the then Syrian-Israeli Mixed Armistice Commission, to the International Committee of the Red Cross, to the Secretary-General, to the Ambassador of the USSR in Israel, to the Holy See and to various Governments, human rights organizations and personalities to approach the Syrian Government on this matter and to appeal for the release of the unfortunate Mashiach. The Syrian Government, at all levels of authority, rejected these appeals and claimed that a prisoner by the name of Mashiach had never been in their hands.

26. On 26 June 1967 the Israeli army found in the Syrian Government offices in Kuneitra, in the Golan heights, a file on the Mashiach case. The documents in the file made it clear that the young man had been abducted by a Syrian army unit which had penetrated into Israel and that he was interrogated and tortured by his captors. According to this file the Syrians knew that Mashiach was a civilian. On 17 July 1967 the Syrian authorities returned to Israel the remains of Mashiach. The Syrian authorities admitted that he had died three weeks after his abduction.

27. By no means forgotten is a more recent instance of Syria's attitude on the detention of Israelis. On 29 August 1969, a Trans World Airlines (TWA) plane en route from Rome to Tel Aviv was hijacked to Damascus by three Arab terror agents. After passengers disembarked there, an explosive charge was set off causing serious damage to the plane. Two Israeli civilians, passengers aboard the aircraft, were imprisoned by the Syrian authorities for 98 days. The two were exchanged only on 5 December 1969 for 13 Syrian prisoners, among them two Syrian pilots.

28. The detention of the two Israelis by the Syrian authorities did not prevent Syria's election at the time to the Security Council, the United Nations organ entrusted with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

29. Not only has Syria's treatment of Israeli prisoners been a most flagrant crime against humanity; the plight of the Jewish community in Syria is one of the greatest tragedies of our times. An ancient and most proud community, which dates back to the period before the Arab conquest of what is today Syria, lives under conditions of cruel oppression and discrimination. Deprived of their human rights, imprisoned in ghettos, unable to leave Syria, the Jews of Damascus, Aleppo and Qamishli live in constant terror of violence, their womenfolk raped and their young men thrown into prison simply for trying to escape the inferno of the country they live in.

30. On 13 June 1972 the representative of Syria submitted a special letter to the President of the Security Council [S/10698] complaining of the indignation that this situation has aroused in the entire world. It is not surprising that he should have done so. The enlightened world has followed with growing anxiety the fate of the helpless Jews of Syria. Governments, international organizations and public figures in all parts of the world have repeatedly expressed solicitude for their fate and determination to persist in the struggle for their liberation. Numerous letters and telegrams have been sent to the President and Government of Syria and to Syrian ambassadors, appealing for an end to the suffering of Syrian Jews. Media of information, mass meetings and conferences have called for their liberation. In France, the United Kingdom, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Brazil, Argentina, the United States and Israel the fate of Syrian Jews has become one of the central elements in the universal struggle for human rights. As far back as September 1969 the former Secretary-General referred, in the introduction to his annual report to the General Assembly, to the situation of Jews in Syria and other Arab lands as follows:

"I share the widely-held concern for the plight of another, smaller group of helpless persons," he said, referring to the Jewish minorities in the Arab world. "These minorities", he continued "would be better off elsewhere and . . . the countries in which they now live would also be better off, given the prevailing circumstances, if the departure of those who would wish to leave could be sanctioned and arranged, since their continued presence is a source of both internal and international tension."²

31. Syria has remained impervious to these expressions of concern. Syrian Jews continue to linger on at the mercy of a Government which has no regard at all for even the most elementary humaneness. This is the Government whose representative comes here to submit a complaint and to preach in the name of humanity, morality and law.

32. The gravest of all crimes of which the Syrian Government is guilty is its continued warfare against Israel and, in

particular, its active support of terror attacks against the people of Israel. Despite the cease-fire accepted by the Syrian Government in 1967, Syria's warfare against Israel continues unabated. More than a thousand acts of armed aggression have been perpetrated against Israel by Syrian regular forces and by terror organizations operating from Syria. In these attacks 54 Israelis lost their lives and 182 were wounded. The Es Saiqa terror organization, one of the most savage of the terror groups, is in fact a branch of the regular Syrian Army. Its operations are carried out under direct orders from the Syrian Army general command. Es Saiqa's leader is a regular Syrian army officer seconded to it. Lately, this organization has been operating in particular from Fatahland, in south-eastern Lebanon, the area from which have come the attacks that brought about the recent aggravation of the situation.

33. On 2 September 1971 President Assad of Syria stated in an interview with the Egyptian weekly *Al-Mussawar* that the *fedayeen* were now situated in more than one sector of Syria and that they could operate freely from the Syrian front. He said: "Moreover, we are strengthening them and spurring them on. Sometimes we even complain of insufficient activity on their part, especially in the Golan Heights.

34. On 21 April 1972 President Assad, while on a visit to Kuwait, declared: "When others talk about *fedayeen* action these people should know that if it were not for Syria there would have been no *fedayeen* action."

35. The terror organizations use the official Damascus Radio to broadcast their communiqués and their propaganda. A special broadcasting station has been established for them in Dera'a. The Es Saiqa organ, *El Talia*, is published in Damascus. The so-called Supreme Palestinian Military Council, which oversees the conduct of terror warfare against Israel, convenes regularly in Syria. The annual conference of the Al Fatah terror organization is also held there. The Central Executive of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the umbrella organization of the terror groups, is located in Damascus. All the individual terror organizations operating also in Lebanon and from Lebanese soil have branches in Damascus, including military commands.

36. The Syrian Government's support of air piracy is an established fact. The imprisonment for 98 days of two Israeli civilians hijacked to Damascus on the TWA aircraft—a case already mentioned by me—and the blowing up of the aircraft at Damascus airport are still fresh in the memory of all.

37. On 27 May 1971 President Assad declared:

"We have nothing to do with negotiations for a peace settlement. We have not committed ourselves, nor shall we ever do so, to restrict *fedayeen* activities. Syria is the lung through which *fedayeen* activity breathes and it will remain that. There is no other way than battle."

38. This is the Syria that has asked to be considered an integral party to the Lebanese complaint, a Syria that has shown inhumanity to prisoners, a Syria that has become the

² *Ibid.*, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 1A, para. 74.

symbol of persecution of Jews in the Middle East, a Syria that has repudiated the United Nations Charter in relation to Israel, a Syria that has rejected Security Council resolution 242 (1967), refused to co-operate with United Nations peace-making efforts in the Middle East and denied entry to Ambassador Jarring, a Syria which insists that war is the only way to resolve the conflict with Israel, a Syria whose avowed and officially proclaimed objective is the destruction of Israel and of its people. By becoming a party to the Lebanese complaint, Syria has instilled in it more unbridled hostility, more fanaticism, more contempt for international law and morality, more perversion of United Nations principles. If Israel had the possibility of receiving a fair hearing at the Security Council table, if problems arising from the Middle East situation could be considered here on their merits, the Lebanese complaint, now bearing the imprint of lawless Syria, would be dismissed for what it is—a complaint by a criminal to the effect that he had a few teeth knocked out by the victim of his armed assaults.

39. The PRESIDENT: There are no other names on the list of speakers and I shall therefore call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting begins.

40. Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Argentina stated its general views on Saturday [1649th meeting] on the problem which the Security Council is considering and we said that we would consider any draft resolutions in the light of those views.

41. In document S/10722 we now have before us a draft resolution sponsored by Belgium, France and the United Kingdom, which will be voted upon shortly. My delegation wishes to state that it will vote in favour of this draft resolution since it feels that there are legal principles at stake which are beyond challenge. At the same time we wish to place on record that the wording of several parts of the draft resolution is not entirely satisfactory to my delegation.

42. Operative paragraph 2, for example, can certainly be improved upon. As regards paragraph 3, while it deserves our support because of its content, it could, I think, also have expressly covered the situation of the prisoners of war who are now in the power of the parties to the conflict. It would have been desirable to make an appeal for the prompt exchange of these prisoners. My delegation, for humanitarian reasons, expresses its support for the negotiations that are now taking place for that purpose. At any rate, that is the way we understand the words "as an immediate consequence" which appear at the beginning of paragraph 3.

43. Having said that and because the draft resolution contains many elements which my delegation considers important, we shall vote in favour of it, in the hope that episodes such as those that have occurred recently will not be repeated and that the way will thereby be prepared for a just and lasting peace in the region.

44. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): I indicated at the 1649th meeting on 24 June that my delegation would

submit a draft resolution that we believed would meet the needs of the present situation. Such a draft has now been circulated to members of the Council in document S/10723.

45. Mr. BOYD (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In explanation of its vote my delegation categorically wishes to state for the record of this Security Council meeting that we have not been consulted in any way on the draft resolutions on the Middle East which have been discussed in various groups of this body and which were submitted to us a short time ago. I am referring to the draft resolution contained in document S/10722, submitted by the delegations of Belgium, France and the United Kingdom, and to the draft resolution contained in document S/10723, submitted by the United States.

46. Since this is a matter of vital importance for my country and because of the very cordial relations we enjoy with both the Arabs and the Israelis, we would have wished to participate closely in the drafting of a more constructive and balanced pronouncement on a subject of such transcendental importance.

47. In the statement we made last Saturday [1649th meeting] we clearly set forth the position of the delegation of Panama, which could not have been other than of condemnation of the recent acts of terrorism committed against Israel as well as of repudiation of the military incursions committed against Lebanon.

48. We wish every situation of violence in the Middle East to be censured with equal emphasis. Since the draft resolution contained in document S/10722 lends greater weight to the condemnation of one aspect of violence than to another, my delegation has received instructions to abstain in the voting.

49. Mr. ABDULLA (Sudan): I shall not dwell at length on this draft resolution. I would only set forth certain objections that my delegation has to it.

50. The first relates to the preamble, of which the sixth paragraph reads: "*Deploring* the tragic loss of life resulting from all acts of violence and retaliation". My delegation's policy is to condemn all sorts of violence, but we think that that paragraph is too vague. We would have wanted it to be very specific and very definite on the act of aggression and violence which was committed between 21 and 23 June by Israel against Lebanon. We should have very much liked the Council to deplore that. Our apprehension is that this paragraph might be interpreted in such a way as to spoil the specific reference to aggression to which I have referred.

51. I should also like to comment on any references to the liberation movement of the Palestinians or any interpretations of such references. We think that this is a true liberation movement, and that the words "acts of violence" that might have been used in some of the discussion do not apply. We believe it is a movement of liberation. Indeed it has been accepted as such by a resolution adopted by a Committee of the General Assembly at its last session. That is why we do not like the formulation of this particular paragraph.

52. I turn now to operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. We fully support the condemnation of "the repeated attacks of Israeli forces on Lebanese territory and population in violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and Israel's obligations thereunder". However, the comments I have just made on the sixth paragraph of the preamble apply also to the phrase "while profoundly deploring all acts of violence" that is used in paragraph 2.
53. I should like to make one more point. The release of the Syrian officers should not be subjected to any sort of delay or any sort of bargaining. This is a straightforward question of international law, which does not permit people to be kidnapped and abducted. We should therefore have liked to see the Council issue a straightforward order to Israel for the immediate and unconditional release of these abducted people.
54. Mr. NUR ELMI (Somalia): In conformity with my delegation's statement to the Council last Saturday [1649th meeting], we would have favoured a draft resolution on this very important problem which clearly condemned Israel and at the same time called upon Israel to release forthwith the Syrian officers who were abducted in Lebanese territory. But we see that the present draft resolution [S/10722] does not reflect our concern on this matter; it does not condemn Israel, as we would have wished it to do, and as did three previous resolutions 262 (1968), 270 (1969) and 280 (1970). It associates the very timid condemnation contained in operative paragraph 2 with the deploring of acts of violence. My delegation condemns all acts of violence, but it would have preferred to see this paragraph divided in the following manner: a paragraph 2 reading "Deplores all acts of violence;" and then a paragraph 3 reading: "Condemns the repeated attacks of Israeli forces . . .". As far as the release of the abducted officers is concerned, the Somali delegation wishes to place on record its great surprise that this supreme organ of the United Nations should express a "desire". It is true that before the word "desire" the word "strong" appears—"strong desire". Nevertheless, the Security Council would now be expressing a "desire" that Israel take steps to release the abducted officers.
55. Like the delegation of Panama, we were not consulted in the drafting of this important draft resolution. My delegation would have preferred to move formal amendments to it, but because of the urgency, because of the emergency character of these meetings of the Security Council, and because the Somali delegation has ascertained that no matter how bad the draft resolution is, it has met—because there is no alternative—with the approval of some of the parties concerned, my delegation will abstain from moving such amendments.
56. Finally, in the present operative paragraph 4 it is stated that if so-called "steps do not result in the release of the abducted personnel"—and I do not see that any steps have been taken—"the Council will reconvene . . . to consider further action". That implies that some action has been taken. The Somali delegation does not regard this expression of a "strong desire" as action taken by the Security Council to compel Israel to refrain from its unlawful acts.
57. After those few remarks, it remains for my delegation to state that the Somali delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution.
58. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Grossly trampling upon the principles of the United Nations Charter and showing brazen contempt for the relevant Security Council resolutions, Israel has over a long period carried out ceaseless armed aggression against Lebanon and other Arab countries. The present draft resolution [S/10722] has failed to reflect fully this actual state of affairs and failed to ask Israel to abandon fundamentally its policies of aggression and war; it has failed to ask Israel to compensate for the losses suffered by the victims of aggression and failed to demand in clear-cut terms that Israel no longer engage in acts of aggression in the future. All this falls short of satisfaction.
59. In the opinion of the Chinese delegation, the Israeli invasion of Lebanon is a premeditated and planned act of aggression, and it is only logical that it should be condemned; whereas it is perfectly just for the Palestinian and other Arab peoples to take up arms to resist aggression and defend their national rights, they must be given support. Both the sixth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2 contain the wording, "deploring all acts of violence".
60. Such a wording could be interpreted as making no distinction between the right and the wrong or between the aggressors and the victims of aggression. The Chinese delegation cannot agree to such an ambiguous wording. The Chinese delegation states that it has serious reservations in regard to such a wording.
61. In operative paragraph 3, Israel should be asked to release the abducted Syrian and Lebanese personnel immediately and unconditionally. The wording in the draft resolution is not clear enough, about which the Chinese delegation also has reservations.
62. The Chinese delegation reiterates that the Chinese Government and people will, as always, firmly support the Lebanese, Palestinian and other Arab peoples in their just struggle against aggression. We firmly believe that, relying on the united struggle of the Arab peoples and with the support of all the justice-upholding countries and peoples of the world, they will surely win final victory in their struggle.
63. With the above statement and reservations, the Chinese delegation is prepared to vote in favour of the draft resolution.
64. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): In evaluating the results of the discussion of the new aggressive act, or rather the acts of aggression, committed by Israel against Lebanon, the Soviet delegation is guided by the opinions which it expressed in its statement [1648th meeting] during the discussion of this question.
65. The piratical air raids on defenceless inhabited localities in Lebanon have already taken dozens of human lives.

Sorrow and tears are being brought to the land of Lebanon by the modern barbarian aggressors, violating elementary international law and disregarding the decisions of the United Nations. The Israeli aggressors must answer for this sorrow and these tears before the court of world public opinion.

66. In the discussion here certain representatives have attempted to equate terrorism with aggression, so far as responsibility is concerned. It is true that terrorism is undesirable. Our party and V. I. Lenin taught us not to follow a course of terrorism. If a revolution is to be organized, the working masses must realize the need for the revolution; this was what happened in Russia in October 1917. But there is clearly a tendency here in the Council to place the terrorist acts of individuals on the same footing, from the point of view of international responsibility, as acts of aggression organized, planned and sanctioned by a State, a Government and a head of State. The terrorist who is still alive will, according to the American press, be tried by a national court in Israel. But who will try the person who planned, officially organized and perpetrated the monstrous new attack against the peaceful inhabitants of Lebanon? Already dozens of persons have died as a result of this new aggression by Israel against Lebanon. When official aggression is committed by a State and by the armed forces of a State, when it is planned and approved and sanctioned by a Government headed not by a youthful extremist but by a venerable grey-haired lady, Prime Minister Golda Meir, then domestic laws and courts are not relevant. This is an international crime, international brigandage. After the Second World War those who committed such crimes, those who crept furtively into alien territories at night and burned, plundered, killed and raped, were punished. When the United Nations triumphed over Hitler, the guilty were brought to trial at Nurnberg and were judged, according to the provisions of the Charter of the International Military Tribunal, Nurnberg, for international crimes, for attacks on other States, for murder and destruction.

67. Therefore anyone who tries completely to equate one act of violence with another is actually attempting to conceal the aggressor and to absolve him from responsibility.

68. The position on 24 June was that over 30 persons had been killed as a result of Israel's new acts of aggression. Who bears the responsibility for this? The State, the Government, the Prime Minister. And this must be taken into account and remembered when the Security Council adopts a resolution.

69. For this reason, on the basis of these considerations, the Soviet delegation would have preferred paragraph 2 of the draft resolution [S/10722] to read "Strongly condemns the repeated acts of aggression of Israel" - not "the repeated attacks of Israeli forces" - "against Lebanon, which are causing the loss of countless human lives and wreaking havoc".

70. We of course deplore loss of life, whether it is the result of extremist terrorism or of aggression, but from the point of view of responsibility we cannot equate an act of

violence by an individual with an act of international brigandage and violence by a State, a Government, a head of Government. For that reason the new acts of aggression and violence by the Israeli State against the Lebanese State deserve severe international condemnation and severe condemnation from the United Nations and the Security Council, which bears primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and international security.

71. We cannot fail to remark on the fact that during the debate certain representatives said that their Governments strongly support the territorial integrity of Lebanon. That is a good and responsible statement to make; it is an important commitment. As the Soviet representative, I fully associate myself with that statement. But why mention only the territorial integrity of Lebanon? Why was this idea not pursued further and why was it not stated equally firmly that such Governments are in favour of the territorial integrity of Egypt, Syria and Jordan? This is the root and the essence of the problem of achieving a Middle East settlement.

72. The key issue in eliminating the aftermath of the Israeli aggression is the question of the seizure and plunder of other people's land by Israel. As long as Israel, which has stolen other people's land, does not return it to its rightful owners, it will be difficult to expect peace, calm and stability in the Middle East. This is the root of the evil and the essence of the Middle East problem. Let Israel return the stolen land to its rightful Arab owners. Then the aftermath of the Israeli aggression will be eliminated, justice will triumph, a peaceful situation will be restored and violence will cease. This is the key to the solution of the problem.

73. Those who are trying to conceal and gloss over the point and essence of the Israeli aggression by various means are in fact playing into the hands of Israel and are not promoting a political settlement of the Middle East problem.

74. There is one more fact to which I wish to draw attention. The Israeli representative here, summing up the results of the discussion, complained that seven members of the Security Council do not have diplomatic relations with Israel. Why is this? It is naturally because of Israel's aggressive policy, because of Israel's disregard for the elementary rules of international law, for the decisions of the United Nations, for the resolutions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly which condemn Israel for aggression and call for a peaceful political settlement. The point is not, however, the existence or otherwise of diplomatic relations. States may live as Members of the United Nations in accordance with the Charter without having diplomatic relations with each other. The Charter specifically says that we must live "as good neighbours". This most important principle of the Charter is being systematically violated by Israel. Israel does not abide by this principle, it violates this principle; it pursues a systematic policy of aggression against its neighbours. This is the root of the evil. This is why Israel must accede to the principal demand made of it: it must withdraw from other people's land and return what has been stolen to the rightful owners, so that peace can be restored in the Middle East.

75. A previous speaker said that in the present circumstances it is difficult to evolve new proposals for a Middle East settlement. But I repeat that such proposals do exist and that the main one, the key proposal, is that Israel should liberate the alien lands which it seized as a result of aggression. Then the main problem will be solved. This proposal is not new but it remains constantly active and relevant; until this proposal is implemented, it will be impossible to hope for stability in the Middle East or an end to the lawful struggle of the Arab peoples for their rights, for the territorial integrity of their States, for national freedom and independence and for non-interference in their internal affairs. For this reason the Soviet delegation has again and again drawn the attention of the Security Council to the main and basic reason, to the key question—the fact that Israel must return the stolen land to its rightful owners.

76. The Israeli representative has depicted to us here the Israeli paradise in Gaza. We know what kind of paradise is created by invaders and occupiers. Hitler too promised Europe a “new order”, the Hitlerite paradise. But what kind of paradise was that? We experienced this paradise under the boots of the SS officers on our backs during Hitler’s occupation of our Russian territory. The Yugoslavs experienced it, as did the French, the Belgians and many other European peoples. They know what kind of paradise in occupied land is provided by the occupiers. No, the peoples of Europe and the peoples of the Soviet Union did not resign themselves to Hitler’s paradise. And everyone knows how this ended for the occupiers. This is why it is futile and naïve to expect the Arab peoples to resign themselves to the Israeli occupation. The sooner the Israeli invaders understand this, the better it will be for them, for their neighbours, for the cause of peace in the Middle East and for international peace as a whole.

77. The reasoning of the Israeli representative about successes in Gaza can be compared with the situation of a gangster who has stolen money from a bank and invested it in more beneficial undertakings and used it more successfully. But he would still be a gangster and, under United States law, could be sentenced to imprisonment for a year or two years or five years, even if he uses the stolen money in a more beneficial and successful way than its previous owner. For this reason, it would be better for the Israeli representative not to use arguments of this kind here.

78. The Soviet delegation strongly urges that the draft resolution be more forceful, that the aggressor be condemned more decisively and that there be no analogy or comparison between an official aggressor, who commits planned and premeditated aggression which is carried out by official armed forces, and other acts of violence. We believe that the inclusion in this context, together with a condemnation of the aggressor, of a reference to all acts of violence is an attempt to camouflage the aggression and to absolve from responsibility those who should answer for the aggression, not before a national court—as in Israel in the case of the young terrorist who committed the terrorist act—but before an international court and in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter. The United Nations—both the General Assembly and the Security Council—has already repeatedly condemned Israel as an

aggressor. As the Soviet delegation has already stated, this has led to the international isolation of Israel in the same way as South Africa has been isolated because of its policy of racism and *apartheid*.

79. I have one more comment on the draft resolution. The Soviet Union delegation feels that an amendment should be made to paragraph 3 concerning the release of the Syrian and Lebanese military personnel captured by Israeli troops. We fully agree with the representatives of the Sudan and Somalia that the military personnel should be released immediately. The members of the Security Council have already discussed this even before the official meetings of the Council. Consultations were held among all 15 members of the Council and it was agreed by an overwhelming majority, with certain remarks by a single member, that the President of the Council should summon Mr. Tekoah and state that the prevailing opinion of the Council is that the Syrian and Lebanese soldiers should be released immediately. Not whenever possible, but immediately; and immediately means within two or three days. The Soviet Union delegation would have preferred the draft resolution to set a time-limit, so that the Syrian and Lebanese soldiers seized illegally and in a brigandish and thievish manner on alien Lebanese territory could be returned immediately, without any conditions, without any reservations and without any counter-claims, since there are no grounds for any.

80. The Soviet Union delegation would therefore have preferred the draft resolution to be strengthened in this way. But if the Arab delegations have no objection to that draft, the Soviet delegation will not oppose its adoption.

81. The PRESIDENT: Since no other representative wishes to speak at this time, I take it that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote.

82. In accordance with rule 32 of the provisional rules of procedure, the Council will vote first on the draft resolution sponsored by the delegations of Belgium, France and the United Kingdom [S/10722].

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Argentina, Belgium, China, France, Guinea, India, Italy, Japan, Somalia, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Panama, United States of America.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*³

83. The PRESIDENT: Another draft resolution has been submitted to the Council in this connexion by the United States of America [S/10723]. In view of the adoption by the Council just now of the draft resolution contained in document S/10722, and in accordance with established

³ See resolution 316 (1972).

practice, it would not be my intention to put to the vote the United States draft resolution unless some member of the Council so requests. As no representative has made such a request, I shall take it that it is so decided.

84. I shall now proceed to call on the members of the Council who have indicated a desire to explain their votes after the vote.

85. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): In my statement on Saturday [1649th meeting], I described the position of my delegation on the question of a Security Council resolution on this issue. I specified certain criteria by which the United States would test any draft resolution placed before us. Since then a number of delegations have worked exceedingly hard during long hours to reach agreement on the resolution we have just voted upon. Unfortunately, however, that resolution did not meet the requirements which I discussed on Saturday.

86. It will be recalled that our delegation felt that a resolution, to be acceptable, must be fair, that it must be balanced, that it must be concerned with terrorist attacks, as well as with the Israeli attacks, that it must show concern for the casualties on both sides of the border and, most importantly, that it must at least carry the hope of moving this area closer to peace. We believed also that if the repatriation of all armed force prisoners could be effected this would have removed an inhibition to progress in this area and would also, of course, have had humanitarian benefits.

87. The resolution that was just voted upon did not meet what we strongly believed are the needs of the situation and my delegation was obliged to abstain.

88. Let me simply add that our draft resolution [S/10723] was no attempt to camouflage. It attempts to express condemnation of the moves in Lebanon, but it also rises above the rather ominous silence which at times surrounds the assaults on Israel, the assaults against innocent life in that country. I have in mind one such assault that only recently claimed 16 American lives, in rather senseless cold-blooded slaughter. We worry about the deaths at Hasbayya. We worry, too, about those who died at Lod airport, or those who have died along the Israeli side of the Israeli-Lebanese border. We are concerned about those things.

89. Mr. JAMIESON (United Kingdom): My delegation co-sponsored and has voted for the draft resolution we have just adopted because we consider that it fairly reflects the situation which precipitated this series of meetings and strikes an appropriate balance, as indeed I attempted to do in my intervention on Saturday. The resolution makes clear the view of the Council that the repeated attacks of Israeli forces on Lebanese territory and population warrant the condemnation of the Council. We have no doubt about that. The resolution also profoundly deplores all acts of violence, wherever they are committed and whoever commits them. Equally, we have no doubt about that. But it is right that the Council should not hesitate to censure when in its view a particular act or series of acts warrant that course, and as I made clear in my earlier statement, my

delegation cannot accept that the Israeli actions in this case were justifiable in relation to what preceded them.

90. Before I close, I should like to say a word about prisoners. In this resolution we have concentrated on the personnel referred to in paragraph 3. And this is right, because of the circumstances in which they were taken; because this is part and parcel of the actions which precipitated our debates; because, therefore, the release of these people is a matter of immediate priority. However it is clearly high time, both on humanitarian grounds and as a contribution towards the lessening of tensions in the area, that there was a general release of other captured persons, those taken earlier in the course of active hostilities and still languishing in captivity. Our vote for this resolution in no way detracts from that position.

91. Mr. VAN USSEL (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): In co-sponsoring the draft resolution which has just been adopted, Belgium sought, in association with France and the United Kingdom, and with the support of Italy, to demonstrate the active interest which Western Europe and, particularly, the member countries of the enlarged community have in the Middle East question. We appreciate the constitutional reasons which prevented Italy from becoming a co-sponsor, but which have by no means detracted from the deeply-held conviction which it has just expressed by voting in favour of the resolution. The numerous visits and actions undertaken by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belgium, M. Pierre Harmel, in recent days, in order to promote the cause of peace, are a reflection of the preoccupation of my country in the face of the ever-explosive situation in this part of the world, with which Europe has so many affinities.

92. The resolution which has been adopted by the Council is the result of a compromise, which means that it does not always reflect all the ideas and desiderata which its sponsors would have liked to have seen included in it. In other words, this resolution is a joint attempt to win as large a majority as possible on action on the part of the Council in connexion with the serious incidents and acts of violence which have been going on for more than a month now, both in Israel and in Lebanon.

93. As my delegation sees it, in effect all the operative paragraphs need to be followed up. Paragraphs 1 and 2 request Israel to refrain in the future from resorting to military interventions against Lebanon, as these are contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter. If the latter in Article 51 has enshrined the natural right of self-defence, at the same time it has limited its application to the single case of armed aggression. But the incidents of 20 June in Israeli territory which provoked the reprisals on the following days, could not be described as an act of aggression on the part of Lebanon, a country whose noble peaceful traditions are known to all. However, paragraph 2 implies, since it profoundly deplores all acts of violence, that the Government of Lebanon should take all necessary steps to contain and effectively control the activities of Palestinian fighters and thus avoid acts of sabotage and ambush against Israeli targets being organized from its territory.

94. At a time when the Members of the Organization are preparing to address to the Secretary-General replies to his questionnaire on steps taken in connexion with the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security it is perhaps pertinent to recall and to reaffirm here paragraph 5 of that Declaration, which provides, firstly, that every State "has the duty to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of any other State" and, secondly, "that every State has the duty to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in acts of civil strife or terrorist acts in another State" [*General Assembly resolution 273 (XXV)*]. I thought it necessary and timely to refer to that paragraph, since I, myself, two years ago was involved in the drafting of that Declaration, which was approved unanimously with the exception of the dissenting vote of South Africa.

95. Regarding paragraphs 3 and 4 of the resolution we have just adopted, my delegation also construes these as requiring a twofold series of steps. As I stated in my intervention last Saturday [*1649th meeting*], the Belgian Government regards the requests of Syria and Lebanon that the officers and gendarmes captured on 21 June in the interior of Lebanese territory be released as a legitimate request to which the Israeli Government should accede. At the same time, we remain deeply convinced that the subsequent reciprocal exchange of prisoners of war constitutes a factor which would very likely reduce considerably the tension between all the belligerent countries in the Middle East. It is in this balanced spirit that we interpret the text of paragraph 3. Although it is true that the release of the Lebanese and Syrian military personnel should be immediate, it is none the less true that it should lead up to a general exchange of prisoners between the countries involved in the Middle East conflict, an exchange which we ardently desire.

96. Once again my Government would express the sincere hope that the matter of the Middle East might be approached and considered by the Security Council in terms of peace and no longer in terms of preventing war. Since 1968 the Council has adopted numerous resolutions as a result of armed military incidents or interventions. Only a few days ago, furthermore, it took a unanimous decision [*see S/10705*] condemning air piracy and acts of illicit interference in civil aviation. The public opinion and the Government of my country were horror-struck at the indescribable massacre which bathed in blood the Lod airport on 30 May last. In the same way, we condemned the grave events which occurred last week in Lebanon, during which 90 were killed and approximately 100 wounded.

97. This means that more than ever my country urges the Security Council and the parties involved to do everything they can to bring about a lasting peace settlement in the Middle East. We have already agreed on the main guidelines for such a settlement, by adopting resolution 242 (1967). Furthermore, we have also supported the initiatives and attempts made by Ambassador Jarring. We hope that, with the help of imagination and the desire to succeed, efforts will be undertaken to draw up an over-all agreement in the Middle East.

98. Mr. VINCI (Italy): As was mentioned by the representative of France, Mr. de Guiringaud, in introducing a European draft resolution, if Italy is not formally among the sponsors of the resolution just adopted it is only because of contingent international constitutional reasons. Following the elections which have recently taken place in Italy, a new government is being formed today in Rome and is now going through the regular formalities which precede the normal seating of a cabinet in place of the former one. We have, however, all along been at the side of the three sponsors, Belgium, France and the United Kingdom, sharing all their efforts in the strenuous task of drafting a text which could be approved by the Security Council. Therefore we have given our support to the resolution and voted in favour of it. I believe that the result of the vote shows that we have fulfilled our obligations as a member of the Council, although the text adopted does not fully reflect the views of my delegation. We are not alone in having such feelings. From what has been stated by other delegations around this table, that appears to us quite clear. However, we all know on the basis of our experience that the price of compromise, in order to enable the Council to act and to produce some results, requires a spirit of accommodation and reconciliation.

99. Anyhow I feel in duty bound to place on record the views of the Italian delegation as they can easily be perceived in the general statement I made at our meeting on Saturday night, which is available to all members of the Council as it is reproduced in the record of the 1649th meeting. I indicated then that our preference would go to a draft resolution which would produce as a first result the compliance of the parties. To achieve such a result we believe that, although we cannot condone in any way any sort of reprisals or retaliations, which are inadmissible under the Charter of the United Nations, it is not reasonable or very realistic to ignore completely well-known facts which have produced the military reactions of the Israeli forces.

100. It is equally unrealistic, in our view, to ignore totally the unfavourable psychological climate created by the criminal action perpetrated at Lod airport which has aroused the indignation of world opinion and produced the general strike of the pilots of most of the international civil airlines. We cannot fail to deplore strongly such senseless murderous acts against defenceless civilian persons which spread death and tragedy to so many families and peoples. But at the same time we cannot accept any connexion with large-scale military operations which have followed or justified for those operations. We sincerely hope that responsible Governments will do their utmost in asserting their legitimate authority and in checking those who plan similar acts wherever they prepare and attempt to carry out terrorist attacks or unlawful deeds.

101. In the same vein we would have liked some changes in paragraph 4 which, as it stands, appears to us to be redundant since it is in part a repetition of the previous paragraph and could have been shortened, keeping the essentials, namely, the provision that we would convene again if necessary to consider further action.

102. We sincerely hope, however, that the resolution will produce the desired results, among which—besides the

release in the shortest possible time of Syrian and Lebanese military personnel—we include, as I indicated in my previous statement on this subject, the rapid exchange of all persons captured in the course of active hostilities. We feel that the continued detention of prisoners of war after the establishment of the cease-fire by the United Nations adds yet another cause of friction in a situation already complicated by so many issues.

103. We fervently hope that the spirit of the resolution will be properly understood by all the parties concerned, to which I address on behalf of my delegation a renewed appeal to make all possible efforts to stop the irrational spiral of violence that seems about to engulf the Middle East again.

104. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): After having listened to the speakers who have explained their votes, I should like to add a few words.

105. My delegation feels that the scope of this resolution which we have just adopted is limited to its subject-matter, namely, the attacks perpetrated last week against Lebanon, and when we express the strong desire that appropriate steps will lead, as an immediate consequence, to the release in the shortest possible time of Syrian and Lebanese personnel abducted by Israeli armed forces on 21 June on Lebanese territory, our only concern is to remedy without delay the specific situation thus created.

106. It goes without saying, however, that, from a strictly humanitarian point of view, my government cannot but rejoice at any development which would make it possible, within an appropriate framework and following mutually accepted procedures, to proceed to an exchange of persons detained in any of the countries of the region. This would doubtless be an important contribution towards the calming of minds.

107. Mr. SEN (India): We voted for the resolution which has just been adopted and had been so diligently prepared after extensive negotiations and so ably piloted by the representative of France on behalf of the three delegations. We voted for it because this resolution meets generally the criteria I set down on Saturday on behalf of the Indian delegation. However, we should make it clear that the language of paragraph 2 could not be interpreted as equating any kind of illegal action with the action of those who assert their legitimate rights. Our vote on this paragraph simply indicates that we share the common concern for human misery and suffering such as that at Lod airport as a result of violence, without in any manner diluting the condemnation which the Council has expressed.

108. Secondly, we must earnestly hope that the resolution will be fully implemented so that the present difficulties can be overcome. Such implementation will help the renewal of the Jarring mission for the application of resolution 242 (1967), which alone can contribute effectively towards a permanent solution of the problem of West Asia. The current developments reflect only too well our failure to make worthwhile progress towards a comprehensive political settlement.

109. The PRESIDENT: I should now like to make a brief explanation of my delegation's vote in my capacity as the representative of YUGOSLAVIA.

110. We voted in favour of the resolution just adopted because the situation called for urgent action by the Council and because, in our view, the main significance and demands of the resolution are in calling upon Israel to refrain from all military acts against Lebanon, condemning repeated attacks of Israeli forces on the territory and population of Lebanon and requesting the release in the shortest possible time of all abducted Syrian and Lebanese personnel. This is of course not to say that we do not have strong reservations about individual formulations contained in the resolution's text. That especially concerns the wording at the beginning of paragraph 2 about deploring all acts of violence. As I clearly stated in my statement last Saturday, while regretting the loss of innocent civilian lives, deploring it in individual circumstances, we have to keep in mind the basic facts and causes responsible for the developments in the Middle East and never deny the right of a people to fight for its liberation and freedom. That remains our position.

111. The Yugoslav Government, the Government of a country born anew through a national liberation war, would never accept anything that could mean taking away any people's right to fight for its just cause.

112. Speaking now in my capacity as PRESIDENT, I call on the next speaker on my list, the representative of Israel, in exercise of the right of reply.

113. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Perhaps the oddest statements made in the Council have been those of the representative of India. I refrained from answering him last time. He has compelled me to reply to his statement today, and I shall do that by a simple suggestion: that he compare his statements in this debate with those made by him and by his Foreign Minister in the Security Council and in the General Assembly only several months ago. When the Indian Government decides which of the two sets of pronouncements reflects India's views on international relations, on international peace and security, when that decision is taken, it will be possible to address oneself to the views of the representative of India with the seriousness which they could normally command.

114. The following definition of aggression has been officially submitted to the United Nations:

"1. In an international conflict that State shall be declared the attacker which first commits one of the following acts:

"...

"(f) Support of armed bands organized in its own territory which invaded the territory of another State, or refusal, on being requested by the invaded State, to take in its own territory any action within its power to deny such bands any aid or protection.

"2. That State shall be declared to have committed an act of indirect aggression which:

(a) Encourages subversive activity against another State (acts of terrorism, diversion, etc.);"⁴

That is not an Israeli definition of aggression; that is a Soviet definition, similar to the provision contained in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, initiated originally by the Soviet delegation.

115. It is known that the Soviet representative has been brought up in an atmosphere of, and is used in his country to having, one law for all Soviet citizens and another for Jews of the Soviet Union. Now, Soviet Jews, downtrodden and discriminated against as they are, are resisting with tenacity and courage this denial of human rights. . .

116. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Point of order.

117. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

118. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Mr. President, I protest at the fact that the Israeli representative, with his usual malicious anti-Sovietism, is raising an internal question concerning the Soviet Union—the so-called Jewish question in the Soviet Union. No such problem has existed, exists or will exist. It was invented by the Israeli aggressors in order to cover up their aggressive actions against the Arab world and to turn the attention of the world community towards the Soviet Union for the purpose of disseminating anti-Sovietism. Please explain to the representative of Israel that his reference to this matter here in his statement, when he is speaking in the role of the condemned person, is inappropriate to say the least.

119. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel may proceed with his statement.

120. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I did not interrupt the Soviet representative when he made his statement, but, in view of his last remarks, I should like to protest against the abuse which he directed against the person of the Prime Minister of Israel, a lady, Mrs. Meir.

121. The representative of the USSR should know by now that in international relations Israel will not agree—as the Jews of the Soviet Union do not—that there should be one law for the Soviet Union and other States, and a different law for Israel.

122. On 21 May 1948, the representative of the USSR in the Security Council, at present the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Andrei Gromyko, declared:

"The USSR delegation cannot but express surprise at the position adopted by the Arab States in the Palestine question, and particularly at the fact that those States—or

some of them, at least—have resorted to such action as sending their troops into Palestine and carrying out military operations aimed at the suppression of the national liberation movement in Palestine."⁵

123. The Arab war, aimed, in the words of Mr. Gromyko, at the suppression of the Jewish national liberation movement, is still continuing; the objectives of the Arab States are still the same; the methods remain the same; and the Jewish people of Palestine are still defending their right to national freedom and independence against Arab aggression.

124. History cannot be changed, Ambassador Malik, and historical facts cannot be erased. We all know that this does sometimes happen in the Soviet representative's country, especially with the publication of each new edition of the Soviet Encyclopaedia, but this cannot and will not happen in the world at large.

125. The representative of the Soviet Union again spoke of Israel's alleged isolation. I appreciate his interest in Israel's feelings about its international situation, but, as I have already pointed out, there is no isolation in a just cause, even if it is the cause of a minority, the cause of a small people. Israel and the Jewish people are not isolated when history, justice and law are on their side. What is the significance of one-sided political resolutions adopted here or elsewhere when history and justice and law are on Israel's side?

126. And finally, if there is a criterion of isolation, or, on the contrary, of sympathy and friendship and understanding, that is most important and most valid in this age of the awakening of peoples—and the Soviet representative should be conscious of that—it is the attitude of the peoples to a particular State, to a particular country, to a particular people. And if the representative of the USSR has any doubt regarding my statement, let him suggest to his Government that it hold a free, unfettered referendum among the peoples of the Soviet Union on how they feel towards Israel and Israel's struggle to vindicate its rights. The Government and people of Israel will accept the results of such a free, unfettered referendum as an indication of whether Israel is isolated, even from and in the eyes of the people of his own country—not to speak of other nations and other countries—or whether it has the friendship and understanding of the Soviet peoples when they can express themselves freely.

127. The text adopted by the Council is inequitable and immoral. In a grave situation brought about by the continuation of terror warfare against Israel from Lebanese territory, the resolution ignores the murderous attacks on innocent civilians, the assaults on villages and towns, the crimes of air piracy perpetrated by Arab terror organizations. Instead of condemning those dastardly attacks, it sets upon measures Israel has been compelled to take as a last resort to defend itself and to protect its territory and its people. The heinous Lod massacre is disregarded as if it had never happened; the killing and wounding of defenceless civilian travellers on highways, the laying of mines on roads

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Session, Supplement No. 11*, annex.

⁵ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, No. 71*, 299th meeting, p. 7.

and in fields, the indiscriminate firing at and shelling of inhabited localities in Israel are all passed over in silence.

128. By failing to address itself to the armed attacks against a Member State which are the subject of Israel's complaint to the Council, by subverting the right of self-defence enshrined in the United Nations Charter, by striking at Israel's right to equal treatment on which the United Nations is founded, the resolution is contrary to basic principles of the Charter. It pays no heed to the fundamental fact of the Middle East situation, which is that the war declared and launched against Israel by the Arab States, including Lebanon, in 1948 has not been terminated, and that consequently this organ cannot counsel by what military action Israel should defend itself against violations of the cease-fire. The resolution is thus an affront to the victims of Arab terrorist atrocities and a travesty of justice. It belongs in the morgue of history.

129. On the question of prisoners of war, I should like to reiterate that the Government of Israel desires to see the speedy repatriation of all prisoners. Negotiations are already under way for the release of all prisoners of war by all parties.

130. The resolution might have grave repercussions on the Middle East situation. The Arab terror organizations might find comfort in it and feel encouraged to persist in their attacks. The Lebanese Government might seize upon it as another pretext for evading its international obligation to suppress the terror operations. Members of the Security Council will undoubtedly wish to impress upon their Governments the implications inherent in their support for a resolution of this kind. Indeed, in the past the Government of Lebanon has utilized one-sided resolutions and such injudicious action as the posting of United Nations observers to try to justify its refusal to put an end to attacks against Israel from Lebanese territory.

131. My delegation would like to stress that one-sided resolutions such as the one adopted today may reflect the political views of their supporters on a specific issue at a particular time. However, such resolutions do not and cannot modify or affect the basic principles and provisions of the United Nations Charter or the tenets of international law. Under these precepts Lebanon is in duty bound to prevent the use of its territory as a base for acts of murder, terror and violence against the State and people of Israel. Israel does not and will not release the Government of Lebanon from this obligation. Israel has insisted in the past, and will do so in the future, that Lebanon abide by its obligations and will hold the Government of Lebanon responsible if it fails to do so. In view of the seriousness of the threats to peace and security resulting from Lebanon's present policy, Israel hopes that the Government of Lebanon will give weight to the unalterable reality in the area—Israel's determination to defend itself and to protect the lives of its citizens—rather than to ill-conceived semantic formulations arrived at here on the East River.

132. The Government of Israel will stand firm on the rights under the Charter of the United Nations and international law to ensure that the people of Israel do live in peace and security. It is in peace that the people of Israel

hope to live and work and build. But even if struggle and strife and bloodshed are forced upon us we shall live. It is this, and not the falsification produced the other day before the Council by the Lebanese representative, that is the Prophet's exhortation: "And when I passed by thee, and saw thee steeped in thine own blood I said unto thee when thou wast in thy blood, live: yea I said unto thee when thou wast in thy blood, live."

133. Through the ages of its millennial history the Jewish people has been bled by foe and tyrant, by fanatic and vandal, but even as it bled it remained alive and vibrant and creative. So shall it be for all time.

134. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

135. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): I wish first of all to confirm the stand of the Syrian Government regarding the five Syrian officers and Lebanese officers and security personnel who are now detained in Israel. The manner in which these officers were abducted—an abduction recognized by the Council's resolution voted upon today—is, as I have already had occasion to state, a grave violation of international law. If no action were taken by the Council this would constitute an erosion of international law and morality and would undoubtedly lead in the ultimate situation to inhuman laws, to the law of the jungle. Israel had before its birth taken the law of the jungle as its basic principle. It continues to do so. The Security Council, by asking Israel today to release the five Syrian officers, as also the Lebanese officers and security personnel of Lebanon, has done the minimum that could be done in such circumstances. Otherwise a very grave erosion of international law would have taken place.

136. The release of these officers is a matter of immediate priority. It is unconditional. It should take place as quickly as possible, otherwise the Security Council will be called upon again to look into this matter.

137. I listened very carefully and intently to the diatribe of Mr. Tekoah concerning Syria and Syria's attitude. He spoke a great deal about law, a thing which has become usual to anyone who has listened to Mr. Tekoah. Indeed, if we took a recording of any previous session of the Security Council we would hear the same words being repeated, the same ideas, the same thoughts, the same conclusions—always a man practising lawlessness and preaching law.

138. Now, in order to prove my point I shall not use my own words but shall read from an article published in the French newspaper *Le Monde* on 23 June 1972 concerning the attack on Hasbayya for which Lebanon has complained to the Security Council, together with the abduction of officers. This is what the article says:

“‘An apocalyptic vision’—this is the first sentence our correspondent in Lebanon cabled us, that was spoken by an archaeologist priest who found himself in a small restaurant in the village of Hasbayya at a time when the Israeli bombardment occurred. He went on: ‘I wanted to help a woman who had been seriously wounded in the leg and whose five-year-old daughter tried to comfort her. I

was rooted to my chair, physically incapable of moving. I had the impression that the entire village was going to catch fire, exactly like the three cars in front of us which were being devoured by flames.'

"The Associated Press correspondent gives his account: 'Women clutching their children started to run, yelling in panic while the Israeli jet planes were sowing death and destruction. Corpses and wounded people were lying in several streets. . . This village of 4,000, most of the population of which is Druse, had already been the target of raids of reprisal by Israel in February and March 1972 and in May 1971, but one inhabitant declared, 'We have never seen anything like this'.

...
"... The village is almost totally destroyed. I saw five cars full of people burning after the passage of Israeli aircraft. They dropped their bombs everywhere. The raid lasted two hours. The inhabitants tried to find shelter in caves and dugouts while the Israeli forces established on the Golan Heights participated in pillaging.

...
"... Fields of wheat and crops were burnt all around Hasbaya after the explosion of incendiary bombs. . . The barracks, the Druse mosque, the nursery school were all hit. People were imprisoned under the ruins of houses. The village seemed to have been hit by an earthquake."⁶

139. That is a description of what Israel understands by justice. I think the best commentary on this article, written by two correspondents, one French and one American, would be the very Biblical verse which Mr. Tekoah has just quoted. I wish I knew it. But I know another verse from the Bible:

"Woe to him who builds his house on blood and his city on iniquity."

140. I shall not indulge in answering all the base accusations which Mr. Tekoah has levelled against my country, but I should like to take up just a few points in order to make the truth clear. We are now living the results of the 1967 war. I wish Mr. Tekoah, for instance, had replied not by going back to 1947 or 1948 but by commenting on the document which I placed in the hands of members of the Council at the 1649th meeting on Saturday and which indicated the settlements that had been established in all the occupied areas after 1967 in contravention of the 1949 Geneva Conventions, of all the resolutions of the Security Council and of the Charter of the United Nations; I wish he had commented on the statements and the decisions taken by the twenty-eighth Zionist Congress to the effect that they were going to build these settlements, to expel the Arabs, to keep the Arabs out of their own territories. But the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War is very clear; it states: "The occupying Power may not alter the status of public officials

or judges in the occupied territories,"⁷ It also stipulates that no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

141. I need not go on quoting the Geneva Conventions and other international documents, but I should have liked to hear an answer from Mr. Tekoah about this particular document which is now in the possession of every Member of the United Nations. What about this altering of the status of the occupied territories? What about the inhabitants of the occupied territories? What about resolution 237 (1967) adopted unanimously by the Security Council and resolution 2252 (ES-V) adopted by the General Assembly at its fifth emergency special session and confirmed by it at its twenty-sixth session? I would have liked Mr. Tekoah to be a little logical and to condescend to answer those questions. Instead, he chose to insult Syria, the Soviet Union, India, anybody who dares raise his voice in criticism of the crimes of Israel. But listening to him is in itself a lesson. It reminds me of a masterpiece written by Jean-Paul Sartre: *Huis-clos*—"No Exit". In that play a man in hell cannot find a way out and he begins to shout and to insult everybody. To him: *L'enfer, ce sont les autres*—"Hell is the others".

142. Mr. Tekoah is inhuman. He has been dehumanized by a neurotic doctrine called "Zionism". Until and unless he realizes that, no dramatic expositions, no insults levelled at India, the Soviet Union or Syria, no beautification of words, no attempts at misleading people will deceive anybody. He is in the situation described by Jean-Paul Sartre: "No Exit". He has proved his inhumanity today. He continues not only to prove it but also to make a doctrine of savagery, of barbarism, of inhumanity, of killing.

143. What I read out about the destruction of the village of Hasbaya—the action about which my Lebanese colleague is complaining—is typical of what has happened in every occupied area. What about the statement I quoted on Saturday from Mr. Dayan himself wherein he said that there is no Israeli village which has not been built on an Arab village? I wish he would reply to that. I wish he would come to his senses and reply to the facts that we are bringing here to the Council. Let him tell us that they are not true. On the contrary, he says: "Under the guise of law, of rights, of justice, we shall go on doing this." That is actually an interesting thing. We are listening to a little Fuehrer. We all know how the great Fuehrer ended: in hell, in a bunker.

144. Mr. Tekoah spoke of two definitions or norms of aggression: support of armed bands, encouragement of indirect aggression. I am sorry to tax the Council's patience but I must once more remind Mr. Tekoah of the history of the founding of his State. I read out on Saturday quotations showing how the Haganah had established import-export agencies in Damascus, Beirut and Baghdad among the Jewish communities in order to deceive the people. But I will read out something else from the same book: *The Haganah*:

"Our men took upon themselves the twofold mission of fighting in the ranks of the British Army, at whatever

⁶ Quoted in French by the speaker.

⁷ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973, article 54.

front they might be sent to, and at the same time doing whatever they could do to ensure the arming of the [Jews in Palestine].”

That was 1943, 1944, and not 1947 or 1948. It goes on:

“The falsification of passports and uniforms was the task of a group of specialists, men and women. Kol Israel, the clandestine broadcasting station of the Haganah, had a special code to communicate with their cells extending from North Africa to Iran.”

145. Here, I pause to remind the Council that he spoke about the clandestine radio station broadcasting for the resistance fighters to the Israeli occupation. But then there was no occupation. As to expansion, here is what the same book says:

“... the regular army of Israel”—which was the Haganah—“availed itself of the May 22, 1948, cease-fire, and of the truce directives of August 19, 1948, to complete two operations: Operation Balak—Hebrew for bird—and operation Dustbowl, ending on October 21, 1948. In September 1948, the United Nations Mediator was assassinated. . . The first operation consisted of smuggling three B-17 bombers from the United States and other planes through South America and Europe, which were used to bomb Cairo and Damascus in the summer of that eventful year.”

And here is the man who wants to teach us what aggression is and what are the norms of aggression. In that same vein, since we are in the Security Council let us go to the records of the Council between 1951 and 1963. There are four condemnations, including the voice of the United States in the Council, for attacks, sneak attacks, by Israeli armed forces against Syria through the demilitarized zone. I repeat, four condemnations.

146. Does he mention that? Can he reply to that? Certainly not. In each of those attacks no fewer than 50 soldiers, 100 sometimes, were either killed or taken prisoner, and Syria never knew about them. There were the established cases of young men who were buried alive on the Golan Heights, in the West Bank, in Gaza, in Sinai. These are facts of history and one day they will jump into the face of Mr. Tekoah and say to him “What have you done?” They will ask him the question: “Are you really your brother’s keeper, as you are claiming to be?” He will have no answer because he will be in his bunker, the little Fuehrer.

147. I shall not refer to anything except United Nations documents about war crimes and the crimes against humanity; they are defined by the Nürnberg Tribunal, and in 1950 by a resolution of the General Assembly [see resolution 488 (V)]. I refer the Council to the reports submitted by the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, from 1967 until the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, where we find the following: that schools have been destroyed, that hospitals have been destroyed, that United Nations personnel have been killed

or imprisoned, that now the United Nations, as represented by the Secretary-General, who is sitting near you Mr. President, has legal proceedings against the State of Israel for destroying the camps of the refugees and their schools and their maternity houses and their hospitals. These are war crimes and crimes against humanity. And Mr. Tekoah cannot escape that.

148. I could refer the Council also to the reports of Amnesty International, the reports of August and September 1971 of the International Red Cross, the reports about the occupied areas. I could refer the Council to two or three reports by the Commission on Human Rights and a committee of the General Assembly. They confirmed the torture, the mass imprisonment of people. Four thousand Arabs are rotting in Israeli gaols right now, and the testimony to that is to be found in all these international documents. And Mr. Tekoah comes to preach to us about law and morality, as though it is a slap in the face.

149. Then, is it a mere coincidence that he has chosen to speak about the Jews in Syria? In 1945, in 1946, according to documents of the State Department, the Zionist organizations in the United States were objecting that the Government of Syria does not permit Jews to go and migrate to Syria. Now they want them out of Syria, because this little Fuehrer is a law-maker. One day he wants them in; the other day he wants them out. And we have to submit to his will.

150. Mr. Tekoah mentioned my letter of 13 June to the President of the Security Council [S/10698] about the Jews in Syria. But he forgot that I had annexed four articles to that letter. They are the following: an article from *The New York Times* of 4 February 1972; “*Chez les Juifs de Damas*” by Robert Verdussen in *La Libre Belgique* of 27 December 1971; “How do Jews Fare in Syria?” by John Cooley in *The Christian Science Monitor* of 27 November 1971; “*Les Juifs de Damas*” by Pierre Démeron in *La Tribune des Nations* of 7 May 1971.

151. I included all those articles because they were written by Americans and by Belgians; we know that none of the Americans, the Belgians and the French are against the Jews. Everybody is for right, for justice, for humanity. These correspondents went to Syria and saw for themselves. Let me read some paragraphs:

“The Jewish Community of Damascus is administered by a seven-member community council presided over by Selim Totah, who lives in one of those old, elegant Damascus villas with a patio and courtyards graced with fountains and orange trees, of which there are still so many in the Syrian capital. Among the members of the Council are Ibrahim Hamra, a young rabbi with a melancholy smile, who is head of the Ben Maimoun School; several dry goods merchants, a doctor, Dr. Nessim Hasbani, and a tailor. The Community Council runs the clinic on Amin St., a welfare programme, and, most notably, the two schools, which are community schools but, like all Syrian schools since the nationalization of education in 1967, teach the official curriculum.”

But listen to this:

“Besides the usual subjects, Hebrew, which is necessary for a reading of the sacred books, is taught. Only 2 of the 22 teachers are Moslems, and they teach Arabic literature to 388 boys and girls, of whom about 10 are Christians and Moslems, again, sometimes of Palestinian origin.”

There is another paragraph:

“Of the more than 6 million Syrians, 100,000 are refugees from the Golan Heights and 250,000 are Palestine refugees. Children died of cold during the winter of 1970 at the Barzé Camp. But the only ones the West had been concerned about are the 4,000 Jews who, as you see, live as peacefully as possible! ’ The speaker was indignant.”

Then the article goes on to describe these various schools and institutions, and one of the largest of these two schools, Maimonides—Musah Ben Maimoun, if he knows what I mean—is actually paid for by the Syrian Jewish community in the United States who visited me and thanked me for the facilities that the Syrian Government is giving for their schools in Damascus.

152. I could go on and on, but there is one point on which I should like to dwell a little. Mr. Tekoah spoke about our non-co-operation with Ambassador Jarring, but he did not say anything about the assassination of Count Folke Bernadotte. We did not assassinate Jarring. In fact we believe that Jarring is a very distinguished Ambassador who is carrying out a very noble mission, and he is Ambassador to Moscow. Ambassador Jarring, both during his mission and previously has been to many Arab countries—including Egypt and Lebanon—but he was not assassinated. The Security Council did not adopt two resolutions on the assassination of this peace mediator. Mr. Tekoah, give us a reply about the assassins of Count Folke Bernadotte who became members of the Israeli Knesset after an amnesty was granted them by the Israeli Government. Is this the justice that Mr. Tekoah is preaching to the Security Council and to the international community?

153. During the six-day war the Security Council adopted, first, resolution 233 (1967) on 6 June and then resolution 234 (1967) on 7 June. On that same day Syria and Israel accepted these cease-fire resolutions. But when did Israel attack Syria? It attacked Syria on 9 June 1967. The Security Council was faced with the filibustering and delaying tactics of Mr. Goldberg, the then representative of the United States, who deliberately kept the Council from meeting for over six hours to enable the Israeli assassins and invaders to occupy parts of Syria. But finally on that same day, 9 June 1967, the Council met and adopted resolution 235 (1967). It recalled the previous cease-fire resolutions and stated:

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

“*Noting* the statements made by the representatives of Syria and Israel,

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

“2. *Demands* that hostilities should cease forthwith;”

That was adopted on 9 June 1967. But what happened? Israel carried on its attacks and penetrated further and further into Syria, because from the very inception of the Zionist idea the Golan Heights and the Litani River were part and parcel of the Israeli State-to-be.

154. Then on 12 June 1967 the Security Council, which had been in continuous session from 9 to 11 June, adopted another resolution, at 2.30 a.m., resolution 236 (1967), in which the Council:

“1. *Condemns* any and all violations of the cease-fire;”

Who was violating the cease-fire? Was it Syria in Israeli territory or was it the Israeli Army in Syrian territory? The answer is clear.

“3. *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;

4. *Calls for* the prompt return to the cease-fire positions of any troops. . . .”

155. Did Israel, I ask the Council, abide by these cease-fire resolutions? Had Israel accepted the first cease-fire resolution, not one single Israeli soldier would have been on Syrian territory and not one inch of Syrian territory would have been occupied by Israel. These are facts of history, and again they jump into the face of Mr. Tekoah and his leaders and ask, “What have you done with history?” He repeated the word “history” over and over again, not knowing that he was desecrating this very sacred word.

156. I could go on and on, but, since he spoke of the encouragement of indirect aggression, I refer him to one of the official historians of Israel, now living, Mr. Michael Bar-Zohar, who writes in Hebrew and is translated into English and French. He has a book on the market now, *Spies in the Promised Land*.⁸ I recommend this book to your attention. Just read the headings of chapters or peruse the book and see how the Lavon Affair and the Cohen Affair and all such affairs are being repeated. They were very well planned, and they are very openly spoken about.

157. Mr. Tekoah speaks about encouragement of indirect aggression. Again I would say that, whatever Mr. Tekoah has said or will say, it is nothing in the eyes of real history but the cries of a tortured conscience that sees no exit from hell.

158. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Lebanon on whom I call.

159. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): If I were to reply to the mass of accusations, falsehoods and fabrications that

⁸ New York, Houghton-Mifflin, 1972.

Mr. Tekoah has levelled against my country on Saturday and today, I should detain the Council unduly, for many hours. As a matter of fact I refrained from using my right of reply on Saturday in deference to the Council, but at the conclusion of this debate there are a few points that I should like to refer to and place on record.

160. Mr. Tekoah the other day showed his magnanimity and his kind hospitality by inviting me—as he later invited my colleague and brother, Ambassador Abdel Meguid of Egypt—to visit the occupied territories and to see for myself in what wonderful conditions the Arab peoples are living there. This is a very kind invitation. As a matter of fact I have no objection to accepting such an invitation, but from the right person at the right time. The people who have the right to issue invitations to the occupied territories are the Arab people of Palestine, of Sinai, of the Golan Heights, the Jordanians—these are the people who have the right to issue such an invitation. I will definitely answer this invitation when, in due course, I receive it from the mass of Palestinian refugees, when they have regained their territories; from the people of the occupied territories when the hordes of the occupying forces have left those territories.

161. The refugee problem has been at the root of the problem of the Middle East for many many years. Many resolutions have been adopted by the General Assembly calling on Israel to allow the Palestinian refugees to return to their homeland or to be compensated, asking that justice be done them. It is interesting to remind Mr. Tekoah that these resolutions as a matter of fact have been produced year after year by the United States, and I should like Mr. Tekoah to ponder these words of Mr. William Rogers, the Secretary of State of the United States, who in an address made on 9 December 1969 before the 1969 Galaxy Conference on Adult Education, in Washington said:

“There can be no lasting peace without a just settlement of the problem of those Palestinians whom the wars of 1948 and 1967 have made homeless.

“ . . .

“The problem posed by the refugees will become increasingly serious if their future is not resolved. There is a new consciousness among the young Palestinians who have grown up since 1948 which needs to be channelled away from bitterness and frustration towards hope and justice.”⁹

These are very thoughtful and meaningful words pronounced by the Secretary of State of the United States. They accurately portray the conditions of the refugees, their spirit, their tendencies and the need to channel their hopes from despair to hope, from injustice to justice, from frustration and what it generates to a constructive life. Then the peace that Mr. Tekoah wants in the Middle East will be achieved. Then the conditions of peace will prevail.

162. Mr. Tekoah comes before this Council time and again to claim that he and his people and his Government want

peace. He asked the members of the Council the other day after two days of debate, “What solution have you offered for peace, to settle this conflict?” Well, the Security Council, in an attempt to settle the Middle East crisis, has offered resolution 242 (1967). Many attempts have been made since then to implement that resolution. Who has been scuttling all the efforts of the Secretary-General, of Ambassador Jarring, of the then four permanent members of the Council who were trying their hand at finding a solution? Who has defied the resolutions of the General Assembly adopted during its twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth sessions by large majorities, not by mechanical majorities, majorities that included all the Western European countries? He wants peace and he works against peace. If he really wants peace and he wants a solution there is a way. He asked: “What is the way?” There is a way. Naturally I cannot speak for the Secretary-General. I only represent a small country and the Secretary-General represents the world. After this meeting Mr. Tekoah can go, tomorrow, to the Secretary-General and tell him, “Mr. Secretary-General, Israel is ready to resume talks with Ambassador Jarring in an earnest desire to find a peaceful solution for the Middle East question.” I am sure that the Secretary-General will immediately send for Ambassador Jarring and that Ambassador Jarring will respond to his call and be here in 24 hours. That is if Israel really wants peace and not talk about peace.

163. I have read today in the dispatches arriving from the Middle East, from Tel-Aviv, the following:

“Mr. Allon, the Vice-Prime Minister of Israel, said in a speech to a collective farm meeting that he apologized for the bombing of the Lebanese village of Hasbayya last Wednesday, saying it was accidental. He said that a technical fault caused some bombs to hit the village. Meanwhile the toll in the 30 May Tel-Aviv airport massacre rose to 28.”

He was trying to make a connexion between the massacre at Lod and the massacres at Hasbayya and Deir el-Ashair. As a matter of fact, he did not mention Deir el-Ashair.

164. But Mr. Tekoah admitted the other day to the Council that Israeli Phantom planes had bombed Deir el-Ashair and he claimed that the bomb hit a commando camp—he calls it a terrorist camp—there. As a matter of fact the “terrorists” that were killed there were 17 Lebanese civilians, the majority of whom were women and children. In Hasbayya 10 people were killed and 20 persons were injured. Havoc spread throughout the town and great destruction of many homes and vehicles and property took place. I should like to pass around to the Council some of the pictures of the mistake that Israel made in Hasbayya. It seems that Israel has a good record of making mistakes.

165. I think we all remember that during the 1967 war Israel made a terrible mistake: its forces hit a liberty ship of the United States, killing and injuring over 100 American navy men. That was a mistake, a terrible mistake. Mr. Allon did not say that the shelling of Deir el-Ashair was a mistake or that the killing of women and children there was a mistake. These photographs and those mistakes show the murderous and brutal way in which Israel is trying to

⁹ See *Congressional Record*, Proceedings and Debates of the 91st Congress, first session, vol. 115, part 29, (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 39096.

impose its law on the Middle East and on Lebanon. Israel wants not the rule of law but the rule of force; it wants to impose that on us. And its representatives come and speak to you here as Mr. Tekoah did just now when he branded the resolution that you have just adopted as an "affront", a "travesty of justice", saying that "it belongs to the morgue of history", that you are producing papers to be thrown into the "morgue of history".

166. That is the kind of philosophy that Israel is developing through its law which my friend and brother, Ambassador Tomeh, has very well described; that is the kind of law Israel is developing, the law of sheer and brutal force to be imposed upon us. And he repeats very clearly in front of this Council that what you do—which is an "affront", which is a "travesty of justice," which belongs to "the morgue of history"—has no value, and that what will have value against Lebanon is the force of Israel; he warns and threatens Lebanon right here in front of the Security Council.

167. What does Mr. Tekoah's Government want from Lebanon by continuing its threats, its attacks and its aggression? Does it want us, the Lebanese people, to transform our peaceful life and to become warriors? Does it really want Lebanon to change its philosophy and its way of life and to develop armies and spend all its resources on armaments as Israel is doing? Mr. Tekoah speaks about the flower shop of Lebanon as a hideout for gangsters and criminals, and he forgets that Israel, that big, beautiful flower shop of Lebanon as a hideout for gangsters and artillery which are every now and then launched against Lebanon and the neighbouring Arab States in naked aggression.

168. As I said, Mr. President, I do not wish to detain you unduly, even though I would have liked to expound on many other points which were raised by Mr. Tekoah the other day. However, I should like to come to the resolution that has been adopted today by the Security Council.

169. In our view, as in the view of many delegations around this table that have expressed themselves, this resolution does not fully satisfy us. It fails to satisfy us not because the Council has failed to render justice—we are very grateful to the Council for having gone a long way to meet our requirements—but because the Council on previous occasions had warned Israel against repetition of its aggressions and attacks against Lebanon. The Council had warned Israel that in case of repetition of its attacks against Lebanon the Council would consider steps or measures to give effect to its decisions.

170. It was with a certain sense of *Realpolitik* that we did not press for real steps and measures during this debate, because we knew that the Council would not go that far because of positions which may be very well understood when we read the draft resolution submitted by the United States of America, which is contained in document S/10723. However, I should like to remind the Council that in the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution adopted tonight the Council has recalled the resolutions it adopted following five attacks by Israel against Lebanon. It refers also to resolutions 285 (1970) and 313 (1972), in

which the Council asked Israel to withdraw immediately all its military forces from Lebanese territory.

171. The Council should be interested to know that Israel for some time has not complied fully with those two resolutions, and we should like to call the attention of the Council and of the Secretary-General and UNTSO to the fact that Israel maintains two observation posts on Lebanese territory in the vicinity of Habbariya and Chaaba. They are manned by Israeli forces approximately 90 per cent of the time.

172. We request, through the Council, an immediate and complete withdrawal of the Israeli forces remaining on Lebanese territory. As I mentioned the other day, we showed our faith in the Council when we came and asked that it strengthen the machinery of the United Nations observers on the Lebanese border.

173. The Council reacted by adopting the consensus of April 1972 [S/10611], which is mentioned in the preambular part of the resolution. The resolution mentions, among other things, the various reports coming from the observers which have in part substantiated our charges against Israel. This is the kind of co-operation we would like to have with the Council, with the United Nations, with the representative of the Secretary-General, in creating conditions for peace and tranquillity in the Middle East. This is the kind of good faith we like to show you, Mr. President. It is not the kind of contempt Mr. Tekoah launches in the face of the Council every now and then.

174. We have heard explanations of vote here regarding some parts of the resolution, especially concerning paragraph 3. We do not at all subscribe to the views tending to connect the case of the abduction of the Lebanese officers and security personnel with other matters. The case must be dealt with independent of any other case. The abduction was committed in flagrant violation of international law and morality and of the Lebanese-Israeli Armistice Agreement and in violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter. The Syrian officers who were on our territory were visiting Lebanon. They were travelling, as we have established, in civilian cars on an open road in an unfortified area and not engaging themselves in any form or shape in any act of hostility against anyone. Israel cannot claim that either the Syrian officers or the Lebanese officers and personnel were prisoners of war.

175. I mentioned to the Council that it had been said by an Israeli military spokesman that they were surprised to find Syrian officers among those who were abducted. Therefore, we have established the fact that there was premeditated intent to capture Lebanese personnel and Lebanese officers, to attack our people on our territory.

176. Mr. Tekoah claims that they opened fire on the Israeli force there, which was composed of tanks and half-tracks, and those officers and military policemen travelling in civilian cars decided to open fire on an armoured force, an armoured unit of the Israeli army inside Israel. What an absurdity. Does he want the Council to believe this big lie?

177. Israel has been levelling all sorts of charges against Lebanon because we have 300,000 Palestinians on our territory—300,000 who have been living in misery for twenty-five years. Well, if Mr. Tekoah has any complaints against the behaviour of the Palestinians, about the freedom fighters of the Palestinians who are operating from within that occupied territory, I can offer him a solution, the solution to which I alluded in the beginning. All he has to do is to allow those Palestinians to return home, and he would have no reason to complain about them.

178. In conclusion, Mr. President—and I promise you I shall not speak again, even if other charges are made, charges as false as those that have been made against my country, my Government and my people—I should like to express thanks to those members of the Council who have seen fit to render us justice by passing the resolution adopted today. We particularly wish to express our gratitude to the representative of France, who has deployed his efforts during the last four days to find a solution to this problem and to the sponsors of the resolution and to the entire European group—although Italy's name does not appear among the sponsors, for reasons we all know by now. We also wish to thank those delegations which have strongly supported us, which would have gone much further than this resolution in the support of justice, of pure justice, against naked aggression launched by Israel against Lebanon.

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

180. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): The hour being late, I do hope I shall be able to make only a few observations, and brief ones, regarding the statements we have just heard from the representatives of Lebanon and Syria.

181. The representative of Lebanon alluded to the statement I made immediately after the vote on the resolution adopted today. I shall not comment on what he had to say about my statement. I am sure that his Government will wish to study it very carefully and to consider it most profoundly. He referred to the question of refugees, again trying to allege that there was a link between the presence of refugees in Lebanon and terror warfare which has been carried out from Lebanese territory. I pointed out in my opening statement in this debate, and in a number of letters submitted by me to the President of the Security Council, that there is no correlation whatever between the presence and absence of refugees in any particular country and the question whether or not terror warfare is carried on from that particular country at any particular time against Israel. That has been true especially of Lebanon itself, because for more than two decades the Lebanese-Israeli frontier has been an example of tranquillity despite the fact that there are Palestinian refugees who have lived in Lebanon since 1948. Terror warfare started from Lebanon, as I explained, when the Arab Governments and the terror organizations decided that Lebanon would be the most appropriate country to serve as a base for aggression, for acts of violence and terror and murder against the civilian population of Israel. I can understand the predicament—all of us do—of the Government of Lebanon in the light of such a development, in view of such a decision by other Arab

Governments, in view of such a policy of the Arab terror organizations. This, however, cannot diminish in any way the obligation incumbent upon the Government of Lebanon to prevent these types of attacks against a neighbouring State.

182. As for the allegation—which is repeated not only by the representative of Lebanon and some other Arab representatives but from time to time also by certain members of the Security Council—that terror warfare is the outcome, the result of resistance, all I would like to do at this late hour is to reiterate my invitation to Ambassador Ghorra and to all representatives around the Security Council table to come and see for themselves what the situation is in those parts of Palestine where the Arab inhabitants of Palestine are free to express their view on the central issue which has troubled the Middle East for so long and which has been before the United Nations for so many years—the question of coexistence, of living side by side, of working side by side, of Jew and Arab.

183. Let them come and see for themselves what is going on and whether the fanatical, ferocious, savage terror agents who are being sent out to massacre, to murder, to blow up houses and to shoot indiscriminately at school buses, represent the real interests, the real aspirations of the Arab inhabitants of Palestine. They, like us, the people of Israel, want peace. However, the present Arab Governments which mask themselves by slogans of progress but are in fact historically feudal, totalitarian and reminiscent of the worst type of régimes that have existed in modern history; it is because of their attitude that there has been till now no peace between the people of Israel, the Arab inhabitants of Palestine and the peoples of all neighbouring Arab States.

184. I would only add one comment on the question of refugees. This is one of the difficulties we face again and again in these debates: Why cannot we try and remain faithful to facts and to truth? Is it necessary really to have behind every representative an entire research department to try and point out how history and facts are being falsified? The representative of Lebanon referred today to 300,000 refugees in Lebanon. But on 18 August 1969, less than three years ago in this very Security Council, he spoke of 200,000 Palestinian refugees [*1502nd meeting, para. 67*]. Now if even this simple number cannot be given truthfully, cannot be presented correctly and creditably to the Council, how can we weigh, how can we consider comments made here? Can one suggest that since 1969, 100,000 new Palestinian refugees have come to Lebanon? From where? Turkey?

185. The Government of Lebanon is responsible for having in the last few years turned its frontier with Israel into a zone of hostilities, into a war zone. If that is so, if those are the conditions prevailing along Lebanon's southern border, the representative of Lebanon and his Government have no right whatsoever to preach to us about how prisoners of war are taken in clashes between regular units of the armed forces.

186. I am surprised that the representative of Lebanon found it advisable to try and strengthen the case presented by him to the Security Council by referring to a statement

allegedly made by one of the Ministers of the Israeli Government, Mr. Yigal Allon. I have not seen that statement, I am in no position to comment on it. I say again that I am surprised that he found it advisable to bring it before the Council. For even if the citation from the statement is not another misquotation, misrepresentation, falsification—and we have been treated to so many of them in this debate as in similar debates in the past—even if it is a correct text, what does it prove? It proves simply that when an Israeli makes a mistake he concedes the fact that he has made a mistake.

187. For years now not only the representatives of Israel but the world at large have been drawing the attention of the Lebanese Government to the presence on Lebanese soil of Arab terror organizations, of operational bases used by them for aggression against Israel, to the Lebanese Government's responsibility to put an end to those acts of violence, to those criminal activities, and to its responsibility to suppress those organizations. No one has any doubt that those are the facts. And yet the representative of Lebanon has come here year after year and said, "No, there is no such thing."

188. I quoted only the other day a statement from the President of Lebanon, Mr. Hélou, saying openly why this is the method, why this is the manner of the submission of the Lebanese case before the Security Council. It was convenient for the Lebanese Government in 1969 to deny the presence of Arab commandos, as he calls them, on Lebanese soil, in the hope that this would bring about a condemnation of Israel.

189. I still wait—I think the world at large and enlightened public opinion still wait—for the Government of Lebanon to recognize facts, to concede, as we sometimes do, that it makes mistakes and to say that it will mend its ways and that it will take the kind of measures that it is duty bound under international law and the United Nations Charter to take. As I said earlier, nothing will release the Government of Lebanon from this fundamental obligation.

190. The representative of Lebanon asked what Israel wants of his Government, of his country. I think this is clear to all those present. It wants one thing, it expects one thing, it will insist on one thing, and that is that the Government of Lebanon, in accordance with its international obligations, in accordance with international law, in conformity with the Charter, its principles and provisions, put an end to the use of Lebanese territory as a base of aggression against Israel, especially when that aggression is being directed against innocent, defenceless civilians. If I were an Arab—and I say this with the most profound respect for the Arab peoples, for Arab civilization, for Arab contributions to mankind—I would be ashamed today to have to face a situation in which the massacre of innocent men, women and children is being considered in the world at large as synonymous with Arab warfare.

191. The representative of Syria, as always, has reminded me of an old Arabic saying. It applies to the representative of Syria, his statements before the Security Council, the policies pursued by his Government. That saying is: "He struck me and complained. He preceded me and wept."

192. It is Syria, not Israel, which started the war in 1948. It is Syria, not Israel, which has refused to make peace throughout these years. It is Syria, not Israel, which today, again and again, says: our objective is war and the destruction of a Member State of the United Nations. The representative of Syria, in an attempt to justify murderous attacks which are now being carried out against Israel, has drawn on the past, especially on what we Jews, the Jewish people, did in certain Arab States in the Second World War. He has the audacity to come before the Security Council in 1972, the Security Council of an Organization established after a struggle against nazism, and complain that the Jews of Palestine fought Nazis and the German armies and pro-Nazis, and Nazi régimes, not only in Palestine but also in Iraq and in Syria. Yes, we are proud of the fact that at a time when Iraq was pro-Nazi, at a time when Syria was under a pro-Nazi régime, we Jews of Palestine established undergrounds in those countries, as the representative of Syria pointed out, to fight the Nazis. At a time when the Jewish people of Israel fought from the beginning till the end and paid a heavy price for its struggle against this monstrous enemy of humanity, Nazi Hitlerism, the Arab States were either pro-Nazi or somewhere on the fence, waiting for a week or 10 days before the end of the war in Europe, after the Allies had declared that only those who were in a state of war with Nazi Germany would be able to benefit from the future, to declare war on the part of their Governments against Nazi Germany. I would still like to hear in this Security Council chamber of the United Nations, an Organization born out of the resistance and struggle against the Nazi danger, one word of reservation, one word of criticism, one word of condemnation of the leader of the Arab anti-Jewish, anti-Israeli terror warfare, before the Second World War and during the Second World War, the symbol of continued Arab terror warfare today: Haj Amin El Husseini, a Mufti, who spent his war years by the side of Hitler and Eichmann—I am ready to distribute photographs taken of these monsters together—in Berlin advising Hitler and Eichmann on the liquidation of the Jewish people. He was declared a Nazi criminal by the Allied Powers and is today continuing to live and act in the Arab States, with full freedom of movement, to move from one place to another, from one Arab capital to another.

193. This is something that the representative of Syria holds against us, the fact that we did struggle, that we did suffer, that we did lose millions of our brothers in the fight against the common enemy of mankind: Nazi Germany.

194. Now, the representative of Syria seems, at his convenience, to be rather sensitive about personal insults. I listened to him with great interest. He who in his recent letters to the President of the Security Council, addressing himself to Israeli Ministers, to members of the Cabinet by name, calls them neurotics, calls them barbarians; he who has already thrown at me the epithet of assassin and little Fuehrer, he is sensitive of personal insult and abuse. I am not of the same habit to make personal remarks about representatives of States Members of the United Nations. But he leaves me no choice today but to make an observation about the absurdities, the misquotations, the misrepresentations and the outright falsehoods with which he floods United Nations organs continuously, constantly, apparently in the hope that other representatives have

either no time or no desire to examine carefully his statements, his charges, his allegations.

195. I shall confine myself to only one example. Several years ago, when the attention of the Syrian Government was drawn, through Ambassador Tomeh, to the plight of Jews residing in his country, and especially to the killing of 75 Jews by an Arab mob in Syria, in the town of Qamishli, the representative of Syria declared in the General Assembly, on 27 June 1967:

“... I would not be doing my duty. . . if I did not state that what the preceding speaker said about 75 Jews being killed in El Qamishliye in northern Syria is a complete lie because there are no Jews in that region, no Jews whatsoever.”¹⁰

196. In the letter which the representative of Syria sent to the President of the Security Council only a few days ago, dated 13 June 1972, out of which he quoted so profusely entire pages, it is said:

“The Jews of Damascus make up the major part of the Jewish community of Syria. There are 2,700 of them in the capital as against 1,300 in Aleppo, and 450 in El Qamishliye in the north-east of the country.” [see S/10698, annex]

This is the same Qamishli about which he said only a few years ago, at the United Nations, that there were no Jews there at all.

197. After this, he expects us, he expects representatives at the Security Council table, he expects international opinion, to give credit to, to consider as veritable, as valid, the allegations, the charges, which he brings to us, although he is not able even to stick to the simple truth about simple facts. He can make whatever charges he desires against my Government and against me personally, and he can call me by whatever names he finds advisable to use in this organ, but he has still not found a single instance in which we have submitted facts, distorted and falsified, figures completely perverted, denials of realities.

198. This is mentioned by me simply as another example of the difficulties that we of Israel find in seeking some basis for understanding, for some self-confidence. I have made some comments about the fact that the United Nations unfortunately does not serve as a forum in which we and our neighbours can speak to each other instead of shouting at each other—discuss and reason with them and find solutions instead of raising hands in mechanical voting. If day after day we confront a situation in which even here, even in the United Nations, even in its highest organ, we are flooded with lies and distortions, where is the slightest basis for some self-confidence, for the beginnings of understanding between our peoples? Is that not what we shall eventually have to arrive at?

199. I referred to the letter from which the representative of Syria quoted, his letter to the President of the Security

Council dated 13 June 1972. The representative of Syria submitted with that letter, attached to it, a number of reports on interviews held by three or four foreign correspondents with a few individual Jews of Damascus. I should like to register deep sorrow, deep concern and deep fear—a protest—at the fact that the Syrian authorities and their representative here are not satisfied with oppressing and persecuting the Jews of Syria but force those helpless, defenceless people to bear witness against themselves. Only in the darkest of ages, only in the days of Hitler, only under the most extreme totalitarian régimes, have Jews had to bear this kind of treatment. Is it not enough to deprive the Jews of Syria of their human rights? Must they be forced under the gun of an officer from the Syrian Army Intelligence Branch, present at all or most of those interviews, to tell foreign correspondents that the Jewish tears are really Jewish smiles, that the Jewish ghetto is a paradise, that violence against Jews is an embrace of the Jewish inhabitants, that the rape of Jewish girls is simply fun?

200. There is an ancient Arabic saying attributed to Kaab El-Akhbar, who lived in the early ages of Islam, and it goes as follows:

“When God created all things, he gave to each a companion. Poverty said, ‘I am going to the desert.’ ‘I’ll come along with you’, said Health. Abundance said, ‘I’m going to Egypt.’ ‘And I’ll accompany you’, said Resignation. ‘I’ll go to Syria’, said Reason. ‘And I’ll go with you’, said Lawlessness.”

So it is until this very day.

201. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I shall be very brief. After listening carefully to the statement of the Israeli representative, his quotations, his dramatization, his habitual dose of anti-Soviet outbursts, I have come to the conclusion that, although the resolution which we have adopted is a weak one, it has hit the mark. It is just, it reveals who is the aggressor and condemns him; no outpouring of words and no quotations can delete this from the history of the Security Council and a specific Council resolution.

202. In this connexion, I should like to congratulate the representative of France, our new colleague, who worked most actively on the preparation of this resolution on his successful début. At the same time, I must express regret at the fact that, throughout the discussion of the Middle East problem in the Security Council, the Israeli representative forgot nothing of his anti-Sovietism and learnt nothing from the decisions of the Council. So much the worse for him. His speeches are the speeches of a condemned and unmasked aggressor, condemned repeatedly by the Security Council, condemned by the General Assembly, condemned recently by an assembly of heads of State and Government of the whole of Africa. This is impotent rage. And in his impotent rage the condemned aggressor in his last word insults those who voted for this resolution. This is nothing new. This cynicism, this disregard for the Security Council and its decisions by the Israeli representative is familiar to us. By adopting this attitude towards the decisions of this international body he does not enhance the prestige of his

¹⁰ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1538th meeting, para. 138.

country. On the contrary. It is—I repeat—an indication of the international isolation of Israel, when an overwhelming majority of the members of the Security Council have condemned Israel's aggression, despite the eloquence of its representative, dramatization and quotations from the time of the Roman Empire and from old Arabic proverbs. I reject his protest about my remark that the Government of Israel and the head of that Government bear responsibility for the new acts of aggression against Lebanon. Who, in his opinion, is responsible? Sholem Aleichem? I once again emphasize that the Government of Israel and the head of that Government bear full and complete responsibility for the new acts of aggression against Lebanon before the United Nations and before international public opinion.

203. In conclusion, it would be better for the representative of Israel not to indulge in lengthy speeches and quotations which prove nothing and in no way justify Israel's new acts of aggression against Lebanon, as has been confirmed by today's vote on the Council resolution—13 members of the Council voted to condemn Israel and the two which abstained did not in their statements express delight at the additional acts of aggression against Lebanon. It would be better for him to tell the Council when Israel will withdraw its troops from Arab territory and when it will return to the rightful owners—the Arab peoples and States—the land stolen from them.

204. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

205. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): In every problem there are derivative problems or derivative aspects of the problem and there is the essence or the substance of the problem. The question that I pose to the Council in all objectivity and sobriety is: why is it that the League of Nations dealt throughout the span of its life and the United Nations has been dealing from 1947 up till now with the Palestine problem and its derivatives? What is involved here is no less than 50 years in which generation after generation has dealt with this problem and surely we have to give an answer. The answer is a right and correct one but a simple one: you cannot condemn a whole people, the Arab people of Palestine, to collective suicide. That is the crux of the matter. Other aspects are derivatives of this problem.

206. What Zionism and Israel have done from their birth till now is to commit an act of geopolitical murder against the Arab people of Palestine. Mr. Tekoah spoke about the number of refugees. Here is the report of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East from 1 July 1970 to 30 June 1971.¹¹ Annex I, Table 1 gives the number of refugees. In 1966 the number of registered refugees was 1,317,749. In June 1971, the figure was 1,468,161. But I remind you that these are the registered refugees. The same report states for instance that there are 120,000, all the population of the Golan Heights, who do not receive any rations. And then there are political refugees all over the Arab world which make a total of 3 million. Therefore when the representative of Lebanon said that we have 300,000 refugees actually in Kuwait, in

Lebanon, in the Syrian Arab Republic, in Saudi Arabia and in all the other Arab countries, we have absorbed more than 1.5 million refugees from Palestine. These are political refugees. These figures do not appear on this table and this is borne out by the fact that in June 1950 the number of refugees was 960,000 and in June 1971 the number was 1.5 million. The same proportion has accrued or increased in other parts of Arab countries.

207. Mr. Tekoah spoke about lots of things but I will not go into them in detail nor into the personal attack he made against me. All I say is that in order to have a true picture of the situation of the Jews in Syria one just has to read the four articles. We cannot say that *The New York Times* is pro-Syrian, that the Belgian newspaper *La Libre Belgique* is pro-Syrian, and so on. In referring to these writers he was quite careful to say "three or four" of them, because some of them do say that they have been to the Jewish quarter and to the Jewish community alone and by themselves. Witness the following:

"I was invited to a circumcision and to a wedding. I attended Sabbath services in various synagogues, without advance notice, I paid a call on the Grand Rabbi Nassim Andbo, who has the beard of a prophet and is said to be 100 years old." [See S/10698, annex]

So as regards these articles, I say that you do nothing more than go back and read them.

208. He went back to what he thinks is one of his strong themes and that is the co-operation with the Nazis. I have dealt with that at great length in the General Assembly and in various committees and I refer him to nothing more than *Perfidy*¹² which was written by a well-known American Zionist, Ben Hecht, to the trial of Eichmann which proved that Eichmann in his own confession in the tribunal in Jerusalem had co-operated with the leaders of the Jewish community in Hungary in order to save the aristocracy among them in order to be able to get trucks for the Nazi army. Is it a mere coincidence that all those who were involved in this affair—Bernadotte, Lord Moyne, who was the contact—were all assassinated? And then there was the great scandal that these revelations created in Israel itself. But I shall go into that. He said I have yet to recognize facts. Well here again is an article by an Israeli intellectual, Uri Davis, who refused to serve in the Israeli army. This is what he said was written about him:

"Uri Davis declared draft resistance in an oppressive yet somewhat liberal state of Israel. Reuben Lassman, together with three others, declared draft resistance in a state of Israel that is, I believe, in the accelerated process of consolidating along highly chauvinistic, and in the final analysis probably along ultimately fascist lines."

209. As to the freedom which he says the Arabs enjoy, I shall leave this article for anybody who wants to read it. It was published in the *Village Voice* of 3 February 1972. It says:

"There are no Israeli-Arab radicals, poets, writers, students, intellectuals . . . members, people who were ap-

¹¹ *Ibid.*, Twenty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 13.

¹² New York, Messner, 1961.

proached by the Israeli security service and refused co-operation, etc., who were and are not subject to one kind of military restriction or another: administrative detention in jail, home confinement, regional confinement, renewal of traveling permit every two weeks, month, six months. . . . While in Israel proper, civil and military law simultaneously govern the life of its Arab inhabitants, in the occupied territories military law is the only law of the land."

210. Ultimately, no matter what Mr. Tekoah tries cleverly to formulate, he stands not only as one accused, but also as one condemned who has no right to invoke history, and to the condemned Tekoah I say, "Do not invoke history; history will record itself what is right and what is just."

211. The PRESIDENT: The next name on my list is that of the representative of Lebanon, on whom I now call.

212. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): Mr. President, I made a promise to you and to the members of the Security Council that I would not speak again. So therefore I should only like to tell Mr. Tekoah that the dispatch from which I quoted regarding Mr. Allon's statement is by the Associated Press writer Hal McClure, and that it just came on the ticker this afternoon.

213. He would be very well advised to read this statement before he accuses me of falsification. This comes from Tel-Aviv, and nowhere else. As a matter of fact, if it were not true, it would not have come from Tel-Aviv, because, to quote again from a letter by Mr. Norman Dacey from which I quoted the other day, published in *The New York Times* on 6 June 1972:

"I have talked with the foreign press corps in Israel, who complain that they haven't been allowed inside an Israeli prison for more than two years, that every word they write is subject to the strictest censorship and nothing critical is allowed to be sent out."

Well, if that is so, all I can say is that if Mr. Allon did not make such a statement the Israeli censors would not have allowed it to get out of Israel.

214. Mr. Tekoah found it very convenient, in his usual way of misquoting or making selections or fabricating statements, to refer once again to an alleged statement by former President Hélou of Lebanon. I have refuted that in previous letters to the Security Council. He claims that the newspaper *Al Hayat* on 1 July 1969 in fact printed that particular statement. I challenge Mr. Tekoah to produce copies now or at any time for the members of the Security Council to prove his allegation. I can prove to the Council, by copies of *Al Hayat* of 1 July 1969, that President Hélou never uttered such words. Former President Hélou is an honourable and courageous man; he stands by his word. And he would have stood by his word had he made that statement. He presided over the Lebanese delegation to the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly; he made a speech, which is in the records of the United Nations and to which I would direct the attention of the representative of Israel. President Hélou spoke many a truth in it, but I

should like to quote only a few of the things he said at that time:

"More than 1 million Arab refugees have been suffering a thousand deaths for years, because of the pretext that it was necessary to find a home for other refugees, and the pretext of a home thus became a metropolis for an empire."¹³

Did former President Hélou say that? Yes, he said that; and in saying that, he spoke the truth. President Hélou also said:

"We certainly respect the Jews as members of the great human family because we are in favour of freedom of religion and respect for the human person. Those among our citizens who are of the Jewish religion are considered by us to be one of the Lebanese communities. But we refuse to accept an incarnation of Zionism in a State which is oppressive and expansionist. We denounce this as an enterprise of spoliation and domination, the spoliation of the most accessible neighbouring lands and the domination of the minds of persons in the most distant places."¹⁴

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

216. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I do apologize to you, Mr. President, and members of the Security Council, for having to impose on your patience and your time. I shall be really very brief.

217. First of all, I should like to comment on what Ambassador Ghorra has just said. At the 1649th meeting I made a statement in which once again I drew attention to the fact that it is difficult to accept at face value the statements, claims and justifications for their policy put forward by Lebanese representatives in this chamber or in the General Assembly. I said that on 30 December 1968 in this Security Council the representative of Lebanon had stated: "Lebanon shelters no commando organizations" [see 1461st meeting, para. 161]. And then, as the representative of Lebanon indicated, I quoted from the Beirut daily, *Al Hayat*, of 1 July 1969.

218. The representative of Lebanon challenged me to produce the text. Well, I have the text, and I shall be only too happy to show it and even distribute it and with your permission, Sir, I should like to say that the newspaper which I quoted reports on a conversation at the meeting between President Hélou and members of the Lebanese Parliament in which questions and answers were exchanged. If I may, I should like to have read out in Arabic the precise words which appear in the daily *Al Hayat* of that date, and then I shall translate them.

[A passage was read out in Arabic.]

219. This is the statement by President Hélou, in reaction to or perhaps in explanation of the fact that the representa-

¹³ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Plenary Meetings, 1867th meeting, para. 15.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, para. 17.

tive of Lebanon on 30 December 1968 in a debate in the Security Council on the Middle East situation had stated that Lebanon sheltered no commando organization. The precise translation of the Arabic just read out is:

"On 3 November 1968 the number of saboteurs in Lebanon did not exceed a few hundred and we were then dealing with their problem. But suddenly they began issuing propaganda publications against us, and their numbers rose to over several thousand."

And then the President added:

"Lebanon had stressed in the Security Council that there were no saboteur bases on its territory in order to obtain a condemnation of Israel by the Council."

220. The representative of Lebanon claimed that Arab inhabitants of territories held by Israel since 1967 do not enjoy the freedoms of movement and expression that I stated the other day they do enjoy. I think that he is once again misrepresenting to the Security Council a situation of which he is undoubtedly aware, because there are literally thousands of visitors from his own country—not to speak of about 150,000 visitors from other Arab States—who are right now in those territories, visiting their families, speaking to them. I have no doubt at all that the representative of Lebanon knows what the situation is on the West Bank or in Gaza on these matters.

221. For instance, he alleged that people who wish to criticize the Government of Israel are placed in gaol, especially Arab inhabitants. Well, there is no censorship in Israel. It so happens there is no censorship in Israel, and it so happens also that the Arab inhabitants of these areas—not to speak of Israel proper—have been free to express their feelings and their thoughts. We are proud of the fact that not only in Israel proper but in these territories there are Arab poets who write poetry against the Government of Israel and its policy. We are proud of the fact that there are Arab newspapers which are published daily and which criticize the policies of the Government of Israel. It may be difficult for certain members around this Council table to understand that such a situation is possible, but it is possible in a democracy, in a free society of the kind we have in Israel.

222. And if that is true of the Arab inhabitants of Israel and territories held by Israel it is obviously true of every Jewish citizen of Israel, like the one cited here by the representative of Syria. If Mr. Davis knew how frequently the representative of Syria quotes him—at almost every meeting—he would really feel he had reached some of his greatest ambitions probably unattainable in life, because apparently there is no one else, or very few others, in Israel the representative of Syria can quote.

223. Mr. Davis, like anyone else, is free to feel, to do, to say whatever he likes. And as you, Ambassador Tomeh, yourself pointed out, he even refused to enter military service in the Israeli army. I would like to make a very simple suggestion to you. If you do feel such high regard for Mr. Davis, you are quite free to make a little exchange. He is free to leave any time to go to Syria or to any other

part of the world to speak as he has been speaking in Israel, to be quoted by you even more frequently, to pronounce even statements written and prepared by you, in exchange for one simple agreement on the part of the Government of Syria—that the same fundamental right of a human being to move freely wherever he wants would be granted also to the suffering, helpless Jews of Syria.

224. To the representative of the Soviet Union, my old verbal ping-pong partner who is so very much concerned about how we Israelis and the Government of Israel feel about our international situation—again and again he seems to harp on the difficulties we face, on the condemnations which have been adopted by mechanical votes in this or that organ, and he draws his own conclusions—I would simply say that if Israel had the veto power, as the USSR has, we would also come out as pure and blameless as the USSR is coming out even if we behaved as the Soviet Union has behaved and is behaving.

225. Mr. NUR ELMI (Somalia): Unless I misunderstood him, the representative of Israel has tonight extended to members of the Security Council an invitation to go and visit occupied Palestine and see for themselves the conditions under which the Arabs of Palestine live under Israeli rule.

226. Well, it so happens that two States members of the Security Council are also members of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of Occupied Territories. But the Government of Israel has in the past, as we all know, refused to admit the members of that Special Committee to these regions. Now, I should like the members of the Security Council and the Secretary-General to take special note of this invitation, if my understanding of the statement of the representative of Israel is correct.

227. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call upon the last speakers. I consider there has been enough time for rights of reply. Statements have been made in right of reply repeatedly. Therefore, the last speakers inscribed on the list are the representatives of Israel and Lebanon.

228. I call upon the representative of Israel.

229. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): In response to the observation made by the representative of Somalia, I would suggest that representatives around this table are sufficiently aware of the facts and developments not to be played upon on the assumption that they are ignorant and gullible.

230. Israel accepted a United Nations mission in 1967. It came to examine the situation of the civilian population in territories affected by the 1967 hostilities. That mission visited Israel, Israeli-controlled areas and the Arab States. In the Arab States the representative of the Secretary-General who carried out this mission investigated and concerned himself with the very question that has been brought up in the course of this meeting: the plight of Jews in Arab States. When, two years later, the Arab delegations pushed through the General Assembly a resolution by a minority vote—a minority of the Member States supported it—and refused to allow the Committee established on the basis of

that resolution to concern itself also with the human rights of Jews in Arab States, Israel informed that Committee it was not ready to receive a body based *a priori* on discrimination against Jews. That is the situation.

231. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of Lebanon.

232. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): A very brief remark regarding the alleged statement Mr. Tekoah read from *Al Hayat* of 1 July 1969. In his statement the other day, he said:

"It was only a few months later that the President of Lebanon at the time, Mr. Hérou, stated, as quoted in the Beirut daily *Al Hayat* on 1 July 1969:"

and he quoted Mr. Hérou as saying:

"President Hérou said, *inter alia*, on 3 November 1968 that the number of saboteurs in Lebanon did not exceed a few hundred and we were then dealing with their problem."

and so on, and so on. And then he claimed that President Hérou had added:

"Lebanon had stressed in the Security Council that there were no saboteur bases on its territory in order to obtain a condemnation of Israel by the Council." [*see 1649th meeting, para. 250*]

What he has now had read out to the Council in Arabic to make it believe he told the truth is refuted by my letter of 8 June 1972 [*S/10689*], in which I said the following:

"On 1 July 1969 the newspaper *Al Hayat* referred to questions"—and what he read were questions—"which had allegedly been asked of the parliamentary groups during the consultations which had been held the previous day in order to form a new cabinet. Some of them did in fact relate to the Palestinian organizations,

but none, however, corresponded, even in an interrogative form, to the supposed statements cited by the Permanent Representative of Israel. Mr. Tekoah has obviously read the texts far too selectively and has twisted them"—as is his usual habit—"so much that he has completely distorted their meaning. Taking out parts of sentences here and there, he has regrouped them and reproduced them in an affirmative form, attributing them to the former Head of State [*of Lebanon*]".

233. That is my final word, Mr. President, and I thank you. I also thank the members of the Council for their patience, and for their patience in having listened to so many distortions and allegations by the representative of Israel.

234. The PRESIDENT: I had closed the list of speakers. Nevertheless, having in mind the co-operation of all the members of the Council in this debate, I call again on the representative of Israel.

235. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): The representative of Lebanon based his reaction on his letter. I based my comments on a direct quotation in Arabic and in English from the Beirut paper. I leave it to the tape recordings of the present deliberations to establish who is right and who is misinterpreting.

236. The PRESIDENT: There are no more speakers for this evening. The debate is therefore concluded.

237. It remains for me to express my thanks to the members of the Security Council for their co-operation and efforts in the consideration of the item on our agenda.

238. In concluding the meeting I wish to mention the possibility of further action by the Council on the basis of the last paragraph of the resolution which was adopted this evening.

The meeting rose on Tuesday, 27 June, at 12.15 a.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب الى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

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 libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишете 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.
