

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

UN LIBRARY

1711th

MEETING: 21 APRIL 1973

SEP 26 1980

UN/SA COLLECT.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1711)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 12 April 1973 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10913)	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.

SEVENTEEN HUNDRED AND ELEVENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Saturday, 21 April 1973, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Javier PEREZ DE CUELLAR (Peru).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Austria, China, France, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1711)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 12 April 1973 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10913)

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 12 April 1973 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10913)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with the decision taken by the Council [1705th meeting], and with its consent, I shall invite the representatives of Lebanon, Israel and Egypt to take places at the Council table.

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

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Again in accordance with previous decisions of the Council [1705th, 1706th, 1708th and 1710th meetings], I shall invite the representatives of Saudi Arabia, Algeria, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia and Jordan to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that they will be invited to be seated at the Council table when they wish to address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. J. Baroodi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. A. Rahal (Algeria), Mr. H. Kelani (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. R. Driss (Tunisia) and Mr. A. Sharaf (Jor-

dan) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before we continue our work, I should like to draw the Council's attention to the text of the revised draft resolution in document S/10916/Rev.1, submitted at the 1710th meeting by the representative of France.

4. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

5. Mr. SEN (India): Without touching on the innumerable instances of rumour, speculation, gossip and kite-flying, and also several diplomatic moves of the last 36 hours or so—all of which represent different lessons to different delegations—I should like briefly to indicate how India will vote on the present joint Franco-British draft before us.

6. We find that the changes the French and British delegations have made in their original draft have significantly modified the great principles we and other members of the Council have repeatedly stated and emphasized, such as the principle that there can be no equation or balance between violence, however politically motivated and encouraged, and State-controlled marauding and punitive raids into other States, or the principle that this Council has to draw a sharp distinction between those who take the law into their own hands and those who come to the Council for redress whenever possible and feasible. There are many other principles involved. The present draft also blurs, to some extent at least, the perspective of the total picture of the situation in the Middle East. However, we acknowledge that the two delegations that have worked so strenuously and seriously towards bringing about a useful conclusion to our present debate must have had weighty reasons for the changes they have introduced in their original draft.

7. We ourselves would have much preferred the first text [S/10916] together with the amendment moved by Guinea, India, Indonesia and Yugoslavia [S/10917]. Such a formulation would have reflected more fully and less faultily the principles which we have accepted. It would also have prescribed more correctly and with greater urgency what, in our opinion, was required of the Council to meet the present Lebanese complaint. We were therefore encouraged when we heard that both the United Kingdom and France would accept our amendment. We thank the representative of France for his acceptance of the proposed amendment, even to the revised Franco-British draft. Presumably, similar understanding would also have been forthcoming from the British delegation if the represen-

tative of Guinea had not withdrawn, with our full support and concurrence of course, the proposed amendment which, in our view, had lost its linkage with the disappearance of the last paragraph of the original text. The womb having been destroyed, the foetus could not stay.

8. In these circumstances, the logical attitude of the Indian delegation would have been to abstain from voting on the present draft, but we cannot ignore the fact that Lebanon is the complainant and if, for whatever reasons and however reluctantly, it finds the present text in document S/10916/Rev.1 something it can accept—or more correctly, but colloquially, can live with—it would not be right, in our view, to fail to support the draft and so bring whatever little comfort we can to Lebanon in its hour of trial and distress.

9. We shall therefore vote for the draft resolution submitted by France and the United Kingdom and moved by Mr. de Guiringaud yesterday in so businesslike a fashion.

10. Mrs. Jeanne Martin CISSE (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation would like very briefly to explain its vote before the vote.

11. Throughout the debate, as we explained in our statement in the general debate [*1708th meeting*], the Republic of Guinea has always supported the cause of Lebanon and the cause of all the Arab States, and indeed the cause of those who are struggling for their integrity and their national independence. In our statement, in reaffirming the integrity of Lebanese territory and the right of Lebanon to fight against attacks from a militarily strong State, from a State which enjoys the support of great Powers, a State which is confident of its impunity, we have always, for our part, affirmed the right of the peoples of Palestine to fight for the reconquest of their national territory. What we have already reaffirmed also is that we cannot deny the Palestinian people that right, nor do we want to separate the general problem of the Middle East from the specific case of Lebanon.

12. In the draft presented by the representative of France [*S/10916/Rev.1*], we have seen that the liberation movements and Israel, which defies the international community, are condemned on an equal footing.

13. I am sure that the members of the Council will not misunderstand the sense of our vote, but we think that we should be consistent. Hence my delegation will abstain from voting on the draft resolution submitted by France and the United Kingdom.

14. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has studied the draft resolution [*S/10916/Rev.1*] tabled by France and the United Kingdom. We find much of the contents of the draft resolution acceptable to us. For instance, operative paragraph 2, which condemns the repeated military attacks conducted by Israel against Lebanon and Israel's violation of Lebanon's territorial integrity and sovereignty in contravention of the Charter; paragraph 3, which calls upon Israel to desist forthwith from all military attacks on Lebanon, and so on. All this is correct. However, it must be pointed out that the

expression "deploring all . . . acts of violence" has been included in the sixth preambular paragraph, and particularly the wording "condemns all acts of violence" in operative paragraph 1. These expressions are very ambiguous. They have failed to draw a distinction between the right and the wrong and between the aggressor and the victim of aggression and, therefore, might be used by the Zionists and imperialists to oppose the Palestinian people who have been subject to aggression and victimized or to oppose the other Arab peoples in their just struggle to resist aggression and recover their lost territories and national rights. We are firmly opposed to it. The Chinese delegation has made active efforts to rectify these above two erroneous expressions, but unfortunately our efforts have not achieved the expected results. In these circumstances, the Chinese delegation cannot but decide to abstain in the voting on the said draft resolution.

15. Finally, the Chinese delegation reaffirms that the Chinese Government and people strongly condemn the Israeli Zionists for their aggressive acts against Lebanon and other Arab countries. We will, as always, firmly support the Palestinian, Lebanese and other Arab peoples in their struggle to resist aggression and to recover their lost territories and national rights. We are deeply convinced that their struggle is just, that a just cause will triumph in the end and that no force on earth can obstruct it.

16. Mr. ANWAR SANI (Indonesia): My delegation has decided, after long hesitation, to vote for draft resolution S/10916/Rev.1 submitted by France and the United Kingdom. We would have been happier if we could have voted for the draft resolution in its original form, before its revision, though even in that form my delegation thought it did not correctly reflect the serious situation in the Middle East which developed after the recent Israeli incursion into Lebanon in which three leaders of the Palestinian liberation movement were murdered and some other innocent civilians lost their lives.

17. As the Council is aware, my delegation had the intention of proposing, along with some other delegations, an amendment to the draft resolution in its original form. The representative of Guinea has already explained why the four nations withdrew their proposal. In particular, the deletion of operative paragraph 4 of the original draft, which is, in the opinion of my delegation, only a weaker version of paragraph 3 of resolution 280 (1970), was an element of great disappointment to us.

18. Though my delegation is not happy with the text and would prefer to abstain, which would be more in line with our view on the issue, we have, however—as I have said, after long hesitation—decided to vote for draft resolution S/10916/Rev.1 for two reasons. First, because Lebanon, as the party most directly interested and the one that brought the complaint before the Council, considers that in its revised form the text meets a large portion of its requirements and is prepared, in the words of my colleague and friend the representative of India, to live with it; and, secondly, because we consider the adoption of draft resolution S/10916/Rev.1 more as an interim measure since the Council has adopted resolution 331 (1973), proposed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, in paragraph 2

of which it was decided that the Council would examine the situation in the Middle East following the submission of the Secretary-General's report on the situation since 1967.

19. As I said in my statement before the Council on Tuesday last [*1708th meeting*], it is the considered view of my delegation that, as a result of the unresolved Middle East question of which the recent Israeli incursion into Lebanon was a manifestation, the problem of terrorism cannot be considered apart from its root causes. My delegation is happy that in adopting resolution 331 (1973), which had our strong support, the Council has agreed to examine the whole question of the Middle East. It is on that basis that my delegation, though most reluctantly, will vote in favour of draft resolution S/10916/Rev.1.

20. Mr. ABDULLA (Sudan): My delegation made it sufficiently clear in its statement in the Council on 13 April [*1706th meeting*] that the case referred to in the complaint by Lebanon regarding Israel's aggression of 10 April was a clear-cut case of aggression by one Member State against another Member State and that it should be treated as such, with all the appropriate decisions by the Council.

21. On that basis, my delegation would have welcomed without reservation a positive condemnation of the repeated aggressions by Israel against Lebanon, including that of 10 April, with a clear warning against repetition of such acts and with a request to all States to refrain from giving Israel any assistance that would encourage its perpetuation of its aggression, terrorism and occupation. Instead of such action commensurate with the Israeli crimes and befitting at least decisions on these lines by the Council, we regret to find that draft resolution S/10916 and its revised version contain forcefully injected reference to and condemnation of individual cases of violence which have taken place outside Lebanon and for which Lebanon is not responsible. We believe not only that that reference is irrelevant to the present case but that it is most probable that Israel will exploit such reference as a pretext for future aggression against Lebanon. In our view, the draft resolution should have contained a clear and exclusive reference to the acts of violence and terrorism that have been committed directly by Israel, which would be relevant to its aggression of 10 April, instead of forcefully referring to acts of violence for which Israel is ultimately responsible also on account of its policy of military aggression, occupation and terrorism.

22. Many statements have pointed to the official and actual threat by Israel of the use of military force without any pretext or justification, which made it necessary to warn Israel against the repetition of such acts in the draft resolution. At any rate, my delegation is opposed to any interpretation of paragraph 1 as applicable to the Palestinian national liberation movement, for all liberation movements have their inherent right to fight.

23. With reference to other components of the draft resolution, while my delegation fully associates itself with the condemnation of Israel, it is equally reassuring to my delegation that the Council clearly upholds the sanctity of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon. However, the draft does not reflect the overwhelming view of the Council that Israel should be warned categorically

against repetition of its military acts against Lebanon under penalty of consideration of more effective measures in case of repetition of such acts of aggression. It is most regrettable that this omission has led to the withdrawal of the four-Power amendment which is important to the consideration mentioned above. It was, however, made abundantly clear by the majority of the Council that military and financial assistance to Israel constituted an important factor in helping Israel to perpetuate its policy of aggression against Lebanon and of occupation, terror and intimidation against other Arab countries. It would, therefore, have been important that this be reflected in the draft resolution. Its absence, however, does not undermine the significance attached to it by the majority of the Council.

24. While on the question of evident trends in the Council which are not reflected in the draft resolution, my delegation observes with satisfaction that many delegations have expressed their conviction and support for the legitimate aspirations and inherent rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to their legitimate struggle to obtain their goal. Many delegations also share our conviction that no military action or terrorism by Israel can stop a liberation movement like the Palestinian movement from reaching its goal, let alone that any futile attempts to liquidate it might succeed. Indeed, it is a lesson for Israel to consider.

25. In concluding my statement in explanation of my vote, let me assure our brother and colleague, Ambassador Ghorra of Lebanon, following reassurances already presented by my President and Foreign Minister to the President and Foreign Minister of Lebanon on 11 April, that we treasure the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon as being as valuable and dear to us as it is to our brother people of Lebanon.

26. For these reasons, and in compliance with the wishes of Lebanon, the vote of the Sudan delegation will be in favour of the draft resolution, despite the very sad fact that we consider the draft resolution regrettably below the expectation of the delegation of the Sudan.

27. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya): In the statement I made before the Council on 18 April, I made the following point:

"We cannot but regret the human suffering that has ensued as a result of this situation. We thus strongly condemn all acts of aggravation of the situation and all acts of terrorism and counter-terrorism; we passionately condemn these in the name of human dignity and in the name of peace. Terrorism is not a commodity for export.

"...

"My delegation repeats that it is opposed to acts of violation of the sovereignty of other States, whether that be through incursions such as the recent Israeli incursion into Lebanon, or through acts of subversion and incursions into other States by groups or individuals trained and encouraged by other States. Such acts of aggression and incursion, and interference with the sovereignty of other States, cannot be justified by any excuse whatsoever." [*1709th meeting, paras. 8 and 12.*]

28. This is the basic position of my delegation and, because the draft resolution in document S/10916/Rev.1 maintains that equilibrium of justice, we shall vote in favour of it.

29. I also indicated that my delegation was in favour of the Council's tackling the Middle East situation in its totality. We still maintain this basic position because the Middle East situation is a complex one and demands a whole combination of solutions in order to bring peace to that part of the world. In a message just received from my Foreign Ministry this basic position of the Kenya Government is emphasized as follows:

"Kenya Government policy is one of effective, prompt and demonstrable implementation of resolution 242 (1967). Kenya opposes military and terroristic measures emanating from any quarter to escalate the conflict in the Middle East. Kenya also opposes injection of cold-war politics and encouragement of arms race in the Middle East because these are impeding early, effective and peaceful settlement of the Middle East dispute."

30. This is our basic position, and because we are of the opinion that this draft resolution introduces the basic equity into the situation we shall vote for it.

31. Mr. BOYD (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document S/10916/Rev.1, submitted by France and the United Kingdom, representing a compromise between several delegations, because Lebanon has considered that this text is acceptable and because, as we see it, the text reaffirms the right of Lebanon to have its territorial integrity and sovereignty respected, and at the same time condemns the repeated military attacks which have occurred recently and which have led to the loss of innocent lives.

32. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): One of the members of the Council has requested a suspension of the meeting before the vote, under rule 33 of the provisional rules of procedure. If there is no objection we shall act in accordance with this request.

The meeting was suspended at 11.10 a.m. and resumed at 11.20 a.m.

33. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): As no other delegation wishes to speak at this time, I take it that the Council is now ready to proceed to the vote, and accordingly I shall put to the vote the draft resolution, as revised, sponsored by France and the United Kingdom and contained in document S/10916/Rev.1.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Australia, Austria, France, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: China, Guinea, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.¹

34. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

35. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia): My delegation would have voted in favour of the original Franco-British text submitted in document S/10916, with the amendment by four non-aligned States contained in document S/10917, which the sponsors agreed to incorporate in their original draft. That draft, so amended, was, in our view, well balanced and contained and reflected, in a much more satisfactory way than the draft just adopted, some of the basic principles and positions important to us, which were expressed in our statement before the Council on Friday, 13 April [1706th meeting].

36. While our views and positions against individual senseless terrorism that causes the loss of innocent human lives and jeopardizes the safety of communications, travel and normal international traffic are well known and established, we find that the resolution just adopted is unbalanced, in that it might give the impression to some that we are here equating the State government-organized, official terrorism of a State Member of the United Nations with other acts of violence, especially since it is Lebanon's complaint against the State of Israel's military attack against Lebanese territorial integrity and sovereignty that has been on the agenda and that was the subject matter of our current meetings.

37. In condemning all acts of violence that cause the loss of innocent civilian lives, we could not equate the roots with the consequences. It is in that connexion that we are expressing our fears that any dilution of Israel's responsibility for its recent and repeated attack on Lebanon might encourage those who organize and conduct such attacks and even proclaim the conducting of those attacks as a State policy, possibly leading to the resumption of such attacks, which would in turn lead to new and very grave consequences and complications.

38. A particularly disturbing change in the draft that the sponsors have accepted was, in our view, the omission of operative paragraph 4 of the original draft—the warning to Israel against a repetition of such attacks. We can only hope that, because the paragraph did exist in the original draft and was then subsequently deleted, and because such warnings against a repetition of Israel's military attacks have been almost invariably contained in practically all our resolutions dealing with similar actions of Israel—such as resolutions 248 (1968), 256 (1968), 262 (1968), 265 (1969), 270 (1969), 280 (1970) and 316 (1972)—this present omission will not be seen or taken by anyone as the Council's possible sudden weakening, even by mere omission, in its stern position against any future attacks.

¹ See resolution 332 (1973).

39. However, despite these reservations and doubts, we voted in favour of the revised Franco-British draft because we were expressly and officially assured by the representative of Lebanon, a friendly Member State, victim of repeated and ruthless military attacks, that the revised draft, however inadequate but containing, nevertheless, a condemnation of Israel for those attacks and calling upon it to desist forthwith from any further acts, would meet, although not fully, some of Lebanon's basic requirements.

40. We hope that Israel will, as it must, conclude from the whole spirit of our debates here and from the whole process of our coming to today's decision, that the Council and the international community are now less than ever prepared to tolerate its policy of military attacks and aggressive assaults against its neighbours, in disregard of the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations and Security Council decisions.

41. In conclusion, let me add that my delegation is looking forward to the forthcoming consideration by the Council of the Middle East crisis as a whole, its roots and causes and the reasons for the collective failure to deal with it adequately since 1967. If we invest all our efforts, energies and good will in the right direction, we might be able to find at least some ways towards a peaceful solution of the problem on the basis of respect for the legitimate rights of all States and peoples of the area, and always starting out from the solemn principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force.

42. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Mr. President, first of all I should like to express satisfaction at the Security Council's adoption at its 1710th meeting, on the initiative of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Mr. El-Zayyat, of an important resolution [331 (1973)] concerning an early review of the question of the situation in the Middle East as a whole in all its aspects.

43. The importance of this resolution of the Council, in the view of the Soviet delegation, is that it may represent a breakthrough in the search for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East, on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which would ensure a just and lasting peace in the area based on the withdrawal of all Israeli forces from all occupied Arab territories and on respect for the lawful rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

44. We attach particular importance to the fact that, at yesterday's meeting of the Security Council, as at previous meetings, during the discussion of the subject, members of the council linked this decision to the need to activate the existing United Nations machinery for the settlement of the Middle East conflict, by which I mean primarily the continuation of Ambassador Jarring's mission and the renewal of consultations among the permanent members of the Security Council on the Middle East.

45. Consideration of this question must, of course, be based on strict observance of the Charter of the United Nations, which provides for comprehensive assistance to and protection of the interests of victims of aggression and for the adoption of appropriate measures to curb the

aggressor and eliminate the consequences of aggression, and also in this specific instance on the well-known resolution 242 (1967).

46. During the discussion, almost all members of the Council stressed the fact that, in order to achieve a peaceful settlement of the conflict in the Middle East, steps must be taken for the immediate implementation of resolution 242 (1967). Many of those who spoke during the discussion, both Council members and representatives of other countries participating in the consideration of the item, noted the responsibility of the Security Council, and particularly of its permanent members, for the settlement of the situation in the Middle East, which endangers the cause of peace. The almost unanimous opinion of members of the Council concerning the need for a settlement of the Middle East conflict on the basis of resolution 242 (1967) reflects the sentiments of all peoples of the world. This is confirmed by the decisions of such authoritative international public and governmental organizations as the World Peace Council, the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, the Organization of African Unity and others.

47. The Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its ninth session, held at Rabat in June 1972, adopted a special resolution on the question of Israel's continued aggression against the Arab States [see S/10741 of 20 July 1972, resolution AHG/Res.67 (IX)]. In that resolution, the Assembly invited Israel publicly to declare its adherence to the principle of non-annexation of territories through the use of force, and to withdraw immediately from all the occupied territories to pre-5 June 1967 lines, in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967). The OAU Assembly also urged all States Members of the United Nations to intensify their action in both international forums and the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly and to take all initiatives for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from the Arab territories and the condemnation of Israel's attitude which impedes the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). The Assembly also requested all States Members of the United Nations to refrain from supplying Israel with any weapons, military equipment or moral support likely to enable it to strengthen its military potential and to perpetuate its occupation of Arab and African territories.

48. The Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, meeting at Georgetown, Guyana, in August 1972, in its resolution on the Middle East,² also acknowledged that it was impermissible to acquire territory through force and to use the occupation of territories as a means of pressure for imposing inequitable solutions, and reiterated that the full respect for the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine was a prerequisite to peace in the Middle East. The Conference also called for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories to pre-5 June 1967 lines. The Conference called upon all States to provide the Arab peoples with any assistance which might help them achieve the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Arab

² NAC/FM/CONF.1/RES.3.

territories and the restoration of the lawful rights of the people of Palestine.

49. This is the universal view of prominent mass organizations and the most important public and governmental organizations throughout the world. All this indicates the need for the Council to discuss the Middle East problem in all its aspects. The Soviet delegation is convinced that such a discussion might make a real contribution to the constructive search for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

50. Even today it is also possible to sum up some of the results of the discussion in the Security Council of Israel's latest monstrous act of aggression against Lebanon. The statements by members of the Security Council and representatives of other States Members of the United Nations have confirmed the view expressed by the Soviet delegation at the very outset of the discussion of this question [*1706th meeting*], that Israel would be morally and politically condemned for its new aggressive crime against Lebanon. Indeed, the statements of practically all representatives have exposed Israel and firmly condemned it as an aggressor who is grossly violating the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the basic rules of international law, above all such fundamental principles of international relations as respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by means of force or the threat of force and renunciation of the use or threat of force in international relations. No speaker has supported or indeed could support or justify Israel's aggression, which has become the major part of its State policy. The attempts of Israel's leaders to extol State terror and the policy of State terrorism and to justify aggressive acts against neighbouring Arab States by references to Israel's so-called "self-defence" or to the right of what it terms retribution for individual acts of terrorism committed by certain private persons and groups who are in despair as a result of Israel's continuing aggression have been exposed and rejected. The vast majority of the members of the Council have spoken in favour of decisive condemnation of Israel's aggression against Lebanon and the adoption of appropriate measures to put an end to any acts of aggression by Israel against Lebanon and other neighbouring States.

51. In the light of what I have said, the Soviet delegation would like to make the following observations on the draft resolution submitted by France and the United Kingdom which has just been adopted by a majority of votes as a resolution of the Security Council.

52. First of all, we should like to express our regret that even the initial draft of this resolution—which, in our view, in the form in which it was originally drafted, was not strong or decisive enough—was subsequently still further weakened. The delegation of the USSR took a decision to vote in favour of that initial draft version of the resolution. However, the draft resolution was then revised, under pressure from pro-Israeli forces, in such a way that we could not support it.

53. Of course, the Soviet delegation supports the ideas and proposals set out in operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of this

revised draft, which has now become a Security Council resolution. In paragraph 2, the Council condemns Israel's continuing military attacks against Lebanon and its violation of Lebanon's territorial integrity and sovereignty. Paragraph 3 contains a demand that Israel should desist forthwith from all military attacks on Lebanon.

54. Nevertheless, as I have already commented, as a result of revision under pressure from the forces I have named, this draft became so weakened that it did not meet the need for the Security Council, as the principal organ for the safeguarding of international peace and security, not only to condemn Israel for its latest perfidious attack on peace-loving Lebanon, but also to take effective steps to prevent similar acts of banditry by Israel in future.

55. Neither the draft resolution nor the resolution now adopted provide for the application of sanctions against Israel, as a State in which aggression has become the main purpose of foreign policy and which stubbornly, systematically and deliberately violates United Nations decisions and the basic purposes and principles of the Charter of this Organization, which are designed to maintain and strengthen international peace and security.

56. Nor can I fail to draw attention to the fact that even our respected colleagues who voted in favour of this draft, for the reasons indicated by them, expressed clear dissatisfaction at the content and nature of the resolution.

57. In the circumstances, and in the light of these considerations, the delegation of the USSR could not support the draft resolution.

58. Mr. SCALI (United States of America): In my remarks before the Council on 17 April, I asserted the deeply felt view that "The overriding task of the Council is to seize the present opportunity and move to put an end to violence [in the Middle East] so that the political process will have a chance to operate" [*1708th meeting, para. 72*].

59. I also state anew what I believe my delegation has made emphatically clear on many occasions: that the United States, as a matter of firm principle, opposes international violence and terrorism from whatever source and of whatever kind. States must not export violence and terrorism; private groups must not export violence and terrorism. Assessing blame is secondary to the purpose of ending the misery and suffering on both sides.

60. My delegation has called for a move away from recrimination to even-handed condemnation of all forms of violence. We do not accept the counsel of despair of those who witness it, deplore it and then conclude that the violence cannot be controlled. Even less do we accept the view that violence should be encouraged and supported regardless of its motivation. We must reject terrorism equally as we reject violence, now, before humanity is forced to endure so much of it that it becomes accepted as normal, as the ugly new rules of engagement that nations and groups can follow to settle their differences. My delegation believes that the present resolution falls short of fully meeting these principles, these criteria.

61. However, through the Security Council, the international community, for the first time in the history of the world Organization, has rejected the cycle of violence and counter-violence, a deadly cycle in which innocent people inevitably become victims. In our view, the resolution condemns both violence and terrorism. These are positive elements. My delegation is pleased that, by its reference in the sixth paragraph of the preamble to "recent acts", the resolution takes note of the tragedy of Khartoum, in violation of Sudanese sovereignty, incidents at Nicosia, violating Cypriot jurisdiction, and other vicious acts in many places, particularly in Europe.

62. In many other places, horrors have been averted only through the timely precautions of local authorities. To bring the matter home to this table, I would also make the point that, except for the vigilance of the New York Police, the recent placing of massive explosives in three crowded locations in this great city could have caused indiscriminate casualties in enormous numbers. Do we here believe that we and our families are immune to this kind of blind terrorism, so long as the international community does not awaken to the need for urgent action?

63. My delegation withheld its positive vote for two principal reasons. In our view, the resolution focuses too much on the meaningless exercise of trying to parcel out blame. It falls short of meeting the full dimensions of the challenge facing the Security Council. Until this very hour, I and my delegation have been applying every ounce of our energies to achieving by quiet diplomacy an agreed draft that could command the unanimous support of this Council. We came close to succeeding in this, and we are disappointed that we did not achieve that outcome. Even so, all of us can derive some satisfaction from the fact that the Security Council has grappled, and grappled vigorously, with one of the great issues of the time. We should not lose sight of this fact, even if the result does not reach our highest aspirations.

64. No resolution and no legislative act are perfect. Each of those who voted for the resolution have, as we have heard, expressed views on how it could have been improved by adding or subtracting some additional element or through some different emphasis. But, more important, no resolution of this Council can be an end to itself. A resolution's worth is judged by its effects, and its effects depend upon the actions of the international community that flow or do not flow from the resolution.

65. Before I close I think it important for the sake of the record to make some comments on the matter of arms supplies to the Middle East area. In the course of this debate we have heard several distorted and one-sided references to United States assistance in meeting Israel's legitimate defence needs. I have sensed an effort to depict this as a flow of arms through one pipeline, from a single source to a single destination. There has been no reference to the fact that, even as we have been sitting in this chamber, major deliveries of war material have been made by certain Powers to several other countries in the area.

66. The United States has no intention of taking steps that would alter the arms balance in the Middle East or

otherwise contribute to instability. However, I would emphasize that the United States does not propose to sit idly by while others pour arms into the Middle East for one side, thus inevitably tempting some Governments to believe that, with those new arms, they could risk another round in the Middle East war.

67. My Government has, in the past six years, insistently sought an agreement among the major arms suppliers to limit weapons shipments to that part of the world. The United States stands ready at this instant to participate in such an arrangement if others are willing to put aside their special political objectives and work with us towards the goal of a reduced military confrontation.

68. In concluding, I want to affirm that, despite the imperfections of the present resolution, my Government is determined to do all in its power to encourage mutual respect of sovereignty among nations in the Middle East and to seek to further the international campaign to protect the innocent against violence and terror from all sources. Despite the imperfections of the present resolution, my Government will regard its positive elements as points of departure for efforts to seek a new era in the Middle East—an era in which all the peoples of the Middle East will live in peace and security and an era in which the hands of friendship will reach across secure and recognized borders. Let us all dedicate ourselves to the achievement of that era.

69. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): My Government has given a great deal of thought to the kind of resolution that might appropriately meet this situation as well as to the text of the resolution just adopted.

70. There is much in the original Franco-British draft resolution that we could agree with. Among other things, as I said in my statement in the Council on 17 April [1708th meeting], the raid on Beirut and neighbouring areas of Lebanon that was planned and executed by the Government of Israel in the early morning of 10 April must be censured as a deplorable intrusion upon the sovereignty of another Member of the United Nations. But, in the view of my Government, a condemnatory judgement that would have treated that particular act, reprehensible as it was, in isolation from the rest of the pattern of provocative violence, terror and reprisal of which it is undoubtedly a part, and which is encroaching on the safety of life everywhere, would have amounted to a distortion by the Council of the realities of the situation in the Middle East and would scarcely have been likely to help towards a settlement of its stubborn problems.

71. For those reasons, and because in our view the draft in document S/10916 was too heavily pitched against Israel, my delegation would not have been able to vote in favour of it. However, the changes that were made as a result of yesterday's consultations and introduced in document S/10916/Rev.1 go some distance at least towards injecting a measure of balance into the resolution to the point where, even though we still do not regard it as entirely satisfactory, we felt able to support it.

72. Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria): As I had the opportunity to state a few days ago [1708th meeting], the

Austrian Federal Government has consistently rejected and condemned all acts of international violence wherever they occurred and by whomever they might be committed. That position of principle must also apply to the Israeli actions in Lebanon that have been the subject of the present debate in the Security Council.

73. The resolution on which we have just voted in many respects meets that position of principle in condemning all acts of violence and addressing itself in no uncertain terms to a particular case. The Austrian delegation therefore voted for the draft resolution presented by France and the United Kingdom [S/10916/Rev.1]. We consider that resolution to be an urgent appeal to all parties involved in the conflict in the Middle East to halt the use of violence in any form and to exert all their influence in order to eliminate all acts of violence. We also consider the resolution to be an important reaffirmation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon, and we express our expectation that its territorial integrity will be strictly respected by all sides.

74. The Austrian delegation wishes to express the hope that this debate in the Security Council will be a first step leading to renewed and concerted efforts by all parties concerned towards a lasting, peaceful and just solution of the conflict on the basis of resolution 242 (1967). We are encouraged in this regard by the unanimous adoption yesterday of the draft resolution introduced by the Foreign Minister of Egypt, requesting the Secretary-General to submit to the Security Council a comprehensive report on the efforts undertaken by the United Nations pertaining to the situation in the Middle East since June 1967 [see resolution 331 (1973)]. My delegation hopes that that report will provide a basis for a constructive debate on the problem of the Middle East.

75. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): As one of the sponsors of the draft resolution in document S/10916/Rev.1, I should like to express my delegation's gratitude and that of our co-sponsor France to those who voted in favour of the resolution. We fully understand the difficulties of many of them and indeed it will be recalled that we were prepared to accept a resolution with additional paragraphs.

76. As we all know, it is not always, indeed it is not often, possible to secure everything that one wants from the Council and compromise is generally necessary. There is a French expression: "*le mieux est l'ennemi du bien*" (the best is the enemy of the good), which sums up the matter very aptly, as the French language does so often. In this case, the good is that the resolution as adopted preserves the essential features of the original draft we submitted and we feel that it meets the needs of the situation in responding to the complaint of Lebanon of the invasion of that country and the infringement of its sovereignty by Israel, while at the same time making clear the Council's abhorrence of all acts of violence.

77. It has been a disappointment to us that not all members of the Council have felt able to support this view. We hope, however, that with this resolution we may witness a de-escalation of violence in the area, a retreat from reprisal and counter-reprisal, and a beginning of a move towards an atmosphere which may be more conducive to a settlement.

78. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): As representative of PERU, I should like to state that I voted in favour of the resolution which we have just adopted because I consider that, even with the changes introduced in the text yesterday [S/10916/Rev.1], it does contain the basic principles which had to be reflected in the decision of the Council.

79. The position of Peru is fully recorded in the records of the Council. Nevertheless, I should like to say that I was prepared to vote in favour of the draft resolution as originally submitted [S/10916] as well as of the amendments in document S/10917 submitted by Guinea, India, Indonesia and Yugoslavia. It is clear that the new version represents a considerable effort at compromise but I should like to point out that deletion of former operative paragraph 4 should not, in the opinion of my delegation, be understood to mean that the Council abdicates its responsibility under the Charter in the event that a situation should arise once again which leads to a complaint such as the one that we have considered.

80. Now, as PRESIDENT, I call on the representative of the Soviet Union who has asked to be allowed to speak in order to give an additional explanation.

81. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Mr. President, during the statements in explanation of vote, one speaker advanced the thesis that the question of assistance, including the supply of arms, to the victim of aggression should be put on the same footing as assistance, financing and the supply of arms to the aggressor. We cannot agree with this approach. It would be analogous to the approach heard in the statement of one speaker during the discussion in the Security Council to the effect that the individual terror committed by despairing individuals and the State terror and policy of State terrorism engaged in by Israel should be put on the same footing. Neither thesis is acceptable. This has been confirmed by the discussion in the Council on the question of Israel's aggression against Lebanon.

82. The vast majority of speakers condemned Israel for its State terror and its policy of State terrorism. This, of course, does not constitute a justification for terror by individuals, which results in the loss of life of innocent victims.

83. However, we must be perfectly clear about this, and I assume that the vast majority of those sitting around this table, as well as of our respected colleagues who attend Security Council meetings—I refer to the permanent representatives to the United Nations—would not agree that the questions of assisting and co-operating with the victim of aggression and with the aggressor should be approached on the same level or measured with the same yardstick. The provision of assistance to the victim of aggression, including the supply of arms, is lawful and just and fully in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Support for and assistance to the aggressor, including the supply of arms, is, on the other hand, a gross violation of the Charter. For this reason I felt it necessary to clarify the principles underlying this question and to stress that this is the position of the Soviet delegation.

84. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of the United States who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

85. Mr. SCALI (United States of America): I must thank my Soviet colleague and good friend for his assistance in identifying one of the sources of the arms and war material that continue to pour into various countries of the Middle East. I said that there were several sources and did not wish to name names. I will not bore this company which has already done a day's work with more details at this time. I shall be happy to give those details on a more suitable occasion.

86. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of the Soviet Union in exercise of his right of reply.

87. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I was speaking about a principle, and did not name any names; I did not mention by name those who defended the thesis that the same approach should be adopted to questions of assistance, including the supply of arms, to the aggressor and to the victims of aggression. It is now clear to us all who in fact supports this thesis.

88. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of Israel has asked to speak and I call on him.

89. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): The adoption of the text just voted upon confirms a number of known facts. It demonstrates once more that the Security Council, like other United Nations organs cannot, because of its structure and composition, its voting procedures and their pre-ordained results, deal equitably with questions pertaining to the Middle East situation. If it cannot examine and at least pronounce itself fairly and adequately on the murder of innocent men, women and children by Arab terrorist gangs, if it cannot recognize Israel's inherent right to defend itself against sanguinary attacks, it is obviously not the body capable to act on any of the complex issues of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

90. The adoption of the resolution confirms that there is international law on the one hand and that there are words produced in the Security Council on the other, and the twain rarely meet. In this Passover season, one is tempted to say that the forceful exodus of the Israelites from ancient Egypt would have been condemned by the Security Council had the Egyptians asked for it. The resolution also confirms that, in the absence of meaningful United Nations action against international terrorism, it is incumbent upon responsible Governments to combat this scourge by their own means. The Government of Israel, in accordance with its inalienable rights and its international obligations, will continue to protect the people of Israel from Arab murder attacks.

91. The debate has given Israel the opportunity publicly to restate its case. We appreciate this, although we knew in advance that the Security Council was not able to consider it on its merits. Ours is a just case and we are fortified in our conviction that this is so not only by the unity of the

people of Israel in the defence of its rights but also by the support of enlightened public opinion all over the world, by the stand adopted by international organizations capable of taking a more balanced view of the situation than the Council and by the attitude of international personalities who, unlike government representatives guided by political considerations, can assess problems on the basis of principles of law, justice and morality.

92. It is now to be hoped that the Government of Lebanon will evaluate correctly its responsibilities. Words, especially such as those that have emerged in the resolution, cannot free Lebanon from its international obligations. The Lebanese Government remains in duty bound to take action to end the savage attacks planned, organized and launched from its territory against innocent civilians in the Middle East and in other parts of the world. Israel expects the Government of Lebanon to act forthwith to eliminate the terrorist bases and centres within its borders.

93. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Lebanon.

94. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): Horace once said that for every folly of their princes the people felt the scourge. Today the Security Council has adopted a resolution which deals with another act of folly and terror organized by the Government of Israel against Lebanon. It is another act on the long trail of Zionist terrorism--on that long trail on which Zionist terrorists have left their footprints. These footprints cannot be effaced by any eloquent speeches here in the Security Council. The acts of Zionist aggression and terrorism have been elevated by the Israeli Government to the status of State terrorism organized by leaders of the country. They definitely cannot take satisfaction in the fact that they have Phantoms and Skyhawks and more power. They must remember that, in the words of William Yeats, "the Phantoms work in the midst of tears" and there are plenty of tears that have been shed in Lebanon over hundreds of our innocent victims that have been murdered by Israel.

95. I am not going to resort to any juridical sophistry here in interpreting the resolution just adopted by an overwhelming majority. I owe it to most of my colleagues around this table to explain and to tell them that, like them, we are not satisfied with this resolution. We are very unhappy with it. Even the previous text submitted by France and the United Kingdom was not satisfactory to us. We wanted more. We have requested the Security Council to take further steps. It has adopted resolutions on previous occasions condemning the acts of Israel against Lebanon. It has warned Israel against such attacks. It has pledged itself to take new steps and new measures against Israel if its attacks should be repeated. However, unfortunately, even the previous draft of the resolution did not satisfy all our requirements. The new draft in a sense meets certain of our requirements, but we are unhappier with it than we were with the previous text.

96. Allow me to remind the members of the Council of one particularly important fact: that the resolution just adopted by the Council was adopted on the basis of a complaint lodged by the Permanent Representative of

Lebanon and that the Council acted following a specific act of aggression against Lebanon admitted by the guilty party. It was an act of aggression and it was a very strong act of violence against my country and my people and the people living in Lebanon.

97. Paragraph 1 is not to be interpreted in any way except in connexion with the other paragraphs of the resolution. I beg to differ with any other interpretation given to this particular paragraph. The paragraphs deal with acts of violence continually perpetrated by Israel, against Lebanon and the neighbouring Arab States. The mere fact that one preambular paragraph refers to recent acts of violence does not mean that it should refer to some acts of violence without referring to others. We all remember the recent acts of violence, in particular the murderous one which resulted in the destruction of the Libyan aircraft. In this respect I should like to place on record in the Council the text of a telegram that was approved by the Human Rights Commission on 27 February 1973 and sent by the Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Ramphul, to the Government of Israel. It referred to a recent act of violence. It said:

"The United Nations Commission on Human Rights is extremely distressed that, on 21 February last, the Israeli Air Force shot down a Libyan airline commercial aircraft. This cruel and unjustifiable act caused the death of over one hundred innocent civilians, including many women and children, nationals of a number of States. The Commission condemns this massacre of innocent people and calls upon the Government of Israel to respect and implement canons of civilized and humanitarian behaviour among peoples and States. Also, the Commission once again calls upon the Government of Israel to abide scrupulously by its obligations under the relevant international humanitarian instruments."³

98. You have just heard the representative of Israel, and you have heard the words he addressed to the Council. I do not have to repeat them; they are on your record already; they are in my hand. They are nothing but another expression of contempt for the Council. This is the international law that the representative of Israel wants to uphold.

99. The United Nations has adopted numerous resolutions regarding Israel, resolutions that Israel has either rejected or scuttled. Twenty-five resolutions have been adopted by the General Assembly on the rights of the Palestinian people; six by the General Assembly and the Security Council calling on Israel to facilitate the return of displaced persons to their homes in the occupied territories; four by the General Assembly and the Security Council regarding the measures taken by Israel in the Holy City of Jerusalem; 14 by organs of the United Nations calling upon Israel to respect the human rights of the population in the occupied territories and to abide by the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949.⁴ Mr. Tekoah would like to tell you that you and the General Assembly of the United Nations, the highest

³ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 6*, chap. XX, sect. B, decision 1.

⁴ Geneva Convention relative to the protection of civilian persons in time of war, of 12 August 1949.

organs of the United Nations, do not represent the real international public opinion and that only a few little gatherings somewhere in the world which pass some favourable expressions to Israel represent the civilized, enlightened public opinion of the world. That contempt by Israel must come to an end.

100. I should like to quote here from a letter I addressed to the President of the Security Council on 21 September 1972:

"On many occasions, the Security Council has condemned Israel because of her acts of aggression against Lebanon and solemnly warned her that if such acts were to be repeated, measures would be taken against her. In the absence of effective and appropriate measures by the Council, Israel, unrestrained and uncurbed, has persisted in her campaign of organized terror against a Member State of the United Nations. Lebanon, which has put all her trust in the Security Council and in the Charter of the United Nations, and which has relied on the international order for her protection, finds herself defenceless when exposed to persistent criminal attacks by Israel." [S/10799.]

101. You have today adopted this resolution. For various reasons already known to members of the Council, we have not gone as far as requesting you to go further; to apply sanctions against Israel and to warn it against further measures to be adopted by the Council. We regret that we had to face a situation in which we accept a resolution like this, but I should like to bring to your attention that we have placed our trust in this august body. We believe in international law, and the time has come for Israel to understand and respect international law. President Eisenhower said on 1 May 1958:

"... The world no longer has a choice between force and law. If civilization is to survive, it must choose the rule of law."⁵

And Mr. Richard Nixon, then Vice-President of the United States, said on 13 April 1959:

"... The time has now come to take the initiative in the direction of establishment of the rule of law ... to replace the rule of force."⁶

102. We strongly believe in those principles, and that is why we come to the Security Council—because we know that the Charter of the United Nations and the Council embody the highest principles of international law that should be complied with and respected.

103. I must say a word of gratitude to the representatives of France and the United Kingdom, who have applied themselves with all their energy, wisdom and talent in order to produce a resolution that could be acceptable to the majority of the Council. We appreciate their labour; we appreciate the position of their Governments; we appreciate their support and the overwhelming support we have

⁵ *Department of State Bulletin*, vol. XXXVIII, No. 986, p. 831.

⁶ *Ibid.*, vol. XL, No. 1036, p. 624.

received for our case from the large majority of the members of the Council. If I have a note of regret to voice at this particular time, it is the fact that the representative of the United States has put so much emphasis on one side of the resolution rather than on others. We are disappointed—as he was disappointed with another aspect—that in the statements of the United States we did not note any mention of Lebanon by name. We certainly noticed a passing reference to the need for mutual respect of sovereignty. We do appreciate many things in our friendly relations with the United States. It is no secret to anyone that we have friendly relations with the United States, as we have with all members of the Security Council. We want those relations to develop and to be strengthened on the basis of justice to us and to the Arab people.

104. A final word. This week has been a week of suffering for the Christians of the world. Yesterday commemorated the day of the *Via Dolorosa*. The Palestine people have been treading a long road of suffering for over 25 years and, as I said before, nothing is in sight to show that their plight and their suffering are coming to an end. Tomorrow, for the Christians, is a day of resurrection. We hope that it is not only a day for the resurrection of hopes. We have seen so many hopes shattered in the past. We have seen them shattered many times. Today, what we want to be resurrected are the genuine and effective efforts to bring peace to that troubled area of the world that is ours. We need peace; we want peace; we have been working and we want to work for peace.

105. Finally, Mr. President, allow me to address to you my appreciation for your forbearance during these very trying days and for all the efforts you have deployed to bring the work of the Council to a satisfactory conclusion. If this conclusion is not entirely satisfactory to many of my friends and colleagues around this table, I do understand their grievances and share in them. But believe me, Mr. President, Lebanon has trust in the Council and will depend on the Council for its defence, and if the Council's resolution has not warned Israel against the repetition of its acts, then the statements I have heard around the Council table were a clear enough warning to Israel to desist forthwith from the repetition of its acts against Lebanon. We hope that Israel will heed those warnings. We trust that it will comply with the will of international law.

106. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Egypt.

107. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt): Mr. President, allow me to thank you for giving me the floor. We have heard the representative of the United States trying to justify, in front of the Council, the massive flow of the most sophisticated weapons and arms to Israel by claiming that it is to assist Israel in its "legitimate defence needs". May I ask the United States Ambassador, through you, Mr. President, what legitimate defence needs are meant? Is it the legitimate defence needs of the occupied Arab territories that he means? Is it the legitimate defence of the Israeli conquest, or is it the legitimate defence needs of guarding the fruits of aggression? It was once said that an eminent and responsible American declared that America was ready to guarantee the existence of Israel, not its conquests. Do

we understand today, after the statement we have heard, that the United States is going to guarantee the conquests of Israel? Are those the "legitimate defence needs" that the representative of the United States is referring to?

108. I should like to hear an answer to that, and a direct answer. Does he consider that supplying the most sophisticated arms in the American arsenal to Israel is the best way to perpetuate Israeli occupation of the Arab territories and thus compel the Arabs to yield to the diktat of Israel? Or does the United States representative consider that such a supply would really convince Israel to desist from its premeditated military attacks on Arab States? Again, does the representative of the United States consider that such a supply of arms is an even-handed policy in the area: assisting the aggressor and occupier to maintain his policy of intransigence, arrogance and disregard of all the efforts so far exerted in the search for a peaceful settlement, honourable and acceptable to every party in the area and, above all, to the Palestinians, who are struggling and striving for the restitution of their right to self-determination?

109. My country has always expressed its determination to have peace, once and for all, established in the area on terms of justice for everyone, and not on terms of injustice to the Arabs. Even-handedness, as we understand it, is not to supply Israel with these weapons and other kinds of aid, and just sit idly by watching it intimidating its Arab neighbours and continuing its policy of expansion and absorption of the occupied territories. Even-handedness is to encourage, and not to obstruct, the international community in carrying out and implementing what it had unanimously agreed to as the only solution to that problem. Of course, I did not go, in my optimism, as far as to expect the even-handedness policy to go beyond non-obstructionism: namely, to encourage positive and constructive endeavours seeking a lasting and just peace in the Middle East.

110. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have a request from the representative of Israel to be allowed to speak. But before calling on him, I think it is necessary to remind everyone that we have already adopted a resolution on the item on the agenda and that members of the Council have already explained their votes; therefore, the debate has been concluded. May I therefore appeal to other representatives to be extremely brief?

111. I call on the representative of Israel.

112. Mr. TEKOAHI (Israel): I think all of us deserve a respite from the kind of statements that we have just heard, and I shall be very brief. I think all of us deserve to be able to go home and to examine in fact the difference between law and Security Council resolutions, to examine the difference between what I called—I think justly—enlightened public opinion and the views of the Security Council, seven of whose 15 members States have no diplomatic relations with Israel.

113. But I should like to say to the representative of Lebanon that we shall continue to insist on the application of one principle, and that is that, if there is international law, it shall apply equally to all States and Israel will not be

an exception in the implementation of its fundamental, legitimate rights under the tenets of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. Israel, like all nations, Israel, like all States of the United Nations, has a right to independence and sovereignty. Israel has a right to protect its independence and sovereignty, to defend its citizens from armed attack and from murderous outrages. Israel, like all other nations, has the right to arm itself in order to be able to withstand the kind of aggression that we have been subjected to since 1948.

114. Now, it is understandable that the representative of Egypt and his Government are not very happy about the fact that, during 25 years of Egyptian aggression against Israel, Egypt has not been particularly successful in attaining its sanguinary objectives. But this feeling on the part of the representative of Egypt and his Government deserves no sympathy at all. It is simply too bad that Egypt has not succeeded in achieving the goal of President Nasser to deal a death-blow to Israel's existence and to drive the Israelis into the sea. It is simply too bad for Egypt that it has not succeeded in the last few years in achieving the goal enunciated by President Sadat: that Israel has to be eliminated from the Arab world.

115. No speeches, no resolutions, no votes can deprive the Jewish people of its right to freedom, to independence and to equality with other nations, and this right the Government of Israel has and will continue to defend, to protect and to vindicate with all the means at its disposal.

116. Mr. ABDULLA (Sudan): I am sorry to intervene at this last minute. I have constrained myself not to make any statement on the repeated references to the Khartoum incident during the debate and afterwards. I have tried to impress on the Council that the present case is a specific case of an attack on the sovereignty of a State by another Member State and that we should limit ourselves to that. Unfortunately, references have been made to the Khartoum incident to an extent where that incident appears to be exploited by Mr. Tekoah as a malicious incitement of various organs or people.

117. The Khartoum incident, regrettable and sad as it was, is not an incident for trading or for political manoeuvres. Everybody is aware that the Sudan Government has taken every necessary step to deal with that matter in the most effective and wisest manner of handling such an affair.

118. I should like to say here that the Khartoum incident was committed by individuals within the Sudanese territory and therefore subject only to the juridical authority of the Sudan. The fact that reference has been made to it in a malicious way perhaps indicates an attempt to prejudice any legal decision that might be taken in that case. No decision has yet been taken. For that reason, we object to such references, but we also object to references to the Khartoum incident because, under Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter, such references are not permissible since the matter is within the national jurisdiction of a Member State of the United Nations. I should like to read out Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter. It says:

"Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which

are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter . . .".

119. For this reason, I thought it objectionable that the Khartoum incident should be referred to in that particular and slanted way.

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

121. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): I shall be very brief. We have again heard another expression of contempt for the Council and some of its members. Because some of the members of the Council do not maintain diplomatic relations with Israel, a distinction must therefore be made between them and the "enlightened" public opinion of the world. I shall not defend my colleagues around this table, but when the majority of the world condemns Israel for an act of aggression, that is not an act of "enlightenment". It is prejudice, it represents a mechanical majority. For Israel the United Nations seems to be irrelevant.

122. Mr. Ben Gurion once remarked, "It is not important what the *goyim*"—that is, the gentiles—"think, but rather what the Jews do."

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

124. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I believe there is no need to explain to members of the Security Council seated around this table the high regard and the deep respect which I personally and my Government have for them, and I do not think that the representative of Lebanon does justice to the situation by trying to utilize my comments about the Council's structure, composition, voting procedures and the preordained results of those voting procedures in order to make political attacks which by now are rather hackneyed and uninteresting. But if he is concerned about the image which this organ, and perhaps other organs of the United Nations, have created for themselves in the eyes of the public and in the eyes of the world, let him study very carefully the records of these meetings and examine the statement made by his colleague and defender, the representative of the Sudan. If a statement of the kind that we heard a while ago is allowed to be voiced without any reaction to it at the Council table, if the murder of American and Belgian diplomats in cold blood carried out in any place in the world. . . .

125. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Sudan on a point of order.

126. Mr. ABDULLA (Sudan): I have just pointed out the inadmissibility of discussing the Khartoum incident, which is under legal consideration by the juridical powers of a national State. I wish to remind the Council again of Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter.

127. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Israel and appeal to him to confine himself to the item on the agenda.

128. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I was about to say that if the murder of foreign diplomats organized at Beirut and

carried out at Khartoum in cold blood in the most savage manner can be said, at the Security Council table, not to be of international concern but to fall within domestic jurisdiction

129. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call upon the representative of the Sudan, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

130. Mr. ABDULLA (Sudan): My objection to continuation of discussion of the Khartoum incident still stands.

131. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call upon the representative of Israel and again appeal to him to confine himself to the item on the agenda.

132. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I am within the limits of the agenda in responding to a statement on the question on the item made by the representative of the Sudan. If a statement such as that is allowed to be made in the Security Council, and the representative of a State which is not a member of the Council is the only one to raise his voice in order to say that we have reached the lowest point of misinterpretation of what our Charter is, then I think it is quite clear why the Security Council and other bodies of the United Nations are regarded as they are by those who apparently know a little more about international law and its precepts, about the Charter and its purposes and principles.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.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 إلى : 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 пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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