

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTIETH YEAR

# 1862<sup>nd</sup>

MEETING: 8 DECEMBER 1975 UN LIBRARY

NEW YORK

JUN 15 1984

~~UN/SA COLLECTION~~

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1862) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 3 December 1975 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11892);	
(b) Letter dated 3 December 1975 from the Permanent Representative of Egypt to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11893) .....	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.

## 1862nd MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 8 December 1975, at 3.30 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Ivor RICHARD (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to participate in the discussion.

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Costa Rica, France, Guyana, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mauritania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania and United States of America.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1862)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the Middle East:
  - (a) Letter dated 3 December 1975 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11892);
  - (b) Letter dated 3 December 1975 from the Permanent Representative of Egypt to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11893)

*The meeting was called to order at 6.15 p.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Letter dated 3 December 1975 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11892);
- (b) Letter dated 3 December 1975 from the Permanent Representative of Egypt to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11893)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the 1859th meeting, under rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Lebanon, Egypt and the Syrian Arab Republic, to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote. In accordance with the decision also taken at the 1859th meeting, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representative of the

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ghorra (Lebanon), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Allaf (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Aql (Palestine Liberation Organization) took places at the Security Council table.*

2. Mr. TCHERNOUCHTENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): First of all, the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic wishes to say how pleased it is to find that, in the work of the Security Council which is called upon to consider a new act of aggression committed by Israel, we have the representatives of the PLO participating. In fact, after the General Assembly it was the Security Council which took an important historical step by affording the PLO, as well as the other parties concerned, an opportunity to participate in the discussion of this all-important and urgent question. Another important United Nations organ, entrusted with special responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security, has made a just decision by taking account of the fact that, without the PLO, questions relating to the Middle East can neither be discussed nor resolved.

3. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR has listened with the keenest attention to the observations made by the representatives of Lebanon, Egypt, Syria and the PLO [*1859th meeting*], who have given a detailed account of events testifying to the fact that a new act of aggression has been committed by Israel against Lebanon and the Palestinians. We agree fully with the description given by the representatives of those countries of the piratical acts of Israel, which has flagrantly violated the territorial integrity of Lebanon and has perpetrated barbarous air-raids against a number of settlements in that Arab State, and against the Palestinian camps on that territory. By reason of that fact— as has been shown by the press, the statements of the representatives of the Arab States and of the PLO—there were victims among the civilian population. Hundreds of peaceful inhabitants have been injured or killed, especially women, the aged and children. A number of dwellings and buildings were destroyed. Even the American press was obliged to recognize that for a year and a half now the greatest number of victims, as a result

of those barbarous Israeli attacks, is to be found among the civilian population.

4. We categorically condemn those barbarous acts which trample underfoot the most elementary rules of international law. This new infamous act perpetrated by Israel comes at a time when the General Assembly and the Security Council are making every effort to contribute to the settlement of the Middle East problem.

5. With regard to the position of the Byelorussian SSR on this question, it is well known that all Israeli troops must be withdrawn from the territories they occupied in 1967. The inalienable rights of the Palestinian people must be recognized, including their right to their own State. If these questions are not solved, there can be no peace in that region.

6. The overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations, and the world community, insistently and rightly clamour for a just settlement of the Middle East problem. They know that the only way to establish peace in the Middle East—to eliminate this explosive situation—would be to solve these fundamental problems in a just and durable manner. In order to arrive at an over-all settlement of the problem, the Geneva Peace Conference—which was established for that purpose—must be convened as soon as possible in order to settle the Middle East problem with the participation of all the parties directly concerned, including the PLO, the representative of the Palestinian people.

7. Events in the Middle East since the latest savage bombardment by Israel against the civilian population of Lebanon show quite clearly that the measures taken recently—either partial measures or half measures—have not succeeded in reducing tensions in the region or in bringing us closer to a solution of this problem.

8. Obviously, one can have no illusions that there will be peace in the Middle East so long as the key problems of the Middle East conflict are not solved. However, Israel defies United Nations resolutions and disregards the will and the wishes of the international community. The most eloquent proof of this is the act of aggression by Israel against Lebanon which is at present under discussion in the Council.

9. Incidentally, these piratical acts of Israel are committed consistently by Israel against Lebanon, despite the numerous resolutions of the Council which resolutely condemn that kind of act. Moreover, the Council has warned Israel that unless it puts an end to such acts, the Security Council will be compelled to take stronger measures against it.

10. We are duty-bound to note that Israel, emboldened by the protection and the financial and economic support in the form of mass deliveries of arms, defies and scorns international law. Indeed, can we now

name a single State, another State, which, like Israel, has committed itself systematically to carrying out acts of aggression against neighbouring sovereign States?

11. From year to year Israeli militaristic extremists are attempting to find some kind of basis for carrying out their raids and intrusions into the territory of Lebanon. At the same time, the representatives of Israel have stated their wish for peace. In truth, the logic of these people is preposterous. They reckon with nothing and stop at nothing in order to put into effect their deep-laid plans. We can no longer tolerate this policy of hypocrisy and treachery. The aggressor not only disregards United Nations decisions but in actual fact haughtily states that it will not take part in the discussion of the Middle East question if the PLO also takes part in those discussions. Along with this it carries out premeditated acts of aggression, in an attempt to complicate the whole situation in the Middle East and prevent a just and peaceful settlement, and undermines the steps already taken in that direction.

12. Israel is making attempts to intimidate the Arab peoples, particularly the people of Palestine, and to exert pressure on them. But the Israeli militarists have chosen a course that is too dangerous, primarily for themselves. Israel still attempts to disregard the PLO, and slanders that organization, which is a legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine; Israel is unwilling to face up to this fact. It is time finally for Tel Aviv to understand that without the participation of the PLO there can be no peaceful settlement in the Middle East. The PLO must take part on an equal footing in all efforts to find a settlement for the conflict in the Middle East, and this includes the Geneva Peace Conference.

13. Our delegation would like to associate itself with those who have categorically condemned Israeli's piratical act of aggression against Lebanon. In carrying out this barbarous attack on the peaceful Lebanese population and on Palestine refugee camps, Israel has added one more crime to its existing list of aggressive actions against Lebanon and there can be no justification for that crime. The intrusion into the territory of another sovereign State, an attack by one State against another, is an international crime and the Security Council cannot tolerate such a thing. It is the duty of the Council energetically to condemn the piratical actions of Israel against Lebanon and to take measures which will put an end to the systematically repeated acts of aggression on the part of Israel.

14. The General Assembly and the Security Council have shown a profound desire to promote a peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem—the strengthening of peace and security in this area. However, in order to resolve the fundamental problems of a comprehensive and general settlement in the Middle East, a climate of calm and peace is, of course, necessary.

15. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR believes that draft resolution S/11898 submitted by the five non-aligned members of the Security Council correctly expresses serious concern at the deterioration in the situation which is a result of the violation by Israel of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and the resolutions of the Security Council, and also points out that the massive air attacks on Lebanon by Israel were premeditative in nature. Nor can we ignore the fact that this draft resolution categorically condemns the Government of Israel for its premeditated air attacks on Lebanon. It also calls upon Israel to call an immediate halt to all military attacks on Lebanon and once again issues a serious warning to Israel that if there is a repetition of such attacks the Council will have to consider the question of taking appropriate steps and adopting measures to ensure compliance with its decisions. Our delegation wholeheartedly supports this entirely well-founded draft resolution proposed in connection with this act of aggression on the part of Israel against Lebanon.

16. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq): I should first like to extend, on behalf of my delegation, a warm welcome to the representative of the PLO who, for the first time, is participating in a Security Council debate on an item involving the Palestinian people. I wish also to express our profound gratitude to all the delegations which supported the proposal to invite the representative of the PLO to participate in the present debate. This invitation is only another step, long overdue, towards the full recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people. The sooner those rights are recognized the better will be the chances of restoring justice and peace in the Middle East.

17. Israel's latest armed attack against Lebanon constitutes not only an act of aggression against a State Member of the United Nations, but is also an act of terrorism and genocide against the Palestinian people.

18. Statistics published in the September 1975 issue of *Middle East International* show that in seven years Israel has committed more than 6,200 acts of aggression against Lebanon; nearly 4,000 air and artillery bombardments of villages, towns and refugee camps; more than 350 military incursions, large and small, employing hundreds—on occasion thousands—of troops equipped with tanks, helicopters and planes. Forty per cent of these aggressions have taken place since the October 1973 war when the Palestine resistance halted actions from Lebanon. Civilian casualties include more than 500 dead, 765 wounded and 151 kidnapped; military casualties number 60 dead, 159 wounded and 30 kidnapped. More than 2,000 houses as well as roads, bridges and orchards have been destroyed or badly damaged; more than 2,000 head of livestock have been killed; crops, grain and tobacco stocks have been burnt.

19. The Israelis have seized a strip of Lebanese land about 30 square kilometres in area running from

Mount Hermon to Kafr Shuba and including most of the farming land of Kafr Shuba and Shebba, established military posts on the hills and mountain slopes of Lebanon all the way from Mount Hermon to the coast; built 54 kilometres of roads inside Lebanon to gain strategic dominance over the Argoub—a 100 kilometre square mountain area lying beside the Syrian-Israeli frontier and thus the most convenient route for any Israeli efforts to encircle Syrian forces defending Damascus.

20. Israel's objectives are twofold: to terrorize the people in the hope of depopulating the region, and to expand and annex more territory. This Zionist Israeli policy is neither new nor is it limited to Lebanon alone. It goes back to the earliest days of the establishment of the Zionist State, which had always sought to justify its raids and attacks against its neighbours on the basis of a so-called "right of reprisal". In fact, the excuse of reprisal was no more than a pretext for aggression. The Security Council had, from the very beginning of the Israeli attacks, denied the existence of any right of reprisal and repeatedly condemned Israel for its acts of aggression. That was at a time when the United Nations was a totally Western-dominated organization and no Israeli or American official would have dared of accusing it of being subject to automatic majorities or to Third-World and communist-bloc dominance.

21. In fact, in its response to Israel's first assertion of a right of reprisal, the Security Council laid down the following principle in its resolution 56 (1948): "No party is permitted to violate the truce on the ground that it is undertaking reprisals or retaliations against the other party". Israel, having no respect for the Council's injunctions, was soon engaged in further acts of aggression against Jordan and Syria. After a series of Israeli aggressions in the decade of 1950, the Council, in its resolution 111 (1956), condemned Israel for an attack on Syria and called upon Israel to comply with its obligations "in default of which the Council will have to consider what further measures under the Charter are required to maintain or restore the peace". That resolution was reaffirmed in resolution 171 (1962) and again in resolution 228 (1966), condemning Israel's attack on the village of Samon in Jordan. The Council again emphasized to Israel:

"that actions of military reprisal cannot be tolerated and that, if they are repeated, the Security Council will have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against the repetition of such acts."

Similar resolutions were adopted by the Council in March and August of 1968.

22. The same principle was upheld by the Security Council from 1948 until 1972, when the United States delegation cast its veto [1662nd meeting] to prevent

Israel's condemnation for attacks on Lebanon and Syria in September 1972. Thus, the United Nations, unable since 1948 to prevent violence, was then put in a position where it was unable even to deplore it.

23. One may indeed reasonably claim that the failure of the United Nations to prevent the recurrent Israeli acts of aggression and terrorism was a significant factor in the rise of the Palestinian armed resistance movement.

24. The American veto cast at the Council's meeting on 10 September 1972 [*ibid.*] encouraged the Zionist régime to drop even the pretence of exercising the right of reprisal which it had used to justify its attack on neighbouring countries.

25. On 15 October 1972, without any apparent cause or reason, Israel's American-made Phantoms bombed Palestinian centres in Lebanon and Syria, causing the usual loss of innocent lives. Israeli officials declared that they had adopted a new policy: to strike wherever and whenever they chose.

26. Two weeks later, on 30 October 1972, Israeli planes bombed four refugee camps around Damascus, killing 100 men, women and children and wounding and maiming a similar number. There can be no question that this policy was encouraged by the inability of the Council to restrain Israeli aggression, and especially by the United States veto of 10 September which had the effect of condoning Israeli attacks on Palestinian refugee camps and on neighbouring Arab countries.

27. On 21 February 1973, Israeli forces distinguished themselves by two acts of terrorism which shocked the world. Palestinian refugees were massacred in their camps in Lebanon by Israeli terrorists. And later that same day, a Libyan Boeing aircraft which had strayed off course over the Sinai was shot down by Israeli fighters on the orders of the military command, killing over 100 passengers.

28. *The Sunday Times* of London published a leading editorial on 25 February 1973, and I would like to quote parts of it. It said:

"One hundred totally innocent travellers have been killed. General Dayan speaks almost as if the incident is one more badge of the national heroism which began at the King David Hotel. He said the pilots were absolutely right. Underlying this impenitence is an assumption of which Israel and Zionists around the world have long been possessed—namely, that for the cause of Israel the world must forgive everything. Elsewhere rough codes of morality are recognized, in principle if by no means always in practice. Arabs in particular must always be ferociously condemned and their legitimate interest in, for example, Palestinian refugees,

disregarded. But whatever Israel does must be exonerated because Israel is fighting for survival. Besides, it is a client State of the Western alliance. It is time for Western Governments, especially Washington, to make rather more clear than they have been prepared to, that this assumption enjoys little popular support. The destruction of the airliner should certainly be followed, as Britain quickly proposed, by an impartial international inquiry. But there should also be a more fundamental review of how much Israeli aggression, at the cost of any prospect of a Middle East peace, the West will continue to underwrite."

And the newspaper went on to say:

"The fact that the terrorism of the Sinai was conducted not by guerrillas but by the forces of a Government and State does not make them more authentic or justifiable, but on the contrary is a greater breach of international order."

29. Now, the latest Israeli attack on the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon is yet another "provoked" attack. It is enough for the Zionist authorities now to decide that they deem it appropriate to take some preventive measure and to strike anywhere and at any time they choose with total impunity. Let everyone seated around this table contemplate for one minute the consequences of establishing such a precedent, where every Power around the world takes into account the Israeli example and the Council's response to it.

30. Even when the Israelis do not link their aggression as an act of reprisal to any specific act of violence, we find here the representative of the United States seeking to establish such a linkage. He stated in the Council that:

"the United States deeply deplores these attacks just as we have consistently deplored those despicable terrorist incidents which have caused the loss of life in Israel." [*1860th meeting, para. 4.*]

These are carefully chosen words indeed—nothing stronger than "deplores". Of course, he has to be careful there in order not to ruffle Israeli-Zionist sensibilities. Yet, "deplore" is not strong enough for Palestinian actions; hence the qualification "despicable terrorist incidents". Yet, the United States representative's choice of epithets to characterize a Palestinian action, admittedly non-existent in this particular instance, only betrays the hypocrisy and the double standard of the United States. It is, in fact, a hypocrisy tinged with racism as well. Palestinian actions are despicable acts of terrorism; the Government of Israel's actions, on the other hand, are only attacks. They are not acts of terrorism and they are not despicable.

31. Then the United States representative spoke at length about the efforts of his Government to

achieve a peace agreement. Does he and his Government, with their double standards, seriously envisage themselves as an honest, objective, successful peace broker in the Middle East? The United States delegation rejected the invitation of the PLO to participate in the Council's debate.

32. The United States insists that the only possible basis for serious negotiations is resolution 242 (1967), which reduces the main party in the conflict, namely, the Palestinians, to the status of nameless refugees. The United States representatives cannot bring themselves to even speak of Palestinian rights. They could only talk of the "legitimate interests" of the Palestinians. It is legitimate Palestinian rights that are involved—inalienable long-established rights that the United States chooses to ignore in order to defend Israeli sensibilities and Zionist colonialist claims.

33. How is one to explain this behaviour of the United States? It may all appear as a highly complex situation, but in fact it has a simple key, and that key, in the view of my delegation, was provided by a previous permanent representative of the United States to the United Nations, Mr. Charles Yost, who was representative here from 1969 till 1971. In his book, *The Conduct and Misconduct of Foreign Affairs*, Mr. Yost speaks of a form of disorientation of United States foreign policy arising from domestic factors, namely:

"the effect on policy of a powerful pressure group or lobby, acting in most cases in what it claims to be the national interest but in fact inspired and stimulated by the interest of a particular foreign Government with which the pressure group has emotional or economic ties."

As an outstanding example of this phenomenon, and the most successful of all, Mr. Yost cites:

"the highly organized and well-endowed pro-Israel lobby, activated and directed whenever the need arises by the Israeli embassy in Washington, which is able almost overnight to mobilize Congressional majorities for any bill or appropriation favorable to Israel."<sup>1</sup>

34. The Council has before it the draft resolution S/11898 and my delegation is one of the non-aligned members of the Council that are the sponsors of this draft. If the Council were to adopt this draft resolution it will not be the first time that it condemns Israel for an act of aggression against a neighbouring State. The present circumstances in the Middle East would make the votes, however cast, in favour of the draft or against it, highly significant. It would help to clarify the true policies of all the Powers involved in the Middle East situation—and its meaning will not be lost on the peoples of the area.

35. Mr. CHALE (United Republic of Tanzania): The Council has been meeting to consider a situation

involving one of the most grotesque acts of defiance against the fundamental principle of the Charter of the United Nations and international law and morality. Amidst the high tension which Israel itself has deliberately created and fomented in the Middle East, and in rebuff to the serious efforts the United Nations is undertaking to settle the problem of the Middle East, Israel has viciously chosen to launch yet another massive raid on Lebanon, a peace-loving Member of the United Nations, and a non-aligned country. The massacre committed in these aggressive raids has been amply reported throughout the world and officially communicated to the Council by Egypt and Lebanon in letters inscribed on the agenda of the Council; it took away the lives of 57 innocent and defenceless people, and 110 more have been wounded. It took place only three days after the Council adopted resolution 381 (1975), by which the Council decided to convene next month a meeting of the Council to deal comprehensively with the whole problem of the Middle East, including the root cause of the conflict, namely, the Palestinian problem.

36. Thus when the Security Council has taken the decision which provides for a rare opportunity to discuss the problem of the Middle East in its entirety, thus facilitating a peaceful and permanent solution to the conflict, Israel chooses to demonstrate its recalcitrance by arrogant and merciless bombings and killings of innocent Palestinian civilians, including women and children. Nothing could demonstrate more clearly Israel's contempt for the United Nations and its determined opposition to any serious movement towards a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

37. It is not my intention to go into the details of this latest manifestation of callous disregard for human life, demonstrated by the Israeli authorities. The reports on the massacre have been amply elucidated by the representatives of Lebanon and Egypt and by the head of the delegation of the PLO [1859th meeting] whose historic participation in our Council proceedings we warmly welcome. I must, however, stress that this latest criminal action against an independent sovereign non-aligned State serves to reinforce our conviction that the Security Council can not tolerate indefinitely the persistent and constant aggression committed by Israel against Lebanon, as well as its continuous acts of defiance against the United Nations.

38. The recent massive raid into Lebanon adds to the series of continued acts of aggression and other forms of provocations of Israel against neighbouring Arab States and continued injustices to the Palestinian people, brought to the attention of the Council and the world at large. In number and frequency of condemnations by the United Nations, Israel is rivalled only by the *apartheid* régime in South Africa. The aggression by Israel on 2 December comes after,

and therefore notwithstanding, the numerous resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly, condemning and admonishing it for such acts.

39. There is no doubt that the efforts of the Council, as well as those of the General Assembly, and any other efforts in searching for a solution to the Middle East problem, are rendered even more complicated by the Israeli displays of rebuff.

40. We believe, therefore, that the raid by Israel on Lebanon, and the calculated massacre of innocent refugees in Lebanese territory are, for those countries that have overtly or covertly condoned the misleading claims by Israel, an admonition for the mistake they are making. It is too grave a repetition of crimes for it to be passed over without serious reassessment by those countries. They face a public choice between peace and justice, on the one hand; and military confrontation and war and injustice, on the other. We should like to believe that none of our countries represented here wishes to be associated, through its acts, with the persistent Israeli defiance of the world community and the very principles of the Charter.

41. As members of the Security Council in particular, we have a very heavy duty to discharge in our primary responsibility of maintaining international peace and security. If we are to face and live up to that duty, we cannot but at the very least condemn, unreservedly and most vehemently, the raids perpetrated by Israel and the sinister motives behind them, and—which goes without saying—demand that Israel desist from any further acts of provocation against the Arab States and the Palestinians.

42. My delegation calls upon those States which have influence on Israel to prevail upon it to change its intransigence and pay heed to the decisions of the Council; for if Israel persists in its current postures, and if such actions are given encouragement, then certainly the Middle East will be rapidly heading towards a further military confrontation, with all its tragic consequences. If Israel entertains the belief that it can continue with impunity to feast on its illegal territorial acquisitions and to flout the rights of the Palestinians, it is certainly indulging in an exercise of self-delusion; for the truth is that the more Israel commits these crimes against its Arab neighbours and the Palestinians—crimes which clearly fly in the face of the Charter and the opinion of the rest of the entire world—the more Israel invites upon itself the inevitable fate of all those whose policies are based on injustice.

43. It is in the light of the foregoing that my delegation is a co-sponsor of draft resolution S/11898, so ably and eloquently introduced by my brother and colleague, the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon. It is the firm belief of my dele-

gation that this draft represents the minimum of action expected of the Council, considering the magnitude and dimension of this latest Israeli aggression against Lebanon.

44. Mr. MOYNIHAN (United States of America): At the outset of this present debate in the Security Council concerning the complaints of Lebanon and Egypt about Israeli raids into Lebanon, the United States spoke briefly but, we hope, consistently—consistent with a position we have maintained throughout the long and often heartbreaking duration of this conflict, which is nearly coeval with the existence of the United Nations itself; and we stated that we considered that all loss of innocent human life was reprehensible and that we were prepared to deplore, in strong terms, such loss of life, whether it occurred from the acts of Governments or from the acts of organized groups. We made no distinction—as, indeed, no distinction could be made with respect to value or worth—between the loss of the life of a Lebanese child and the loss of the life of an Israeli, or Syrian, or Egyptian child. We asked on that occasion if it were not possible for the Council to join in this perception which all of us share. None of us around this Council table think otherwise; none of the nations or organizations represented at this table would share a different view. We said that:

“We are prepared to support an appropriate resolution which registers the strongest disapproval by the Council of all acts of violence in the Middle East, particularly those which result in the death of innocent civilians, and which calls on all parties to refrain from any action that might endanger peace negotiations.” [1860th meeting, para. 4.]

45. Now, we said that in our capacity as a member of the Council, but I think it will be granted that ours is a special concern in this regard, owing simply to the fact that we are the member of the Council which is seeking, in the role of mediator, to bring about peace. We are trying to mediate this seemingly unending conflict, and we cannot see the role of mediator as in any way advanced by a one-sided resolution, a resolution which would persuade one or another party that an imbalance had occurred, that an injustice was being done. It is only the even-handedness of the United Nations, just as it is the even-handedness of the mediator, that bears any promise of success.

46. In the past, the Council has seen and understood and acted upon this fundamental requirement of responsible behaviour, to wit, the requirement of even-handedness and balance. The most recent occasion on which a Security Council draft resolution of this kind had been before us was in April of 1974, when we adopted resolution 347 (1974), in a context not dissimilar from the present context:

violence and counter-violence; violence, counter-violence and then violence counter to that. It is not new to human history, certainly not to that of the Middle East.

47. On that occasion the Council acted in a manner which was resolute but fair, concrete but balanced. Resolution 347 (1974) was adopted by 13 votes to none in opposition—such that the whole of the Council may be said to have approved that course of action; and nothing, a year and a half later, should suggest to us that there was anything imprudent about what we did. On the contrary, it stands as an example of responsible behaviour seeking effective results. We all know this. There is no Government at this table that does not know this, and it is not required of me to do anything more than to say what we also all know, which is that the draft resolution before us is not balanced; it will not be perceived as fair; it will not advance the cause of peace. To that extent it cannot be seen as responsible.

48. We speak not just as a Government, but as a Government seeking to bring peace in the role of mediator. That is our role in the Middle East. It is never an easy one. We find ourselves called upon to make pleas to you for perspective and balance in a matter and at a time in which we fully understand that there are Governments at this table that do not feel balanced at the moment. And we can understand why they would not. Yet we, as mediators, say: "Even so, it is not the moment that matters, it is the progress we are making towards a just and lasting peace; and the question is, will the action we take today add to that progress, encourage it, facilitate it, or will it do otherwise?"

49. Therefore, the United States, the mediator country, would like to suggest two simple amendments to the draft resolution before us. We have asked the Secretariat to circulate the amendments without delay. I am sure it is doing its very best, as it always does—and here, indeed, they are.

50. Now, these are not unfamiliar amendments. On the contrary, the language will be familiar to you, Mr. President, and to a number—to most, in fact—of the members of the Council, for the very simple reason that most of the members of the Council have already voted for them. These amendments have won the approval of every permanent member of the Council; they won the approval of all the members elected to the Council who were here last year, and they won the approval of all other elected members who were there at that time, with the exception of one permanent and one elected member that chose not to participate in the vote. But with respect to all the participating nations, the vote was unanimous.

51. The amendments [S/11901] read simply. The United States would add to the operative part of the

present draft resolution, which has three paragraphs, a fourth and a fifth. Paragraph 4 would read:

"4. *Condemns* all acts of violence, especially those which result in the tragic loss of innocent civilian life, and urges all concerned to refrain from any further acts of violence;"

Paragraph 5 would read:

"5. *Calls upon* all parties to refrain from any action which might endanger negotiations aimed at achieving a just and lasting peace in the Middle East."

I repeat, these are operative paragraphs which the Security Council has already voted upon; it did so in a similar situation—or a not dissimilar situation—a year and a half ago. There is no one present at this table who opposed those paragraphs.

52. The purpose of paragraph 4 of the operative part would be, very simply, to provide balance as to those acts which we condemn, reflecting nothing more than our true feelings and our stated position, that we condemn all acts of violence. I cannot imagine that any Government would not be willing to condemn and deplore violence which leads to the loss of innocent lives; and I simply point out that there is not a Government at this table which did otherwise when faced with the possibility—more than the possibility, the necessity—of doing so a year and a half ago.

53. Finally, paragraph 5 would call upon all parties to refrain from any action that would endanger the negotiations aimed at achieving a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. I remind you, those negotiations have not failed in the year and a half since the relevant resolution was adopted; on the contrary, extraordinarily difficult, dense, but in the end successful, negotiation has brought conditions of peace, the absence of violence, and stability to the Sinai, and similar efforts are soon to be undertaken, we cannot doubt, with respect to the Syrian-Israeli border, and the relations of those two States.

54. In those circumstances, in the name of sanity, in the name of peace, the United States proposes these amendments and asks for a vote thereon.

55. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United States of America has moved two amendments to the draft resolution at present before us. As I understand the procedure of the Security Council, those two amendments should be taken up separately, and we should therefore commence with such debate as the Council thinks right and proper on the first amendment, namely to add the new operative paragraph 4. I would propose that after the conclusion of the debate on the first amendment, we proceed to vote on it. I would propose that we then

take up the second amendment, upon which any member of the Council could, of course, freely express his views. I would then propose to move to the vote on that second amendment.

56. In relation to the first amendment, I should inform the Council that I have received a request from the representative of Saudi Arabia to take part in this debate. As a procedural matter, it would seem appropriate that he should take part in the debate on the new operative paragraph 4. It will, I am sure, not inhibit him from expressing any views that he would wish to put before the Council. May I take it, therefore, that that procedure is agreeable to the Council as a whole? As I hear no objection, I invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to take a place at the Council table.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) took a place at the Council table.*

57. The PRESIDENT: The Council will now proceed to a discussion on the first amendment [S/11901] to draft resolution S/11898, which is to have a new operative paragraph 4.

58. Mr. OYONO (United Republic of Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): I have asked for the floor not only on my own behalf but as a spokesman of the non-aligned members of the Council. We have listened with very great interest to the statement made by the representative of the United States concerning the two proposed draft amendments, the text of which has just been communicated to us.

59. I should like, first of all, to state for the benefit of the Council that this is a piece of goods that the representative of the United States had already tried to sell us under cover, and with which we would have nothing to do. He knows full well that we have undertaken interesting exchanges on the subject and he is fully aware of our reaction to his amendment. It is rather strange that we are faced with this situation.

60. It is not because these amendments were adopted in connexion with draft resolutions dealing with a situation connected with Lebanon sometime in the past that we now have to introduce them in this new draft before the Council. And we all know that comparisons are not reasons.

61. And what is the United States representative proposing? Representatives who have spoken in the Council have been clear in their analysis of the events that have taken place in Lebanon. There is no misunderstanding as to this question and as regards the party that is to be condemned. But the representative of the United States said a moment ago, in the corridors, that because of the situation that prevails in the region, why should we condemn Israel? We should condemn all acts of violence regardless of where they come from.

62. But in this instance we are dealing with an act of State terrorism perpetrated by a State on the territory of a State Member of the United Nations. If to condemn that State, we must water down that condemnation by invoking metaphysical concepts of violence, then I would say that this is neither intellectually, morally, nor politically admissible. It is for this reason that on behalf of the non-aligned members of the Council I state that we oppose the most categorical *non-possumus* to these amendments proposed by the representative of the United States.

63. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia.

64. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I feel heartened by the presence in the Security Council chair of a noted parliamentarian who has so far conducted the deliberations on this question with justice and equity, although I must say that he must have been irked, like many of us, at the protracted consultations that have been taking place. We were waiting for those consultations to yield fruit.

65. But I find that I was hoping against hope. Our colleague from the United States kept us guessing for a couple of days as to what he would do. I must thank him for having come out now with his two amendments because they make the situation patently clear, in the sense that his argument—and he is a professor, and here I must talk to a professor—revolves around the premise that the United States should continue to act as mediator. In other words, the representative of the United States is arrogating to himself, and to the Government he represents, the role of mediator. How can the United States, which is a *parti pris*, as the French say, consider themselves as mediators? Is it by virtue of the world power, my good Mr. Moynihan, that you wield, you and the Russians? You consider yourselves as mediators when since 1947, at Lake Success, you caused the partition of Palestine, and ever since, year in, year out—you were in short pants then—you have been supporting Israel. Why? How can you be mediators?

66. There must be two considerations. First, because you consider Israel as a bastion of alleged democracy in the Middle East, democracy which has been ritualized and institutionalized. Secondly, as was mentioned by the representative of Iraq—he quoted [*para. 33 above*] from the book of our friend, your predecessor, and no doubt your friend too, Mr. Yost—the Zionists bring pressure on your Government, on your Senate, on your Congress, and you seem to be helpless. Why not come out with the truth and say, we cannot be with justice; after all we would like to be with justice. I know that the United States is a fair country. The people are fair. I have lived amongst you for 35 years. You are a decent fellow but for the epithets you sometimes use. Why do you not come out with it? You want to wield

world power? Well, there is the Soviet Union also which wants to wield power. But they are cleverer than you. They are astute; they are watching you, you see, everywhere. More power to them if they can play that game. Do not think you are very skilful at that game. They have been more skilful than you since the days of the Czar. It is in them.

67. I shall not say anything about our British friends because of the respect I have for that gentleman who is sitting in the chair. Both you and the British, or, rather, the British and you, created Israel. What for? Shall we repeat and reiterate the old arguments, historical arguments, religious arguments, that do not hold water—religious arguments because Israel flourished there. So did Christianity; so did Islam, which identifies itself with the Holy Land of Palestine.

68. If you go by the democratic yardstick, there are 16 million Jews, most of whom are not Zionists; I daresay may be 14 million or 13 million of them would like to be left alone, not to be always doggedly indoctrinated by Zionists that "God gave you Palestine". And for the hundredth time I say, since when was God in the real estate business to parcel out land and give it to one people or the other? Since when? This fundamentalist approach to the Bible is *passé*. God does not parcel out land, for none other than King David said "The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof".

69. My good friend Mr. Moynihan, the other day mentioned, out of context, the argument of the Zionists that God gave them Palestine. If God gave them Palestine, and they are the chosen people of God, then God is a discriminator, and discrimination is being fought in almost every committee of the United Nations.

70. The United States might say that Israel is a *fait accompli*, and that the United States has responsibility as a big Power. Of course it is a big Power. So is the Soviet Union. Why is the Soviet Union not championing Israel? It is championing the justice that they think is due to the people who were dislodged. I am not digressing. I am coming to the core of the amendments of the United States representative today. I like Mr. Moynihan very much, but I must say he is misguided, and becoming emotional, swept by the emotionalism of the Zionists around him. Seventy-five United States Senators toed the line and voted for Israel.

71. In 1922, when Palestine was declared a mandated Territory by the League of Nations, there were hardly six or seven per cent Jews among the population and Mr. Woodrow Wilson, before he came President, initiated the principle of self-determination, which it fell to me and some of my colleagues between 1948 and 1956 to elaborate into a fully-fledged right which figures in the international

Covenants on Human Rights and is enshrined as a principle not only in the Charter, but also in many resolutions adopted by the United Nations.

72. In 1967 I happened to be in Geneva, just before the June war; His late Majesty King Faisal was there and the late General de Gaulle invited His Majesty to have luncheon with him in Paris—General de Gaulle, that illustrious man who at one time was maligned by the Zionists for wanting to be independent in the policies of France on this question. His Majesty asked if I would like to go too, but I had just arrived from the United States, so I remained in Geneva. General de Gaulle said to His Majesty, "The poor Jews suffered a lot in Europe, and it is a *fait accompli*", and His Majesty replied, "When the Nazis invaded your country, General, did you consider that a *fait accompli*?" and he said "You have a point. I can say nothing."

73. This *fait accompli* theory will not survive as long as the *fait accompli* is based on injustice, on the usurpation of the rights of a people robbed of their homeland.

74. There was no problem between the Arabs and the Jews, between the Palestinians and the Jews. I have said that time and again, and it bears repetition in the Council. I told the United States Secretary of State once, and he said he did not know this, that many of the Palestinians, after the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D., became Christians; and later, when Byzantium ruled the area again, the Byzantines used Christianity as a motive for their political and economic ends and usurped the rights of the Christians, many of whom had been Jews, because there were Aramaians and others who embraced Christianity.

75. Many Jews embraced Christianity. Who were the disciples of Christ but Jews—Peter, Paul, Matthew, Mark and Luke, and others who are not named in the New Testament? What did they do? They got tired of that type of Christianity that was used to dominate them, and when Islam appeared on the horizon many embraced Islam, to escape from that *ersatz*, if I may use the word, Christianity as practised by the Byzantines; and those who are called refugees are, ethnologically, many of them the Jews of the land, our brothers. And then who came but the Khazars who had been converted to Judaism in the eighth century A.D., on account of the balance of power, such as the United States is practising with our friends the Russians nowadays. Our friend the representative of China calls it hegemony. Call it whatever you will, but what have they done? They said, "Leave those pagans who settled in the first century A.D. Let us not have them become either Christians or Moslems, because they will upset the balance of power". There were a few rabbis there, so they went and converted them to Judaism. They never saw Palestine. They never laid eyes on Palestine. I have researched Mr. Herzl, and those who espoused

the *Judenstaat*, and found that their forbears were converts; they never saw Palestine.

76. Mr. Moynihan happens to be descended from the Irish. The Irish are good Christians; and the English, many of them, are good Christians. Does that make them Semites, because they have a semitic religion? Does it make our Nigerian brothers, who are Moslems, Semites because they have a Semitic religion? The Khazars had a Semitic religion, but they were not Semites. There is no such thing as Jewish blood, or Arab blood, or Irish blood. The Americans are not Semites, nor are the British. The Sudanese are Semites, because Arabism became a way of life.

77. So one cannot just use religion as a motivation for political and economic ends, just because of what the late President Truman did. God have mercy on his soul. One day I will tell him when we meet in the hereafter what trouble he created. We warned him through Mr. Stettinius, through Mr. Acheson, Mr. Rusk and many others. I have been here since the beginning, and the State Department has always said "We made a mistake". The mistake has been increased, compounded. I say to my dear friend Mr. Moynihan, "What are you espousing?" The cause of Israel, because it is an outpost of your so-called American democracy.

78. Does democracy constitute that wooden box? You said there is no alternative. Maybe it is the best. But why should you interfere in our area? What have we done to you, you Americans? When I was a young fellow I used to malign the poor English, poor not in pocket but in the sense that I pitied them. Those colonialists, the stiff upper lip, the aristocracy, they would say "God in the heavens and the American on earth". We loved you. Why should you interfere in our affairs? Why?

79. Do you want a balance of power? All right, we will appeal to our friend here. Mr. Malik is your brother—in humanity if not in ideology. In humanity we are all brothers. Even the Zionists are our brothers in humanity.

80. And that Zionist newspaper—*The New York Times*—when I said "If they become the scapegoats, I will be the first to snatch them from the claws of those who want to hurt them", they said "Baroody said this with anti-Semitic undertones". The crooks.

81. We love you. We love the Russian people. We love everybody. We should love one another here. But what have we done to you, my dear Professor Moynihan, to interfere at a distance of 6,000 miles? Balance of power? All right, we will appeal to our Russian friends. You and the Russians "Hands off the Holy Land of Palestine". And we will live in peace; and maybe then we can make a deal with the Zionists through none other than those whose land

was usurped. We will never make a deal behind the backs of the Palestinians. Never! And as long as there are Palestinians, do not lose your breath and come with all these amendments of yours.

82. What if you veto this resolution? You will alienate yourself. People will say "Look, the American veto; either their Government wants to alienate the Arabs, or they want to curry more favour with the Zionists". And I feel sorry for the Jews because you are endangering the Jews everywhere in the world. And they are human beings, they want to be left alone and to be loyal to their country of birth or adoption. But you do not leave them alone, or they do not leave you alone. I do not know which. It is a vicious circle.

83. I am talking to an honest professor, because you are a scholar. Do not get mixed up in politics. I have been at it since I was seventeen; I was never a politician. It is a dirty game. Do not let anybody sell you any bill of goods that Palestine was given to the Zionists. No, Sir.

84. And to return to that *fait accompli*—this does not work. Do you remember the French maquis—the maquisards—you can find all kinds of inscriptions on walls: "Here died so-and-so for the love of France". And I see your language has improved a little bit today; you say "groups" instead of "terrorists". He does not look like a terrorist, this fellow behind me here. And see this bearded fellow? They call him Santa Claus. I spoke to Arafat and he told me time and again: "We would live with them if our rights are not usurped".

85. And now we come to Lebanon. I caught on immediately when you read your amendments. You used the words "even-handed". Our friend, Mr. Goldberg, used those words in the context of the Palestinian question: "even-handed". And here you say: "Add the following new operative paragraph 4" "and urges all concerned". All concerned includes Lebanon, too. Has Lebanon done any wrong to any of its neighbours? The poor Lebanese are fighting each other because many are pulling the strings. I am not going to embarrass them; some of them are seated around this table—not the people, but their Governments. Ask me, I will tell you.

86. Who drove the Palestinians to Lebanon, Syria and Jordan—and very few to Egypt, because of the desert? Who? The Zionists. After Deir Yassin. And after they blew up what? The King David Hotel. And after there were massacres. It was a land of pilgrimage. They lived peacefully, the Palestinians, they never killed a man, except perhaps once in a while when there was a crime of passion or some other crime. But who drove them into Lebanon? The Zionists. They confiscated their land and drove them to Lebanon.

87. Do not let them give you that argument that many Jews got scared in Arab lands and left. Israel does not speak for all the Jews, but they wanted to speak for them and they wanted to gather all the Jews—in Christendom and outside than Christendom—into Palestine; from the Euphrates to the Nile and from the Nile to the Euphrates. All this by association they want to consider the Holy Land of the Zionists. Abraham, our patriarch as well as theirs, is not the patriarch of all the monotheistic religions.

88. And what have we done to you—for the hundredth time—so that you can interfere and take sides? We do not want you to side with us, but leave us alone, for Heaven's sake, my good friend, Mr. Moynihan. If you want to be an arbitrator, how can you be an arbitrator and year in, year out send millions and billions in arms—and Skyhawks. I do not know what they call those planes; they rain destruction on the Lebanese and on the other Arab people. How can you say your mediation is getting more difficult? You cannot be a mediator, you cannot be a judge, you are a *parti pris*. That is a good word.

89. Let us be honest with ourselves. If you want to play politics, then I would not waste my breath to reply to you. Why? Because essentially you are a decent man. In order to become a professor at Harvard, you must be a scholar, and a scholar searches after the truth, and I am giving you the elements of the truth so that you may know them. You are very intelligent, but you have no time to research everything. Ask me! Give me five minutes every day and I will coach you. And I will do it objectively.

90. Do not impress us with your use of epithets. I could use the epithets you use, but I do not want to use them. But I find a good deal of improvement. I congratulate ourselves on our good manners today. We all make progress. I make progress. I am not angry with Mr. Moynihan, I am pleased with him, because for once he shows you he is a gentleman. But he has lost his temper. I lose my temper too. But instead of losing my temper and calling such things a big lie, I pound my fist, it is better than calling names. Pound your fist. It will hurt you a little bit, but it is better than antagonizing people.

91. The amendment says “*Condemns* all acts of violence, especially those which result in the tragic loss” as if you are talking into the future. I am but a humble student of English, but to say “which result”, meaning in the future, is as if one were saying: “the past was past”. I am not saying I think you are right in having this amendment, but I think you meant to say, “*Condemns* all acts of violence,” especially those which have already occurred. In English you can say “which had resulted in the past, result now, or will result in the future”. It can be said, it is idiomatic. We will go back to our friend the President. That is what he means, I believe, by saying “which

result”. But here it is said “*Condemns* all acts of violence, especially those which result in the tragic loss” and “urges all concerned...”. Among the “all concerned” are the Lebanese. What have they done to the Zionist State of Israel? Have they encroached on them? The American policy draws on them. That is because they were frightened. They give you that line. I heard them say, “you know who sent them?”, and then they said it was the Arab leaders. I checked all the Arab Presidents and no Arab President said to the people of Palestine, “Come ye to Lebanon. We will fight”, because the Lebanese never fought anybody outside their border. Unfortunately now they are fighting each other because there are many foreign hands that are pulling strings. For your information, they never fought. They were known as the Canaanites or the Phoenicians by the Greeks, and whenever they were hard up they took to the sea. They established Marseilles, for your information. They mined tin from Ireland. Perhaps we are mixed up with you and that is why we are a little emotional. They had settlements in Ireland centuries before Christ. In Tunis, in Carthage—they never tried. But who encroached on them? The Romans encroached on them because they were prosperous in trade. But I will not digress now because that is history, which you know better than I.

92. Why do you not tell those Zionists that we do not hate them, although they have done a lot of harm, and I will tell our friends not to hate them and engage in rancour. If you want to be a mediator, do not bring pressure but persuade them instead of them persuading you about this fundamentalistic approach that God gave them Palestine; it is not a matter of self-determination, nor democracy, nor religious association, nor history.

93. Did you know that Jerusalem was called Salem-Uru—“Uru” means city and “Salem” means peace. And when Joshua, our Joshua, came, that is the Joshua of the Khazars who came from Europe and who converted to Judaism in the eighth century A.D., he stormed Jericho fifteen hundred years before Christ, 2,500 years earlier the Canaanites lived there. The Canaanites and the Jews were one and as I have mentioned time and again, Abraham had wives and concubines that were Canaanites from the tribes. We have no quarrel with the Jews. The quarrel is with those who use Judaism as a motivation for a political and economic end.

94. At one time, during the Crusades, Catholicism used religion as a motivation for a political and economic end. The Borgias also used the Caliphate at one time to spread their supremacy over non-Arab Moslems. That is nothing new. Now is the turn of whom? Now it is the turn of the Khazars, the Central European Jews. That is passé, that is finished.

95. Do you want peace? We do not want to kill the Jews. Persuade them to listen to reason, otherwise

they will not survive for long. But it will not be through extinction, throwing them into the sea. We Arabs speak allegorically. We speak in poetry. Who is going to throw people into the sea? They live there and finally they will intermarry. But that is their trouble, they do not want to marry their beautiful girls to our men, or our beautiful girls to their men. They will dissolve. They will assimilate. But let them keep their religion. There is nothing wrong with that, it is a question of the conscience. For Heaven's sake, you Americans desist because we love you and do not want you to get into trouble.

96. I am sure the Russians want to make peace with you. They are importing from you and you are exporting to them. What do you export—gold? They import wheat. The only ones who understand us without having an axe to grind are the Chinese. One day I should like the Americans, the Chinese and the Russians to become brothers instead of each trying also to engage in that antiquated game of balance-of-power and spheres of influence which will backfire. The world is becoming decadent.

97. Therefore, withdraw these amendments. They are not good at all. You cannot be an arbiter. You do not have to persuade our Jewish friends from our area as we have a *rapport* with those from our area. They call me every now and then and say, "Why are the Zionists doing this to us?" I say to them, "Go and ask them". We are friends. But try and tell those Central European and Eastern European Khazars, who are Jews, to listen to reason and seek acceptance in the area, because sooner or later they will not survive.

98. The Crusaders stayed for a couple of hundred years, but now things go faster. With American and Russian weapons of mass destruction we may have a holocaust. Is it worthwhile? There is so much beauty in life, in nature, in poetry, in art, in literature, in friendship and in family. What do you want to do? Just because you grew strong after two world wars—who told you to get into those two world wars? Your forbears came from Europe not to be entangled but you entangled yourselves. You cannot be isolationists. The world is one world since Wilkie wrote a book about it. America has 6 per cent of the world's population. You cannot lord it. There should be *rapport* and you, Mr. Moynihan, are the man to bring it about. So why not say "Professor Moynihan turned a new page". I like you because you are unorthodox in your approach—I do not mean in a literal sense. I hear that you have a following in the United States. The Zionists love you because you mentioned some epithets that were inappropriate. But let us forget that, that is of the past. Now you can play a role and bring those people here.

99. Does this gentleman look like a terrorist? No, he is decent. I spoke to him, not because he happens to be an Arab. His name is Basil Aql. "Basil" means

"courageous" and "Aql" means "mind". He has a courageous mind. Our Arabic names have meaning. The name fits the character, and I have known many of them. I have remonstrated with the Palestinians since the days of the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem when he told me that they wanted a flag and a State and they wanted to drive us out. It was in 1925—before you were born—that I went to Jerusalem. I was twenty years old. Pound some good sense into them. These Zionists are intelligent, they are not dumb. Tell them that if they want to seek acceptance they should make it up with the Palestinians and should either assimilate the Palestinians or the Palestinians should assimilate them with a tolerance for religion. It is the same God, the same prophets. What is the difference? They have technology and so everybody will benefit.

100. For Heaven's sake withdraw these amendments. Even if there is an excuse for you to cast a veto, it does not mean anything. The movement will still be there. Unfortunately, the fighting will be there. I am not trying to condemn one or the other, and all this phraseology does not get us anywhere.

101. I have been here 30 years, my good friend. So instead of playing the role of partisanship, play the role of personal mediator as a human being, not only as an American, because you happen to be an American. And I think you got what you wanted from the President. Go and tell him Baroody said this. Your President made a speech when you were not here about oil and food-stuffs. And I told him when we shook hands with him in the Indonesian lounge, that it cost me \$10 for a lunch here, and a barrel of oil costs \$10 or so. "You use it", I said, "Mr. President, for several weeks maybe. What are you griping about? By the end of the day I may be hungry. It runs your car". He said, "What do you say, Henry"? I said, "Now you discuss it with your Secretary. He is a reasonable man". He was amenable. He did not take issue. So put your heads together with the Zionists and say, "Baroody told us there is no future for the Zionists unless the Palestinian right of self-determination is observed". And I will bet you anything, before you get to be my age you will be a hero to both Arab and Jew in the Holy Land of Palestine.

102. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the procedure that the Security Council agreed to, I propose now to move to the voting procedure on the first of the two amendments moved by the United States. Does any delegation wish to explain its vote on this amendment before the vote?

103. I call on the representative of Italy for a point of order.

104. Mr. VINCI (Italy): From the statements which have been made until now, it is my understanding that we risk being stuck on the discussion of this issue and being unable to take any action which can

be fruitful. In other words, I believe that in spite of the consultations that have been carried on throughout the day, we have not got to a point where we can see the possibility or chance of some resolution which will be voted on and adopted.

105. In spite of what my good friend, Mr. Baroody, has said, the fact that we will be faced with a resolution which will be rejected, not because it failed to have a majority—I am sure it will have the majority—but because it would not be useful. It would even be of some damage. I have in mind especially the prospect of the debate which we will have in January. Speaking for my delegation and for myself, we are looking forward to the debate which could produce a very comprehensive review of the Middle Eastern situation, including the Palestinian question, at that moment. And it is my strong conviction that a positive conclusion or outcome of the discussion on this particular case would certainly increase the chances of a good discussion at that stage. I think it would certainly show a great sense of responsibility on all sides. It would be a good sign, a positive sign coincident with the very first time the representative of the PLO has sat at this table, and altogether open much better prospects than we could look for today.

106. This is why I would move for an adjournment until tomorrow morning in order to give us a little more time. We did it on several occasions before and we never regretted it, because we always came out with a positive conclusion. I do not see why we should not try again. We have been rather inactive for two days. I do not think it would waste our time. It would give us a better chance if we had 12 hours more to have discussions among ourselves for our final consultation and see if we can come out with something which will give the Council the possibility of a very positive and constructive outcome.

107. I made clear the position of my delegation, I think, when I made my first statement on 4 December [1859th meeting]. We did not conceal our condemnation of the actions which the Israelis have carried out against the territory of Lebanon, inflicting death on so many innocent victims. We certainly have that in mind and we will never forget it. But I think we have to look more to the future because, unfortunately, we cannot call back to life those poor persons who have been sacrificed. So why not look to the future? Why not give us one more chance, 12 hours more, to see if we can bring about a positive outcome? So, I would move for an adjournment just until tomorrow morning.

108. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Italy has moved to adjourn the meeting to tomorrow morning. As I understand it, that is a motion under rule 33, paragraph 3, and under the terms of the provisional rules of procedure that is debatable.

109. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq): My delegation has listened very carefully to the motion just made by the

representative of Italy. We find no reason for us to adjourn until tomorrow. The text of our draft resolution was made available to all the members of the Council on Friday. It was decided in principle that we should vote in this draft resolution today. We have had extensive consultations throughout the day, separately and jointly, with the parties interested in this draft resolution. As has been explained by our colleague, the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon, unfortunately these consultations did not narrow the gap between the two positions explained during this debate.

110. Frankly, we see no hope of arriving at an agreed draft resolution between the two positions even if we adjourned the meeting beyond tomorrow. You know better than everybody else on the Council, Mr. President, that there are many other pressing matters that require the immediate attention of the Council. We would oppose any motion to adjourn the voting on the draft resolution before us today.

111. The PRESIDENT: Under the provisional rules of procedure, a motion to adjourn the meeting takes precedence over the other business which the Council is at that time considering. Unless any other member of the Council wishes to speak on the motion made by the representative of Italy, in accordance with the rules of procedure, I now propose to put to the vote the motion by the representative of Italy that the Council adjourn further consideration of this issue until tomorrow morning.

*A vote was taken by a show of hands.*

*In favour:* Costa Rica, France, Italy, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Against:* Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Guyana, Iraq, Mauritania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania.

*Abstaining:* Japan.

*The result of the vote was 6 in favour, 8 against, with 1 abstention.*

*The proposal was not adopted, having failed to obtain the affirmative votes of 9 members.*

112. The PRESIDENT: I now propose to put to the vote the first amendment submitted by the representative of the United States of America.

113. I call on the representative of Iraq to explain his vote before the vote on the first amendment submitted by the United States of America.

114. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq): My delegation feels that the amendments put forth by the representative of the

United States seek, in fact, to equate the party that has perpetrated the present act of aggression with the victims of that aggression. We are all here gathered because of the complaint made by the representative of Lebanon. We do not know of other acts of violence connected with that particular aggression perpetrated against Lebanon; even the party that perpetrated the present act of aggression, namely, Israel, has not tied it to any other act in the area. My delegation, therefore, will not participate in the vote on this amendment.

115. The PRESIDENT: Does any other member of the Council wish to speak in order to explain his vote before the vote on the first amendment submitted by the United States of America? Since no one wishes to speak, I now propose to move to the vote. The vote is to adopt the new operative paragraph 4 set forth in document S/11901.

*A vote was taken by a show of hands.*

*In favour:* Costa Rica, France, Italy, Japan, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Guyana, Mauritania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania.

*The result of the vote was 7 in favour, none against, with 6 abstentions.*

*The amendment was not adopted, having failed to obtain the affirmative votes of 9 members.*

*Two members (China and Iraq) did not participate in the voting.*

116. The PRESIDENT: That disposes of the first of the two amendments submitted by the United States of America. I now propose to move on to the discussion of the second amendment. Does any member of the Council wish to address the Council before we move into the voting procedure on the second amendment submitted by the United States?

117. Since no member wishes to speak, I propose to move into the voting procedure. Does any member of the Council wish to explain his vote before the vote? Since there is none, I propose, therefore, to put to the vote the second amendment submitted by the United States of America, namely, that we should add to the draft resolution the new operative paragraph 5 in the document S/11901.

*A vote was taken by a show of hands.*

*In favour:* Costa Rica, France, Italy, Japan, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Guyana, Mauritania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania.

*The result of the vote was 7 in favour, none against, with 6 abstentions.*

*The amendment was not adopted, having failed to obtain the affirmative votes of 9 members.*

*Two members (China and Iraq) did not participate in the voting.*

118. The PRESIDENT: I now propose, to put to the vote the draft resolution, unamended, as submitted by Guyana, Iraq, Mauritania, United Republic of Cameroon and United Republic of Tanzania, contained in document S/11898. Does any member of the Council wish to address the Council in explanation of vote before the vote? Since there are none, I now, therefore, propose to put this draft resolution to the vote.

*A vote was taken by a show of hands.*

*In favour:* Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, France, Guyana, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mauritania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania.

*Against:* United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Costa Rica.

*The result of the vote was 13 in favour, one against, with one abstention.*

*The draft resolution was not adopted, the negative vote being that of a permanent member of the Council.*

119. The PRESIDENT: A number of delegations have asked to speak in explanation of their vote after the vote. The first speaker is the representative of Italy, on whom I now call.

120. Mr. VINCI (Italy): On 4 December [*ibid.*] I already had the opportunity to explain the position of the Italian delegation on the complaint made by Lebanon. I stated in particular our firm condemnation of the "preventive" raids by Israeli aircraft on defenceless Lebanese villages and on Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon. The same condemnation had been voiced the day before in Rome, where it was especially felt that no one could overlook the gravity

of the action carried out by Israel against a friendly country like Lebanon, which is going through a troublesome stage of its history; a country, furthermore, whose political and territorial integrity is essential to a just and lasting settlement in the Near East. I do not think I need to say more on the substance of the matter. I would rather restrict myself to a brief explanation of the vote I have just cast on behalf of the Italian delegation.

121. We share, of course, the shock of the sponsors of the draft resolution over the raids which have taken an exceptionally high toll of human lives, especially among women and children. We regret, however, that the wording they have used in their text was somehow removed from the general context of the situation in the Middle East. The omission of any reference to the well-known background of this tragic incident made it less acceptable to my delegation. In other words, while we have been ready to strongly condemn the Government of Israel for the air attacks against Lebanon, I feel duty bound to state once again that we also condemn all acts of violence in the Middle East, wherever they take place and from whichever side they are undertaken.

122. Therefore, we cannot fail to condemn, for example, the recent fedayeen attacks in the centre of Jerusalem which caused the deaths of six innocent adolescents and wounded over 30 others. It is with horror, indeed, that we heard that a second explosive charge was discovered on 12 November by some school children in Jerusalem near a large food market [see S/11878]; fortunately, it was defused before exploding. We would have therefore liked to see the sponsors,—while taking note of the most recent casualties, also make reference to previous casualties as well, so that the memory of the innocent fallen on both sides might not be forgotten. We believe that it is good policy not only to make the right move at the right moment, but also to show at the same time human understanding and solidarity with the suffering of innocent persons, regardless of at whose door you can place, in each case, the responsibility for all of the wrongdoing.

123. That is the reason why we regret in some way that on one side some of the amendments, at least part of the amendments proposed by the representative of the United States were not adopted, and that we failed to adopt any action on this particular issue.

124. In my view, it would have sounded a positive note if, as I said before, this first time that the representative of the PLO has sat at the Council table, we might have had something acceptable to all, and opening better prospects for constructive deliberations in January, when we reconvene for a comprehensive review of the whole Middle East situation, including the Palestinian question. These are the simple reasons why, as I said, we supported the amendments proposed by the United States delegation. And my

delegation, for the same reasons, was ready to support some smaller changes, taking obviously into account the substantial difference between the present case and what occurred in April 1974. May I conclude by saying that I also regret that we did not have more time to try to reach a more satisfactory conclusion of our deliberations this time.

125. Mr. SALAZAR (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The country my delegation represents does not believe in violence as a means of solving problems between men and between nations. We have repeatedly declared, in respect of the problems before us, that as a peaceful country that has no armed forces, it is imperative that we oppose anything that in any way encourages the use of violence. For the same reason, we have always believed in peaceful settlement as the only means of dealing with disputes.

126. Nevertheless, some may say that I am speaking of something else; that here we are considering a condemnation of Israel for its perpetration of an act of violence that has taken a heavy toll of dozens of innocent civilian victims. This is something my delegation regrets and deplors. It was the insensate product of violence. Whether perpetrated by a State or by terrorist bands, it is nonetheless violence that has broken out into a dispute.

127. My delegation considers this violence to be the root-cause of the deterioration of the situation in the Middle East, and does not minimize its effects merely because at times it is committed by irregular forces; nor do we consider it more serious when it is supported officially by any Government. Let no one believe that we are hereby trying to minimize the extremely serious view my delegation takes of the recent Israeli air-raids which resulted in many dozens of innocent victims.

128. Far from it: we must declare categorically that we fully disagree with such actions: we are shocked by the number of victims and we sympathize with their loved ones. But with equal candour, in order not to judge such actions unjustly or improperly, we must remember that these deplorable acts must be viewed within the context of the complex Middle East problem. Different aspects of this problem have been considered by the Security Council for nearly three decades, which bears witness to the fact that we are faced not with a recent problem but rather with a complex situation that has many antecedents. Be that as it may, my delegation wishes to make it clear that we are not making this reference to the past with any intention of repeating accusations or indulging in recriminations, or, even less, of reviving hatreds or resentments. In our view, we must look to the past in order to stress that we are faced with an old problem which in all its stages must be approached in terms of all its dimensions.

129. Hence the grave events which we deplore today should be rationally considered in terms of the over-

all problem of the Middle East. We believe that violence, which we constantly repudiate, has been used repeatedly both by Israel and its counterpart in the most reprehensible way: leading to the loss of innocent lives. We would merely be departing from reality were we to emphasize the violence used by only one of the parties and to shut our eyes to it when it comes from the other side. That is the justification for our having abstained from voting on the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned countries, although we do not ignore the fact that it was relevant to condemn Israeli action.

130. Moreover, the draft contained no reference to what might be regarded as a condemnation of violence as generated by the Israeli counterpart. My delegation believes that merely with the introduction of the amendments proposed by the representative of the United States the draft would have been acceptable to us.

131. I would now revert to what I said at the beginning of my statement: violence cannot replace peaceful settlement. If those responsible for this tragedy would reflect, they might feel that perhaps it is not too late to do what they should have done from the very outset: that is to say, talk matters over, negotiate, and seek solutions through peaceful means which take account of the just aspirations of all the peoples of that region.

132. Mr. RYDBECK (Sweden): Sweden voted for the draft resolution S/11898. In so doing, the Swedish delegation interpreted the fourth preambular paragraph, which refers to all previous relevant resolutions on the subject, as implying a clear rejection of all acts of violence, and as a call upon all parties to refrain from any actions which might endanger the efforts towards reaching a peaceful solution of the Middle East problem.

133. Mr. MOYNIHAN (United States of America): As has been clear in what I have said here tonight and what my delegation has done here today, this is an outcome which is disappointing to the United States. On 4 December [1859th meeting], when this matter first arose, we spoke briefly—plainly—and we asked for balance. All day long, as my friend the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon has said, we spoke in private meetings with other members of the Council, asking for some measure of balance in the draft resolution. We were not successful. We introduced measures familiar to the Council on behalf of our delegation which we thought would provide balance. The representative of Italy asked that we recess for 12 hours in order to talk further about the proposals, and we voted with five other members of the Council for such an adjournment, but it was not the wish of a majority.

134. Now, the United States strongly deplores the Israeli action which was brought to our attention by

the Governments of Lebanon and Egypt through the offices of their representatives, who are with us tonight. But we also believe that the problem of loss of innocent life resulting from incursions from Lebanon and other neighbouring States by Israel should also be condemned.

135. This is part of the cycle of violence with which we are dealing and which the United States, as a mediating Power, hopes to bring to an end. We worked strenuously for a balanced resolution and we have reluctantly had to veto the draft resolution as it now stands, which we made clear from the beginning we did not consider to be balanced.

136. The PRESIDENT: As there is no other Member of the Council wishing to speak in explanation of his vote after the vote, I should like to make a statement in my capacity as the representative of the UNITED KINGDOM.

137. Once again the Council has been called to consider an act of violence in the Middle East which has led to a tragic loss of life. This is not the first time that the Council has met to consider a Lebanese complaint against action undertaken by the State of Israel, the most recent occasion being in April 1974 [1769th meeting] when the Council adopted resolution 347 (1974). Since that time, the Government of Lebanon has submitted numerous letters to the Council complaining of further action by Israel against refugee camps in Lebanon and of violations of Lebanese territorial integrity. The Council has also received during the same period a number of letters from the Government of Israel complaining of acts of violence and terrorism undertaken by the PLO. The Israeli Government clearly believes that those acts have originated in and have emanated from Lebanese territory.

138. My Government has put on record many times its total condemnation of any and all violence in the Middle East, wherever it may take place and from whichever quarter it comes. We consider that such acts, involving as they do the loss of life and injury to innocent civilians cannot conceivably be justified. Nor can we accept the logic of those who say that the only answer to violence is more of the same kind. This senseless cycle of violence and counter-violence must be ended if there is to be any chance of a just and of lasting settlement in the Middle East.

139. It was against this background, therefore, that my Government approached the draft resolution on which we have just voted, which in its operative paragraph 1 condemns the Government of Israel for its air attacks against Lebanon. The information which we have received suggests that a total of some 90 people were killed in the attacks and over 150 were wounded. Many of those involved were women and children. The Israeli Minister for Defence explained on 3 December that these raids were aimed at

preventing sabotage attacks against Israel, in particular of the kind that have taken place in the past few weeks. We equally condemn those attacks and we regret the loss of life they have caused. We understand the deep emotions that they have aroused in Israel. For these reasons, we should have wished the resolution for which we have voted to have recognized the significance of those attacks too as part of the unhappy cycle of violence and counter-violence to which I have just referred, and we would have wished it to have expressed, as previous resolutions of the Council have done, our deep concern over, and our condemnation of, all acts of violence that endanger or take innocent lives. That is why we voted in favour of the two amendments proposed by the United States of America. We regret that they were not adopted by the Council. But although we regretted, and do regret, the lack of balance in the draft resolution, we accept that these previous attacks cannot justify in any way the recent raids by Israel and the scale of losses which they have caused. We do not accept that any Government has the right to take the law into its own hands in this way. It is particularly regrettable in our view, that this should have taken place at a time and in a manner which could put at risk the fragile peace and could damage the prospects of reconciliation in Lebanon, a country which has suffered such severe trials itself over the past few months.

140. It was for these reasons and despite the reservations which I have expressed concerning the lack of balance in the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned countries, that my Government decided to vote in favour of it. But, although we supported the action which it was proposed the Council should take, it is not, in our view, sufficient simply to condemn acts of violence in the Middle East; we should act to prevent them in the future. What was needed, therefore was a clear call from the Council to all the parties concerned in the Middle East, and not only to one side, that this violence should stop. If there is one thing that perhaps can be learnt from the history of the Middle East over the last 25 years, it is that nothing lasting and permanent can be achieved by violence of this sort. It only hardens the positions of both sides and makes the processes of negotiation even more difficult than they are at present. In our view, only when the violence has stopped will the parties be able to begin the real negotiations without which there can be no hope of a settlement.

141. My delegation has made clear on many occasions and in many forums the requirements, as we see them, for a just and lasting settlement. These are: Israeli withdrawal from territories occupied in 1967; the respect for the rights of all States, including Israel, to live in peace within secure and recognized borders; and the right of the Palestinian people to the expression of it national identity. My Government has declared its willingness to do anything which it can to promote negotiations towards a settlement on

these lines. What we ask again of both sides is that they should show the necessary statesmanship, moderation and restraint without which these goals cannot be achieved.

142. The representative of Lebanon has asked to make a statement, and I now call upon him.

143. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): I want my first words to be words of thanks and appreciation, first to the co-sponsors of the draft resolution, namely, Guyana, Iraq, Mauritania, the United Republic of Cameroon and the United Republic of Tanzania; and secondly, to those delegations, the overwhelming majority of the members of the Council, who have supported that draft resolution. The fact that it was not adopted does not, in our opinion, detract from its value. The condemnation is there, whether it was vetoed or not vetoed. It was a condemnation by 13 members of the Security Council.

144. My appreciation, and that of my Government and people, also go to all those delegations that have expressed words of warm friendship towards my country, especially in these trying days when we do, sincerely, need every friendly support. I shall not fail to convey to the Government of Lebanon and to the families of the victims the expressions of sympathy that have also been expressed around this Council table.

145. It is most regrettable that the United States has chosen to veto this draft resolution and to kill it. Our disappointment is all the greater because of the friendly relations which have always existed between Lebanon and the United States. We had every reason to expect from a friend, at this time, every moral and political support. The United States has on many occasions declared its support for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon. The sovereignty and the territorial integrity of Lebanon were brutally breached by a massive air attack by the Israeli air force. It was an opportunity for the United States to reconcile its vote with its pronouncements. I must add that those planes which have attacked Lebanon and Palestinian refugee camps situated in Lebanon were Skyhawks and Phantoms. I certainly would have liked to hear from the representative of the United States whether his Government, in its dealings with Israel, has placed any conditions on the use of those planes, or any other armaments supplied to Israel, against friendly countries such as Lebanon.

146. As I said, the draft resolution that was defeated may not have given us full satisfaction. It could perhaps have given us some moral or political solace. But certainly, had the Council adopted the draft resolution, it would not have deterred Israel from repeating its acts of aggression against Lebanon and the Arab countries.

147. The Council has on several occasions adopted various resolutions. As a matter of fact, we are here for the thirteenth time. Perhaps it is a bad omen. The Council has adopted resolutions containing condemnation and warnings: condemnation of Israel and warning the Government of Israel against a repetition of its acts against Lebanon. Those resolutions were only met by contempt and challenged by further acts of aggression.

148. We fail to understand why on every occasion, particularly on this occasion, an attempt is always made to tag on to a Lebanese complaint some extraneous matters. Israel is a Member of the United Nations. It has every prerogative to use the United Nations if it has any complaint. The doors of the Council are open to it. They are open to those delegations which support Israel. They can come at any time and to bring action against Lebanon, if Lebanon really is at fault. But to go and speak about other acts of violence in the area and equate them with premeditated acts of aggression, conceived, planned and executed by the Government of a State Member of the United Nations, in violation of the provisions of the Charter, is an injustice committed against Lebanon. Equanimity and balance should be sought for the sake of justice and not for injustice.

149. Now we are facing a very difficult situation. As I said, even had the Security Council adopted the draft resolution, perhaps our troubles with Israel would not have ended. For in our opinion there are only two ways to relieve Lebanon from these repeated onslaughts and the consequences of the Middle East problem. The first is to take specific measures under the Charter to prevent Israel from perpetrating further acts of aggression. The Council has never been able or enabled to do so, and tonight it was not even enabled to adopt a simple resolution of condemnation and warning. The second, and naturally the more desirable, course to follow is to bring about a lasting peace in the Middle East through a just settlement of all aspects of the Middle Eastern and Palestinian problems. The Council, and particularly those States active in the search for peace and a peaceful solution, must overcome the obstacles and obstructions that Israel constantly sets up on the road to peace.

150. Lebanon has undergone and is now going through one of the most tragic episodes in its history. Some aspects of our problem are internal and it remains for our Government and our people to solve them, but lest we forget, I must state here that the basic causes of our troubles in Lebanon fall within the context of the conflict of the Middle East.

151. From this angle we can determine that Israel was and remains the principal obstacle to the solution of the Palestinian problem and to peace. Since 1948 the United Nations has adopted scores of resolutions affirming the rights of the Palestinians to return to their homeland and many others advocating the peace-

ful settlement of the Middle East problem on the basis of Israel's withdrawal from the Arab territories occupied in the war of June 1967, namely, Sinai, the Golan Heights, the West Bank and the Arab sector of Jerusalem. Israel has stubbornly refused to abide by those resolutions and to respect international public opinion. It procrastinates now, as it has always done, in the search for a peaceful solution.

152. It is our firm belief that the solution of the Palestinian problem is of paramount importance to Lebanon. Since this problem arose in 1947 and until now, Lebanon has opened its doors to the Palestinians who were evicted from their homes and homelands by the Israeli invaders. Over 400,000 of them, in a country of only 2,500,000 people, were condemned to live in the misery of the refugee camps for 28 years. Does the international community wish to perpetuate their misery and, at the same time, to perpetuate the existence of the belts of misery around our major cities?

153. We must remember also that the Israeli attacks on southern Lebanon have created for my country another refugee problem, that of the Lebanese refugees who had to abandon their homes and their villages in southern Lebanon as a result of repeated Israeli attacks against that area. They also have to seek refuge in the vicinity of and around Beirut and other cities and towns. Such a situation was bound to have serious social and economic consequences for a small country which found itself unprepared to deal with such consequences.

154. Lebanon has never wavered in its total and loyal support of the cause of the Palestinian people and the Arab people. Its solidarity with them is unshaken. Its belief that the cause of the Palestinians is a just one has remained ever firm. There has never been a division in Lebanon, and there is none now—and I stress this point—regarding the rights of the Palestinians to nationhood in their homeland of Palestine. The Lebanese people, whether Christians or Moslems—and I stress that too—are one in this belief and feel that the time has come to do justice to the Palestinians 28 years after their expulsion from their homeland of Palestine.

155. You, Mr. President, and members of the Council around this table witnessed one of the finest expressions of support of Lebanon for the cause of the Palestinians last year, for the President of Lebanon himself, Mr. Suleiman Franjeh, was entrusted by the Arab Summit Conference with the mission of defending the Palestinian cause at the United Nations<sup>2</sup>. That trust was in keeping with the role that Lebanon has always played, is playing and will continue to play in the United Nations in defence of their cause, as well as that of the Arabs in general.

156. For the record I should like to repeat what I said here on 4 December:

“Lebanon has always maintained and reaffirms now that the problem of the Palestinian people constitutes the core of the problem of the Middle East, and that no solution to this problem can be effective and durable unless the Palestinian people exercise its inalienable rights, already recognized by the United Nations and, chief among them, their right to self-determination and nationhood. This aspect of the Middle East problem has been sidetracked for many years... The question is the restoration to the Palestinians of their basic rights in order that they may live in dignity and build their own future in a national homeland of their own and on their national soil. The international community must face this question fairly and squarely and swiftly and find the proper solution for it at the same time that it is seeking to find solutions to the other aspects of the Middle East problem. To leave this aspect unattended to is to invite the infliction of more tragedies on the peoples and countries of the Middle East, and to allow the situation to fester indefinitely.” [1859th meeting, para. 106.]

157. I should like to add that it is our firm conviction that the international community, and particularly the great Powers responsible for the creation of Israel on Arab land and for the calamity that befell the Palestinian people as a consequence, should assume a special responsibility not only towards the Palestinian people but also towards Lebanon. We believe that justice rendered to the Palestinians is justice rendered also to Lebanon and to the Lebanese people.

158. We have warned so often in the past of the grave dangers of the lack of a solution to the Palestinian problem for stability and peace in the Middle East. We shall not fail to emphasize, as strongly as we can, the importance of solving the Palestinian problem arising from the war of 1948. The Palestinians are entitled to have their long suffering and their dispersion terminated. They are entitled to enjoy, like any other people, a better life in their own State and on their own national soil of Palestine. The Arab States, mainly Egypt and Syria, which have made untold sacrifices, are equally entitled to live in peace and to devote their resources and their energies to building a better future for their peoples. They must not be subjected to the squandering of their resources indefinitely on defence spending. As far as my country is concerned, it also is entitled to live, to progress and to prosper in peace.

159. The nightmare of the Middle East problem, which has lasted too long, has projected itself on the Lebanese scene in all its dimensions. All of its repercussions have been focused and centred in Lebanon and have shaken its fragile institutions. Lebanon, which has constantly steered a moderate course, is caught in the web of the complexities and contradictions of the problem of the Middle East.

160. We have become the victims of circumstances, reaping the consequences of events not of our own making. The tragedy of Lebanon is an extension, an off-shoot, of tragedies long suffered by the Palestinians and the Arab States because of Israel's continued wars of aggression and her many attacks on Lebanon in particular.

161. We in Lebanon revolt against the fact that we have to pay a heavy price because of a lack of will and determination to solve the problem of the Middle East swiftly in all its aspects, however complex they may be. And our revolt is justified because our people are dying, our cities are being destroyed, our economic and social institutions turned to shambles, and because Lebanon's image as a land of moderation, peaceful coexistence, amity, culture, stability, security and peace, has been shattered.

162. Is this the fate to which my country—a country which has always been loyal to the United Nations—has been condemned? Because of the non-action of the United Nations, because of the unwillingness of the Security Council to act decisively to put an end to the tragedies of the Palestinian people and the Arab people, by delaying a solution to the problems of the Middle East, by failing to deal with the essential aspects of the entire conflict, we are condemning the Middle East and Lebanon to perpetual upheavals.

163. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Egypt.

164. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt): I should like to express Egypt's deepest regret that the Security Council was not able to pass a resolution condemning Israeli barbaric attacks against a sovereign country, Member of the United Nations, and against innocent Palestinian civilians in refugee camps. This is because of the American veto cast today. It is most unfortunate.

165. When Egypt, together with Lebanon, asked for an emergency meeting of the Security Council with the participation of the victims—the PLO—it did so with the certain belief that the highest organ of the United Nations, responsible for international peace and security, would not let this opportunity pass without letting the aggressor be clearly told that his acts of aggression cannot be condoned, or be allowed to pass without the strongest condemnation.

166. We believe that no one could but condemn this barbaric act which resulted in the tragic loss of dozens of human beings, including women and children. This is especially so because even Israel admitted that its air attacks were not in retaliation for any other acts, but rather a premeditated act of State terrorism. Israel may believe now that the Council condones its acts, and this could lead it to commit further acts of aggression. Even *Ha'aretz*, one of the Israeli

daily newspapers, expressed criticism of Israel's air strikes which, it said, were carried out with excessive force, and thereby increased the danger of inflicting casualties among civilians. *Ha'aretz* contended that there was no need to escalate action to a point where Israel is charged with responsibility for a massacre of civilians, and said that the price Israel will have to pay in terms of adverse reaction in the Western news media bears no relation to the border security achieved by the air strikes. Who ever planned the operation intended it against armed enemies, but the Government which approved it failed to calculate the other aspects and repercussions, according to *Ha'aretz*.

167. In my statement before the Council on 4 December [1859th meeting], I solemnly warned Israel that her acts could endanger the prospects of a just and durable peace in the Middle East. I hope that Israel will wisely heed this warning in the future. At the same time, it is a matter for satisfaction that the majority of our Council condemned this Israeli aggression in the most severe terms.

168. I should like to express my deepest satisfaction and appreciation to the majority of Member States in the Council who supported Egypt's request that the PLO take part in our deliberations, like any other Member State of the United Nations. By this wise act, the Council—despite all its shortcomings today—has shown that the true representatives of the Palestinian people will not be denied any opportunity to participate fully in any debate concerning the Palestinian question, and through this historic act, there will be no difficulty in the future for the PLO to take part in all Council deliberations concerning the Palestinian question and the Middle East problem. Despite the veto cast today, the whole world is witness to the breakthrough achieved by the PLO in the Council, the principal organ of the United Nations. By this action, a very important step was taken to show the whole world that the Security Council, after the General Assembly, recognized the PLO as the sole representative of the Palestinian people.

169. Let me conclude with a few words addressed to my distinguished brother and colleague, Mr. Ghorra of Lebanon. He can be sure that the vast majority of the Council is whole-heartedly with Lebanon, and with the Lebanese people and their Palestinian brothers who were brutally attacked by Israel. The day will certainly come when no aggressor will be able to get away with his aggression. Always, in the end, right and justice will prevail.

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

171. Mr. ALLAF (Syrian Arab Republic): We believe that Israel has been condemned. The overwhelming majority of the members of the Council have voted in favour of the draft resolution. Thirteen members

of the Council approved the clear and specific condemnation of the brutal and barbarous Israeli attack on Lebanon and the Palestinian people. This draft resolution does not propose any practical measures. It condemns and warns. That has been achieved. The 13 members representing a broad majority of the Members of the United Nations and the world have in fact condemned Israel for its aggression and have warned Israel that a repetition of that aggression would entail serious action against that aggressor by the Security Council and by the world international community.

172. With the condemnation of the Israeli aggression, the bias of the United States of America has also been condemned because that great Power, which has special responsibilities as a permanent member of the Council under the Charter of the United Nations, has once more failed to fulfil that serious and special responsibility and has sided with an aggressor in spite of the overwhelming condemnation by both Member States and by world public opinion—and I dare to say even by some opinion inside the occupied territories themselves.

173. During the last six days the United States has tried to dilute the issue and to manoeuvre in order to weaken the condemnation of this flagrant Israeli aggression, by introducing a reference to other acts which, in this case, have never been committed. Even the Israelis themselves did not claim that their action was in retaliation for an attack or any previous action undertaken by any Arab, Palestinian, Lebanese or otherwise.

174. At the beginning, the Israeli Zionist aggressors were very frank and they stated through their military spokesmen, and then later ever through their responsible leaders, that their aggression was an answer to Security Council resolution 381 (1975). Their military spokesman said, as I quoted in my previous intervention, that they had done that to emphasize that Israel "would meet the Palestinian guerrillas only on the battlefield" [*ibid.*, para. 141]. So Israel, when it committed that act of aggression, was not responding to any so-called "provocation" and was not even claiming to practise, justly or unjustly, a retaliatory action against the Palestinians or against Lebanon.

175. The efforts and attempts during the past six days by the delegation of the United States to introduce amendments to the draft resolution presented to the Council by the non-aligned members would have carried paragraphs adopted word for word from previous Council resolutions. The American representative asked why we could not transmit these whole paragraphs to this new resolution; what had happened since the Council agreed 18 months ago to those same paragraphs? And why was it difficult for the Security Council to accept them again? It is as if those paragraphs were *clichés* to be used

whenever necessary. It is as if the Security Council, as a responsible organ of the United Nations, is not supposed to study the circumstances of each case, the wrongs and the rights which have been committed by this or that party at the time of the case, and then take responsible action. The logic of the United States delegation is that we should print prepared and prefabricated resolutions so that whenever needed we could take them from the shelves of the United Nations archives and use them whenever there is a complaint made to the Council.

176. Even at the time those paragraphs were introduced because of the pressure of the United States—paragraphs such as those introduced in resolution 347 (1974)—the United States delegation used pressure in order to minimize the condemnation of the Israeli aggression at that time. But many countries then, including the victims of that aggression, wanted to give a chance to what was stated—as it is stated today—by saying that if one had a little more balance, then Israel would cease its aggression. But we have seen the results. Despite that reference imposed in the previous resolutions to the so-called “other acts”, Israel continued its aggression and did not feel it had a responsibility not to repeat the aggression, nor did it obey the warning at that time as given to it by the Security Council.

177. I believe that the only reason Israel has not heeded the resolutions, instructions and orders of the Security Council at any time is because each time it finds a country, a super-Power like the United States, to support it. If they know there is somebody to defend them even though the overwhelming majority of the members of the Security Council condemn them, then why do they have to care? That is the grave responsibility which, once again, the United States will bear in the future because our conviction is that Israel, which since its implantation, since its creation in the Middle East region, has not obeyed a single resolution of the General Assembly or the Security Council, will still continue its acts of aggression, but this time as in other times, it wants to continue that aggression with the protection of super-Powers like the United States.

178. The Israelis were very clear. They said, “We have attacked, we have committed that act of aggression because we do not recognize the Palestinians and we do not want to negotiate with them”. And here we answer all those delegations which have expressed concern that by passing this resolution maybe the process of negotiation would become more difficult. I have in front of me a cable by the United Press International dated 5 December, a few days ago, in which it is stated: “Israel said today it would not negotiate with any Palestinian group because such talks would imply willingness to allow a separate Palestinian State to be established on its eastern frontier”. The Israeli leaders used to say they do not want to negotiate with the PLO because

they do not recognize that the PLO is the representative of the Palestinian people. We have said previously, here, and in the General Assembly, and everywhere, that it is up to the Palestinian people itself to decide who is the spokesman and who is the representative of the Palestinian people. But, leaving this aside for a moment, we discuss now the question of allowing or not allowing a third State to be between the States of Israel and Jordan, as it was stated in the words of Mr. Rabin.

179. I think this declaration by the Israeli leaders, should be condemned in its turn. Because this is the first time that I remember a country proclaiming for itself an extraterritorial sovereignty, a country which says, “I do not like to see any other State outside and beyond my borders”. This is very strange, because if it is going to be applied, we think that the whole map of the world would be put in doubt, and all countries can say, “We do not like to see this country as our neighbour or that country as our neighbour”. At the same time, if Israel really does not want to see other States beside its own, then Israel would be denying the very birth certificate that gave it existence. The United Nations created Israel, justly or unjustly, according to a resolution. According to that resolution, there was mention of two States. The first of these two States was the State of Palestine. If Israel now denies the right of the Palestinians to have their own homeland, then it will be denying itself the very resolution on which its State was established and according to which all the injustice was done against the people of Palestine.

180. The United States delegation in using, or rather, abusing, the right of veto, has stated that they are doing this because they are mediators in the Middle East and they do not want to accept any resolution which is not balanced. We have never been convinced that the United States is really a mediator, or a neutral mediator, in the area. On our side we have been convinced of that fact long ago. But by their veto today we are sure that the United States representatives have proven also to those who have a certain amount of confidence in them that they do not deserve that confidence, because they were, as usual, alone and isolated in supporting the Israeli aggression. If they really care about negotiations and if they know the Israeli stand concerning negotiations, they should, on the contrary, use their influence in order to oblige Israel and to persuade Israel to accept the real negotiations. And not, as we have seen from the declarations of the military and political leaders of Israel, and from the declaration of the Prime Minister of Israel, that Israel is not prepared to negotiate with the party mainly concerned in the Middle East conflict.

181. To those countries which want to see the process of negotiation progressing freely, we say that everything has to be undertaken with the Palestinians, because it was made clear by all the Arab parties

in the Middle East that without the Palestinians there will be no peace in the Middle East region.

182. The American representative said that, after the agreement on Sinai, this resolution might endanger a similar agreement on the Golan Heights with Syria. As a Syrian representative I answer officially by quoting the declaration of the President of the Syrian Arab Republic, Mr. Hafez Al-Assad, on 6 October 1975, when he affirmed that there would be no progress on the Golan front without similar progress on the Palestinian front; and Syria would never undertake or accept any movement on the Syrian front without a similar movement on the Palestinian front. Within that understanding and spirit, the Syrian Arab Republic requested a few days ago that the Security Council be reconvened on 12 January 1976, in order to have a full debate on the Middle East problem, including the Palestinian question, with the participation of the PLO, because they are the first and mainly concerned party in that question.

183. We have seen the answer of Israel to resolution 381 (1975), which was the barbarous aggression against Lebanon and against the Palestinian people. But we are confident, as I have stated, that despite the veto of the United States, the Israeli aggression has in fact been condemned. And also we are sure that when the Security Council is reconvened on 12 January next year, the Palestinian representatives will be sitting, as they are now, beside us; and the debate on the Middle East and the Palestinian questions will be undertaken by the Security Council seriously if there is a real desire to have peace established in the region.

184. All we hope is that at that time the United States will be more responsible in its actions and policies and that it will really participate constructively and positively in that debate in order to find a solution to the state of aggression which now and for so many years has prevailed in the Middle East, and that at the end the Security Council may undertake some serious and practical measures in order to put an end to Israeli aggression and to establish a real, just and lasting peace in the region.

185. The PRESIDENT: The final speaker is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, on whom I now call.

186. Mr. AQL (Palestine Liberation Organization): On behalf of the PLO I should like once again to express our deep appreciation and gratitude to all those members of the Council who have deemed it necessary to condemn unreservedly Israel's latest savage attack on innocent Palestinians and Lebanese. Their condemnation of the attack is simply a reflection of their deep belief in the Charter and principles of the United Nations.

187. General Rabin may continue to insist, faithful as he is to the premises of his racist zionism, that the

only place where he will confront the PLO or any Palestinian group is on the battlefield. The air raids and bombardments which he authorizes, bringing untold death and destruction to Palestinians as well as Lebanese, are fully intended to bring about our capitulation and that of the Arab States. He should have learnt that our resolve is unshaken and that his brute force strengthens our determination to confront his forces on all fronts.

188. His arrogant use of brute force, which is totally dependent on massive supplies of sophisticated instruments of war by the United States Government, has brought Israel and heaped on it, more than any other political entity in the history of the United Nations, the fury and disgust of the international community.

189. Since 1967, Israel's brutal actions have been condemned 11 times by the Security Council, censured once and deplored six times; while in the General Assembly, Israel has had 11 condemnations and six deplorations bestowed on it since 1967. This disgraceful record does not merit any further elaboration.

190. However, my delegation was not surprised that the representative of the United States Government chose to dissociate himself from the consequences of the lethal war instruments which his Government has so generously been putting at the disposal of the ruling military junta in Israel. This position is doubly clear and understandable. In the absence of his Israeli counterpart, Israel's views had to be voiced by proxy; and he carried out the mission entrusted to him with the stylistic eloquence of a Harvard intellectual.

191. Whether the draft resolution condemning Israel was adopted or not, it was amply clear that Israel's savage attack was condemned by 13 member States of the Security Council, leaving the United States Government isolated from the international communities together with its Israeli ally. The United States Government should take pride in the fact that it is protecting aggressive Israel, which is being condemned day in and day out by the different organs of the United Nations which reflect the will of the international community.

192. My delegation has also tried to note with seriousness the statement by the representative of the United States which purported to say that his Government did not condone and indeed deplored the Israeli raids, but wanted them set in context with all other violence in the Middle East. Is he trying to convince us that his Government really clings to the so-called, much publicized policy of even-handedness?

193. If his Government had honestly, genuinely and sincerely followed an even-handed policy, derived from Abraham Lincoln's belief in equality which he so unflinchingly upheld and symbolized, the whole

political and geographical spectrum in our region and in many other parts of the world would have been completely different. But acting according to the excessive manipulations, lobbying and back-stage manoeuvring of a small but powerful Zionist minority, the United States Government proceeded to create Israel, to support it, to finance it, to sustain it, to arm it and even to consolidate its grip on occupied Arab territories. The result was misery, anguish, disaster, bloodshed, tension, turmoil and violence which the United States Government, we are told, tries to deal with in an even-handed manner. If one-sidedness is defined as even-handedness, we must certainly be witnessing an era of semantic acrobatics in American diplomacy.

194. It behoves the United States Government to embark on a drastic and soulsearching revision of the totality of its policy towards the people of Palestine. Since it bears the lion's share in the injustices inflicted upon us, the United States Government must bear the lion's share in redressing these wrongs and grievances. In his testimony before the International Relations Committee of the United States Senate, Mr. Saunders concedes rather implicitly and peripatetically certain Palestinian realities which have long been denied by his Government. His difficulty, he admits, is not what but-how. Difficult as his question may seem to him, we believe, as all the peoples who have supported us do, that the answer to his question has already been provided by resolutions 3236 (XXIX) and 3376 (XXX) of the General Assembly which seriously, methodically, realistically and wisely endeavour to bring about a just and durable peace to the region on the basis of the implementation of the national rights of the Palestinians on their national soil.

195. When we fervently speak and point out the dangers which Zionism poses to our national existence, we are not, as some people would like to see us, indulging in a practice of polemics. I have here with me Golda Meir's memoirs, entitled *My Life*,<sup>3</sup> published this year in New York. Instead of drawing on Herzl's or Weizmann's sayings, we thought Golda Meir would be more up to date. After all, she is a former Israeli representative to the United Nations, a former Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Prime Minister of Israel until two years ago. Listen to what she had to say on Zionism, the Palestinians and the future. On page 23, Golda Meir defines Zionism as meaning:

"that the so-called Jewish problem (of course, it was really a Christian problem) was basically the result of Jewish homelessness, and that it could not, and would not, be solved unless and until the Jews had a land of their own again. Obviously, this land could only be Zion, the land from which the Jews had been exiled 2,000 years before."

196. Could the relation—forged as it may be—between ancient Hebrews and modern Jews be the

substitute for the relation between the Palestinian Arabs in exile and those under Israeli occupation? Is it fair and realistic that the so-called return of the Jews to Palestine be predicated on a 2,000-year-old myth, while the return of the indigenous Palestinian Arab population forcibly expelled 28 years ago is still categorically denied?

197. On page 149, Golda Meir refers to the people of Palestine in the following terms:

"And let me add, there was no time during the thirties that I did not hope that eventually the Arabs of Palestine would live with us in peace and equality as citizens of a Jewish homeland."

During the thirties, when Mrs. Meir admitted she wanted us as citizens of a Jewish homelands, we, the people of Palestine, both Moslems and Christians, constituted more than 75 per cent of the population, and we had almost total land ownership. Later on, when the whole of Palestine was occupied, it was the same Golda Meir who declared in 1969: "Who are the Palestinians? They never existed".

198. Thus our metamorphosis in Zionist eyes had gone through the following stages: Bedouins, non-Jewish communities, non-existent, and, finally, terrorists. Thanks to Chairman Yasser Arafat, our non-existence has been transformed into freedom-fighters, whom the Israelis still insist upon considering as terrorists.

199. As for Golda Meir's vision of the future, she wrote the following on page 460 of her book: "My vision of the future? A Jewish State in which masses of Jews from all over the world will continue to settle and to build". According to the Israeli *Law of Return*, any Jew, be he an American or a European national, is automatically entitled to settle in-occupied Palestine and to have Israeli citizenship, while a Palestinian Arab is still being denied the right to return to his homeland, where he was born—the land of his father and forefathers.

200. These are merely samples of the thoughts and writings of a leading Zionist and contemporary Israeli politician. They are a mirror replica of the writings of Herzl 70 years ago and those of Weizmann 40 years ago. The one unchanging common denominator among them is racial exclusiveness and racist Zionism. And so, when our existence impinged on their ambition to conquer our soil, the Zionists denied our national entity and proceeded with their deliberate attempts to denigrate us and destroy us. But neither attempt can succeed.

201. It was Golda Meir's bad fortune that her political career was brought to an end following the October 1973 war which shattered the myth of Israel's invincibility. This is what she had to say about the war, on page 427:

"... The shock wasn't only over the way in which the war started, but also the fact that a number of our basic assumptions were proved wrong: the low probability of an attack in October, the certainty that we would get sufficient warning before any attack took place and the belief that we would be able to prevent the Egyptians from crossing the Canal. The circumstances could not possibly have been worse."

She goes on to say, on page 429:

"The Canal had been crossed by the Egyptians, and our forces in the Sinai had been battered. The Syrians had penetrated in depth on the Golan Heights. ... One burning question was whether at this point we should tell the nation how bad the situation really was, and I felt very strongly that we should wait for a while. The very least we could do for our soldiers, and for their families, was to keep the truth to ourselves for a few more days."

Those are the confessions of the Prime Minister of Israel during the October war of 1973.

202. Thus the Israelis have already got the message conveyed to them in October 1973: you cannot always have the upper hand. We can confront you and fight you.

203. With our people's national rights anchored in international legitimacy, the struggle of the people of Palestine has been recognized as the struggle of a colonized people entitled to national sovereignty and national independence; and we have been allowed to use all means for the restoration of these internationally sanctioned rights. Armed struggle is no innovation of ours: some of the representatives sitting in this hall, and many others sitting in the General Assembly, could not have been among us had it not been for their armed struggle.

204. Nevertheless, we want peace. We are ready for peace, and we are fighting for peace. But Palestine cannot be the State of an exclusive group. We realize that a new Jewish generation has been born in occupied Palestine; and in conformity with our tolerant nature, we are willing to live with this fact because in our depths we believe in diversity, creativity and productivity.

205. However, what we want is peace, and not capitulation. We want peace that does not detract from our inalienable rights already recognized and reaffirmed by the General Assembly this year and last year. We want peace that does not forfeit our right to national independence in Palestine and to repatriation. We want peace that acknowledges the Palestinian reality, the Palestinian presence and the legitimate Palestinian leadership already recognized by the General Assembly.

206. Meanwhile, let me make it categorically clear: we cannot, under any circumstances, offer to accede to our national extinction as a political community in Palestine. To put it in the words of Chairman Yasser Arafat: "We are fighting in order to exchange our tents for our national soil; and we will stick to our guns until the exchange is effected". For the sake of emphasis and clarity, we reiterate what we have already said here in New York: "The ball is not in our court".

*The meeting rose at 9.50 p.m.*

*Notes*

<sup>1</sup> Charles W. Yost, *The Conduct and Misconduct of Foreign Affairs*, New York, Random House, 1972, pp. 40 and 41.

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-Ninth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2284th meeting.

<sup>3</sup> Golda Meir, *My Life*, New York, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1975.



---

### كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يسكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استلم 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.

---