

UNITED NATIONS

UN LIBRARY

JAN 24 1973



**SECURITY COUNCIL  
OFFICIAL RECORDS**

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

**1502<sup>nd</sup>** MEETING: 18 AUGUST 1969

NEW YORK

---

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1502) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 12 August 1969 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of Lebanon addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9385)	
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 12 August 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9387) .....	1

## NOTE

*Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.*

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

## FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND SECOND MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 18 August 1969, at 4 p.m.

*President:* Mr. J. DE PINIES (Spain).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Algeria, China, Colombia, Finland, France, Hungary, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zambia.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1502)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:  
Letter dated 12 August 1969 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of Lebanon addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9385).
3. The situation in the Middle East:  
Letter dated 12 August 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9387).

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The situation in the Middle East

**Letter dated 12 August 1969 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of Lebanon addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9385)**

### The situation in the Middle East

**Letter dated 12 August 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9387)**

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): In accordance with the decision previously taken by the Council, I shall now invite the representatives of Lebanon and Israel to take places at the Council table.

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

2. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Council will now continue its consideration of the item on the agenda. Before calling on the first speaker on my list, I must inform the members of the Council that document S/9393 has been circulated. In this document, the Secretary-General transmits to the Security Council the

text of the identical letters he has addressed to the Governments of Lebanon and Israel.

3. Mr. MORALES SUAREZ (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. President, during the Council's discussions I have not yet had an opportunity to perform the pleasant duty of noting the brilliant performance by Ambassador Boye of Senegal as President of the Council or to express my delegation's great pleasure at seeing you, a worthy representative of Spain, occupying a post in which your outstanding qualifications have already been displayed.

4. The events described in the Security Council during these meetings are a source of profound concern to the delegation of Colombia for several reasons. First of all, within the world arena, such events thwart the basic purposes of the United Nations, undermine the possibilities of conciliation and understanding and—which is more inhumane and painful—may represent the sacrifice of innocent persons. Furthermore, the cordial and long-standing relations maintained by my Government with Lebanon make us sincerely distressed that these deplorable events should be affecting that country's nationals and territory.

5. My delegation considers—and this is an unquestionably valid principle—that reprisals are indefensible actions, contrary to international ethics and the canons of justice; one nation, which is necessarily motivated by partial considerations, cannot have the right to use this pretext to punish the acts of other nations and violate their integrity or the security which their nationals are entitled to enjoy.

6. In accordance with the general criterion which determines my delegation's position in the Security Council, however, we cannot consider only one aspect of the problem, because we would then become an instrument of one-sided interests, instead of serving the cause of justice. The fact is that violations of the cease-fire which are maintaining tension in the Middle East have occurred. These violations must be censured indiscriminately, regardless of their origin or the reasons given to justify them.

7. My delegation is ready to consider in a constructive spirit measures designed to forestall and prevent a recurrence of the kind of events now being considered by the Council. In our desire to serve the cause of peace, we clearly see that the road to understanding, as the Permanent Representative of Colombia to this Organization has put it, is not through extremes but through the mid-course of law, reason and justice.

8. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Colombia for the kind words he has addressed to me.

9. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. President, the grave events which have recently occurred in the Middle East are once again engaging the attention of the Security Council. These events, which have caused loss of life, human suffering and substantial material damage, come after other similar events which have been repeated with tragic frequency in recent months, as has already been said in this Council.

10. This time, the scene of the bloody incidents to which I refer was the frontier between Lebanon and Israel. In saying this, we wish to point out with alarm two particularly significant facts. The first is the obvious continued and increasing deterioration in the general situation. I need not recall that the state of affairs in one of that region's most critical areas has recently been described by a highly authoritative spokesman as a virtual state of war.

11. The second fact is that the frontier between Lebanon and Israel, which until recently was one of the few areas practically free of incidents and actions of the kind we are discussing, now seems also to be a place where truce violations and continuous threats of breach of a peace so precarious that it is hardly worthy of the name are almost daily occurrences.

12. In view of the obvious gravity of the situation, our first and basic concern is the complex general problems of peace and security in the tormented Middle East region. We are fully aware of the modest means at our disposal and our action in this Council has a firm and well-defined purpose: to co-operate with the utmost determination in the establishment of a just and lasting peace between the countries of the area.

13. By the unanimous vote of its members, the Security Council has created the legal instrument which provides what may be the only effective means of achieving that stable and just peace. I refer, of course, to resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. The implementation of all its provisions and unconditional adherence to the principles contained in it point the way to peace.

14. We well understand the many and complex obstacles in the way of the achievement of this common objective but we do not believe that any of these obstacles are insurmountable, if persistent efforts and firm determination are combined with the necessary patience and tenacity.

15. Bearing this objective constantly in mind, we believe that one of the basic prerequisites is scrupulous observance of the cease-fire provisions adopted by this Council and prevention of violations of these provisions. If this is an obvious prerequisite for the creation of the minimum conditions for the fruitful development of the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, and of the action, which we hope is co-ordinated and effective, by the four permanent members of this Council, then the authority of this Council makes it mandatory that the cease-fire, truce or armistice be respected.

16. At the 1483rd meeting of the Council on 1 July 1969, the representative of the United Kingdom said: "... my careful inquiries indicate that there are several highly placed

representatives who hope that July will be a month devoted more to bilateral than international diplomacy" [1483rd meeting, para. 26].

17. We all know full well to which representatives and what bilateral diplomacy Lord Caradon was referring, just as we all know full well the value of the pacifying influence which can be exerted by the countries on whose behalf those important representatives are acting. Indeed, what he said about the month of July is also applicable to the month of August.

18. Our faith in the results of bilateral diplomacy, sincere as it is, nevertheless does not inspire us to excessive optimism, because we have been discouraged by many set-backs. Even so, we have hopes that progress may be made towards the achievement of peace.

19. So far, I have referred to the general situation and our position on the conflict dividing the States in that region, all of which are linked with us by firm ties of friendship.

20. With regard to the bloody incidents which are the reason for these meetings, I wish to repeat once again the principles and sentiments my delegation has already expressed in similar cases in the past. We sincerely and fraternally deplore the loss of life, whether Arab or Israeli, and even more so when the victims are innocent civilians. We lament the human suffering resulting from the acts of violence committed in violation of the truce or armistice. We deeply regret the material damage, especially when it is suffered by developing countries whose economic infrastructures are therefore basically weak.

21. We consider it the bounden duty of all parties concerned scrupulously to observe the cease-fire, truce or armistice. Although we reserve our right to examine each violation individually, we have never been and are still not willing to overlook any violent incident of this kind or any violation of the cease-fire, all of which we unhesitatingly condemn.

22. These general considerations, which—I repeat—have already been stated many times, will determine my delegation's attitude towards any proposal that may be submitted to the Council.

23. Before concluding my statement, I should like to mention the proposal contained in the text of the identical letters which the Secretary-General addressed to the Governments of Lebanon and Israel on 16 August 1969 through their Permanent Representatives. This letter is reproduced in document S/9393, circulated today. The proposal is as follows:

"In view of the increasing seriousness of the situation in the Israel-Lebanon sector, I consider it to be my duty to propose to both Governments concerned, as I now do, that United Nations Observers, in adequate number to observe effectively, should be stationed on both sides, with the function of observing and maintaining the Security Council cease-fire."

24. In all modesty but also with all firmness, we venture to urge the Governments concerned to consider this proposal of the Secretary-General.

25. At the beginning of my statement, I said that until recently the frontier between Lebanon and Israel was practically free from the bloody incidents which have so often engaged the attention of the Security Council in other areas of the same region. It is our fervent wish that, despite the events which took place a few days ago, this distinction which made the Lebanese-Israeli frontier practically unique, may be preserved.

26. In this spirit and to this end, we simply but firmly urge Israel and Lebanon to consider the proposal of the Secretary-General most carefully in the hope that it may meet with a rapid and favourable response from the Governments concerned.

27. Mr. LIU (China): For the second time since last December the Security Council has been convened to deal with a dispute between Lebanon and Israel. This time Lebanon has charged that on 11 August units of the Israeli Air Force raided villages in southern Lebanon, using napalm bombs, rockets and machine-guns, and causing several civilian casualties. Those charges have not been denied by Israel. In his statement before this Council the other day, the representative of Israel characterized the Israeli attack as an act of self-defence against commando bases on Lebanese territory. He asserted:

“The shelling and mining raids from Lebanese territory had been going on day after day in utter disregard of the cease-fire, endangering the lives of innocent civilians, bringing bloodshed and destruction to towns and villages.”

He added:

“The Lebanese authorities seemed unable or unwilling to curtail those attacks. Israel had no alternative but to resort to self-defence.” [1498th meeting, paras. 66 and 67.]

28. For his part, the representative of Lebanon has disclaimed any responsibility for “the actions of the Palestinian commandos” who have been struggling for the recovery of their legitimate rights. He has not tried to conceal the fact that “The Lebanese people . . . have always stood, and firmly stand at present, on the side of . . . the Palestinian people.” [Ibid., para. 33.]

29. Thus, the essential facts involved in the present case are not in dispute. The crux of the matter is how these facts are to be evaluated in the context of the over-all situation in the area.

30. It is a sad commentary on the state of affairs in the Middle East that over two years after the tragic events of June 1967 the psychological gulf separating the Arabs and the Israelis remains as unbridgeable as ever, and the prospects for lasting peace continue to be bleak. In recent months the situation has further deteriorated. A state of violence and counter-violence prevails along all the cease-fire lines. The Secretary-General of the United Nations, speaking of the situation in the Suez Canal sector, said in a special report dated 21 April 1969: “. . . the only conclusion to be drawn is that the Security Council cease-fire

has become almost totally ineffective in the Suez Canal sector and that a virtual state of active war now exists there . . .” [S/9171].<sup>1</sup>

31. This state of active warfare has now spread to a country which did not participate in the June 1967 war and which has shown moderation and restraint in the midst of passion and conflict. Admittedly, there have been commando raids from Lebanese territory but there is little evidence that the Government of Lebanon has been directly responsible for them. Indeed, there is reason to believe that since the Israeli raid against the Beirut airport last December, when a dozen airliners were destroyed, the Lebanese Government has tried to restrict the commando activities. The representative of Israel seemed to be aware of this when he stated:

“. . . saboteur squads trained and equipped primarily in Syria have crossed the border and have established themselves on Lebanese soil. . . . Indeed, the presence of the terror bases seems to have had some repercussion on the internal political situation in Lebanon.” [1498th meeting, para. 47.]

32. That being so, it seems to my delegation that the Israel air attack on Lebanon was directed against the wrong party and cannot fail to stir up strong anti-Israel sentiment in a country which has played a moderating role in the Middle East situation. It is hardly necessary for me to add that my delegation has always been opposed to the doctrine of retaliation, a doctrine which must be regarded as contrary to the spirit of the Charter.

33. My delegation deplores all acts of violence regardless of their source or origin. It is a matter of profound regret to us that the situation in the Middle East has so deteriorated as to make the cease-fire totally ineffective. Although the border warfare is still limited in scope and magnitude, there is the danger that those who control the destiny of the area may find themselves under such constant and unbearable pressure as to act against their better judgement and drift into all-out war without actually wishing it. The Security Council must therefore exert itself to prevent any further deterioration of the situation. It is in the light of those considerations that my delegation will support any measure that may be worked out in the course of the current discussions.

34. I may add that my delegation whole-heartedly welcomes the initiative taken by the Secretary-General in his communication today proposing that United Nations Observers be stationed in the Israel-Lebanon sector.

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

36. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): In the exercise of my right of reply, I wish to refrain from the sort of recriminations to which Mr. Tekoah resorted in his last statement before the Council. I do so for two reasons: out of respect for this Council, whose authority and dignity we wish to enhance;

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fourth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1969.*

and because the facts about our complaint and about the aggressive action of Israel against Lebanese territory are sufficiently clear.

37. Nevertheless, Mr. Tekoah has raised some points which call for replies.

38. Mr. Tekoah resorts to the easy task of heaping insults and slander on the *fedayeen*—the resistance fighters who rose from the ranks of the million and a half Arab Palestinian refugees—and calls them murderers, assassins, and so on. On 15 August [1501st meeting], he saw fit to quote to the Council the contemptuous proclamation of last March of the Vice-President of the Association of Resistance Fighters of Belgium, a proclamation which has already been firmly accounted for here in the Council.

39. But for Mr. Tekoah's sake, and for the information of the Council, I should like to mention that Israel has no monopoly on the feelings of resistance fighters in the world. If I wished to detain the Council on this matter, I could recite scores of declarations, articles, and resolutions by resistance fighters in many lands in favour of the Palestinian Arabs and their resistance fighters. I would mention only a certain news dispatch which I am sure has not gone unnoticed by members of the Council. *The New York Times* of 14 July 1969 reported from Amman, Jordan, the visit of a Dutch resistance hero, Mr. Piet Nak, who helped organize Amsterdam's historic general strike in February 1941, in sympathy with the Jews—an act for which he was decorated twenty-five years later by Israel. But this time Mr. Nak went to the Middle East at the head of a pro-Arab delegation called "The Palestine Committee in the Netherlands". That Committee is composed of several Dutch groups and associations. Mr. Nak stated that the sensibility that had moved him to champion the cause of the Jews in 1941 has led him now to champion the cause of the Palestinians, and he added: "After fourteen days in the Middle East, I am convinced I have chosen the right side".

40. The Palestinian Arabs, Christian and Moslem alike, have legitimate and inalienable rights in their homeland, in Jerusalem, and to their Holy Places. The question is repeatedly asked, how to restore those rights to the Palestinians. The answer has also been repeatedly given by the United Nations. Year in and year out resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948 has been reiterated by the General Assembly. It stipulates in favour of the Arab refugees for repatriation or compensation. The road is clear; it must be travelled, and the major block on the way to peace with justice should be removed.

41. It behooves all of us to ponder the sad situation in which those refugees have lived for twenty-one years. Their plight must gain the compassion and the attention of all mankind. They cannot go on for ever living in squalor and misery. The restoration of their rights and their human dignity is the essence of the whole Palestinian problem. Their feelings must be taken into consideration.

42. Allow me to offer a quotation. In its issue of 13 May 1969, *Look* magazine published an illustrated article by its senior editor, Mr. Christopher S. Wren, entitled "With the

Arab Guerrilla Forces". In the conclusion of his article, Mr. Wren mentioned the case of one of the *fedayeen* who told him:

"We didn't accept it for twenty years"—meaning the fact of being forced out of his home and country. "Our children will not accept it. Their children will not accept it. There is room for us. We know it very well. What can we do? I don't want to live forever in a tent".

And looking towards the west, he added: "I sometimes take my children to the top of the mountains to show them the lights of Jerusalem. I tell them, 'That is your land'".

43. We cannot tell these people not to struggle for their rights. We can only tell them that we are ready to administer justice to them.

44. An esteemed Israeli Professor of history, Dr. Yakov Talmon, has seen the light and felt the needed humanitarian compassion towards the Arab Palestinians. In a letter to the Israeli Minister of Information, Mr. Galili, he wrote:

"In world public opinion, and in my own personal opinion, Israel's recognition of the Arab Palestinians as a people entitled to their right to self-determination remains the major issue . . . Our respect for the rights of others is the measure according to which the democratic character and the moral nature of our State will be evaluated."

45. The Israeli authorities claimed that on 1 August Qiryat Shemona was attacked with Katyusha rockets emanating from Lebanese territory. On that occasion the Lebanese Minister of Information denied this and other Israeli allegations that settlements in northern Galilee were subjected to attack directed from within the Lebanese borders. He stated that Israel's persistence in levelling these accusations against Lebanon was only a cover-up for its aggressiveness against Lebanon.

46. The Israeli representative, in his statement here on 13 August [1498th meeting], went on to enumerate twenty-one attacks alleged to have been made against Israel. May I remind the Council that none of those alleged attacks had been the subject of any letter of complaint addressed to the President of the Council or to the Secretary-General prior to our debate. After they were brought out of Mr. Tekoah's bag, the Lebanese military authorities thoroughly investigated the charges. They are in a position emphatically to deny their veracity.

47. To add to his long list of fabricated accusations against Lebanon. Mr. Tekoah has sent to you, Mr. President, his letter of 15 August 1969 [S/9392] in which he claims that two similar attacks were made. The Lebanese authorities categorically refute this new charge.

48. All these charges are clearly trumped up to confuse the cardinal issue before the Council: namely, the Lebanese complaint against the premeditated, well-planned, massive and aggressive air attack by Israel against seven villages in southern Lebanon, where a number of civilians were killed and injured, some of them as a result of burns inflicted by napalm.

49. The "Johnny-come-lately" policy followed by Israel of lodging unfounded counter-complaints against well-substantiated Arab complaints smacks of frivolity and of an underestimation of the role of the Security Council. For the sake of argument, I wish to grant Mr. Tekoah a point: the Lebanese word may not be enough; it is pitted against the Israeli word. Therefore, why go around the North Pole to reach the truth—the real facts? There is a shorter and more direct road. It follows a straight line: the legal line of the United Nations machinery established under the Armistice Agreement. The Armistice Commission is still juridically alive; its members are physically present in Lebanon. They are absolutely free to perform their duty, and Lebanon, as always in the past, is willing to facilitate their task and to co-operate with them. For over two years they have been prevented by Israel from performing their mission.

50. The Secretary-General, in his report to the General Assembly on 17 September 1967, considered that the Armistice Agreements between the Arab States and Israel were still valid. That was and remains our view. The Security Council can reaffirm this legal fact; it can take the necessary measures to make Israel respect its obligations under the Armistice Agreements. The members and the observers of the Commission could then readily ascertain the true facts and report them to the Council. Should the Council determine that there is a real need to strengthen the system of observation through the machinery of the Armistice Agreement, the Lebanese Government is agreeable to entertaining recommendations to that effect.

51. Israel can do likewise if it is really interested in the promotion of peaceful conditions. But, alas, this has not been and is not its interest. Its interest lies in taking the law into its own hands, in defiance of a binding international agreement and of United Nations resolutions. This led Israel treacherously to attack the International Airport of Beirut on 28 December 1968, for which it was strongly and unanimously condemned by this Council; and to attack seven Lebanese villages in southern Lebanon on 11 August 1969, for which it deserves an equal condemnation.

52. We are certain that the Council is conscious of its duty under the Charter to prevent aggressive acts against the sovereignty, peace and security of a Member State. Lebanon does not request the legal protective shield of the Security Council only because it is a Member State entitled to benefit from the system of security established by the Charter; Lebanon requests it because Lebanon is a small, defenceless, peace-loving, non-militaristic and non-aggressive nation; Lebanon requests it because, from the inception of the United Nations, Lebanon has whole-heartedly and profusely contributed to the development and strengthening of the United Nations, to the elaboration and application of its principles, to the promotion of all the just causes and rightful endeavours it has espoused and undertaken, to the writing, declaration and application of human rights; Lebanon requests it because Lebanon has shown on many occasions its peaceful policies and its support for all actions tending to promote peace in the world.

53. Lebanon has every juridical and moral reason strongly to request that the Council take the necessary action to curb the aggressive acts of Israel against Lebanon.

54. For the sake of peace and justice, the conquest of Arab lands must be terminated—a situation which, as the President of Lebanon, Charles Helou, has said, "Pretends to find in violence the foundation of peace". That situation must come to an end. Otherwise, the consequences are bound to lead to disastrous developments.

55. I should like to quote in French the apt words which President Helou pronounced on 21 November 1967.

*[The speaker continued in French.]*

"The omnipotence of truth and justice, if disregarded, always asserts itself in the end. Error and iniquity, by an inevitable chain reaction, are destined to provoke disasters of unlimited consequences. To admit the primacy of force by allowing the victor to subject the vanquished to his law is to invite the vanquished of yesterday to take over the initiative of violence in order to win their own victory. If force and not justice is to govern international relations, what power does not run the risk of becoming another Palestine one day? Lebanon, a country of fraternity and tolerance, is opposed to any policy of force and racism, in solidarity with the Arab States."

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

57. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I have asked to speak in order to make a few very brief observations on the statement just made by the representative of Lebanon.

58. I regret to inform the Security Council that, even as it pursues its deliberations, acts of aggression from Lebanese territory are continuing. After Friday's meeting of the Council I submitted, on instructions from my Government, a letter to the President in which I drew attention to the following attacks against Israel:

"On the night of 14-15 August, approximately at 2400 hours local time, the village of Metullah was subjected to bazooka fire from Lebanese territory.

"On the same night saboteurs crossed from Lebanon into Israel and blew up a water conduit near the town of Qiryat Shemona near the Lebanese frontier. A second unexploded charge was later discovered in the same area. A water conduit and an electricity pole were also blown up between the villages of Manara and Yiftah.

"In both cases tracks of saboteurs were traced from and to the cease-fire line with Lebanon," [S/9392].

59. Yesterday, 17 August, a mining raid in the Hermon area resulted in the blowing up of a vehicle and the death of an Israeli soldier. These further incidents underline the gravity of the situation created by the continuous acts of aggression perpetrated from Lebanon.

60. Today the representative of Lebanon has chosen again to express support for terror warfare against Israel and for the *fedayeen*—Arab assassins organized, trained and financed by the Arab Governments to wage warfare against

Israel by murdering Israeli men, women and children. They do so whenever regular Arab armies are incapable of carrying out full-scale hostilities. That has been the pattern for the past twenty years. By now the entire world knows what these assassins stand for. Their spiritual father, Haji Amin El Hussein, is a former collaborator of Hitler's who spent the Second World War years in Berlin advising Eichmann on the annihilation of Jews, a man declared a war criminal by the Allies. Their present leader, Yassir Arafat, defined on 5 June 1968 the aim of the *fedayeen* terror warfare against Israel as follows: "The liquidation of the Zionist existence".

61. Let there be no mistake about it. By identifying themselves with the terror organizations, the Lebanese Government in Beirut or the Egyptian Government in Cairo identify themselves with the fanatical attempt to destroy a Member State of the United Nations.

62. It is after adopting such an attitude that the Lebanese representative comes here to preach to us of Lebanon's loyalty to the United Nations and its machinery and to demand a one-sided Security Council resolution directed against Israel.

63. The Lebanese representative's line of argument in his statement of today, in which denial follows denial about facts known to all, is reminiscent of the old Jewish folklore story about the glass jar. A landlady who lent a glass jar to her next-door neighbour went after some time to ask for its return. The neighbour, an astute landlady herself, cried out the following answer: "Really, my dear, you are all wrong. First of all, I have never taken any jar from you. Secondly, don't you remember that the jar was really all chipped and cracked, nothing but a broken piece of glass? Finally, I have long ago returned the jar to you, and it is real temerity for you to suggest that I want your miserable vessel."

64. As I indicated at previous meetings, the facts concerning armed attacks from Lebanese territory have been not only widely reported but also openly admitted by Lebanese leaders and the Lebanese press. It may of course happen that, for the sake of debate in the Council, arguments put forward here are somewhat different from attitudes adopted elsewhere. However, the gap between the Lebanese representative's protestations and the views expressed by the Government of Lebanon on other occasions is most striking and unusual. Thus, *Le Monde* of 9 August reports that the Prime Minister of Lebanon declared on the previous day to the Middle East News Agency: "The Government of Lebanon should assume its part of the responsibility for the activities of commandos." Will the representative of Lebanon—indeed, will the Security Council—not recognize the responsibility which Lebanon's Prime Minister says his country should assume?

65. If the Lebanese Government were only to see as they are the dangers inherent in the situation created by the use of Lebanese territory as a base for armed attacks against Israel and to face squarely its international obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and the cease-fire, the solution would not be long in coming. There is an Arab proverb which may well hold the key to the understanding of the situation. The proverb states: "He himself brought

the bear into his vineyard." To Lebanon we say simply: "Get the bear out, and there will be no trouble." It is to be hoped that the Lebanese representative and his Government will see the wisdom of that proverb.

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

67. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): I have only one comment to make on the last statement by Mr. Tekoah. It is not the bear that we have in Lebanon. We have over 200,000 innocent lambs who have been driven from their homeland, Palestine.

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

69. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): It is not unusual for Arab delegations from time to time to employ the plight of refugees—with which all of us fully sympathize—for political purposes, in particular for debating contests. The Arab delegations tend on such occasions to ignore one simple fact. An almost equal number of Jewish refugees from Arab States left their homes and settled in Israel after the 1948 war. The only difference between the Jewish refugees from the Arab States and the Arab Palestinian refugees is that, while the latter have been abandoned by their brethren and many of them continue to live on international charity, the Jewish refugees from the Arab States have been accepted and fully integrated into Israel.

70. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I have no more speakers on my list. I believe that all the members of the Council have participated in this debate, with the exception of my own delegation. I now propose therefore to make a statement on this matter, speaking on behalf of SPAIN.

71. The Security Council is considering the complaint made by Lebanon concerning the bombing of some Lebanese villages. In that bombing the most modern weapons were used, inflicting considerable damage and, what is even worse, leaving dead and wounded among the civilian population.

72. We also wish to mention the complaints lodged subsequently by the representative of Israel concerning the activity which, according to his information, is being conducted by irregular forces. We deplore all the casualties inflicted, whatever the cause.

73. The attempts to justify the Israeli aggression against Lebanon by invoking the right of self-defence are, in my delegation's opinion, completely unacceptable. This explanation given by the delegation of Israel shows that the attack of 11 August was a premeditated action, which therefore cannot be disregarded by this Council. On the contrary, it deserves our denunciation and condemnation.

74. Last December there was another Israeli attack, also based on the so-called right of self-defence. The Council did not accept that explanation, however, and cannot accept it now. It is, to say the least, a mockery of the legal principles of self-defence to try to fit preventive war and reprisal into



that framework. Such actions are nothing but acts of force contrary to the United Nations Charter, Article 2 (4) of which forbids the Members of the Organization to resort to the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. At the same time, it is well known that Lebanon scrupulously observes its international commitments and has always respected the 1949 Armistice Agreement with Israel. In my delegation's view, it is essential for that Agreement to be maintained and strictly and scrupulously observed by both parties in the future. This will provide us with a safeguard against an increase of tension in the region and an extension of the zone of conflict.

75. I should like at this time to recall the statement made by my delegation during the Security Council debate on 28 March 1969:

"My delegation has always considered that, if this grave conflict [*in the Middle East*] is to be settled, political solutions must be worked out; but in the face of so many denunciations by Israel of the attacks which it alleges are being committed by the Arab States, my delegation wonders whether Israel has failed to realize that all these acts could be avoided if Israel were to withdraw immediately from the territories which it occupies. Had this withdrawal already been carried out, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions, all those victims whom we mourn today would have been spared or at least, the legal and procedural position of Israel before this Council would be far clearer. My delegation cannot understand why these acts of violence are periodically denounced before the Council, when it is within the power of the party which

considers itself wronged—Israel—to settle the conflict. Do away with the root cause that is to say—the occupation of the territories seized by force in violation of the Charter and the effects will readily disappear . . ." [*1469th meeting, para. 58*].

76. Over two years have now elapsed since the war of June 1967 and almost two years since the Security Council adopted resolution 242 (1967). The longer its implementation is put off and the withdrawal of the military forces occupying the territories of the Arab countries is delayed, the longer the danger of a recurrence of these incidents will persist. On this point too, Israel tries to base its case on the right of conquest, but reprisal, preventive war and conquest are inadmissible under the United Nations Charter. Only a few days ago, together with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, I attended a moving ceremony in honour of the memory of a distinguished observer who died in the performance of his duty. It is time to put an end to this conflict, to prevent the loss of innocent victims and to restore calm and security, so that all the countries of the area can live in peace and quiet.

77. In the face of the accusations submitted, the Council cannot stand aloof. It must discharge the responsibility entrusted to it by adopting an appropriate resolution which forcefully condemns the premeditated attacks against Lebanon and, at the same time, issues a warning that a repetition of the attacks will oblige it to take more effective steps, in conformity with the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

*The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.*

---

#### **HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS**

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

#### **COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES**

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre librairie ou adressez-vous à: Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

#### **КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ**

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. 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.

---