



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FIFTH YEAR

1537th MEETING: 12 MAY 1970

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1537)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 12 May 1970 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9794)	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 12 May 1970 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9795)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 12 May 1970, at 11 a.m.

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

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1537)

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

Adoption of the agenda

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*):
Early this morning I was notified by the Ambassador
of Lebanon that Israeli troops had attacked southern
Lebanon. Consequently the Government of Lebanon
submitted a complaint to the Security Council and
requested the urgent convening of the Council. Accord-
ingly, I decided immediately to convene this urgent
meeting of the Security Council. As was my duty, I
then notified the Ambassador of Israel of the complaint
made against his country. The Ambassador of Israel
informed me that he also requested a meeting of the
Security Council and that he was submitting a counter-
complaint. I decided to include this Israeli request also
on the agenda of the Security Council.
2. The agenda before the Council thus reflects the
actual sequence of events as well as logic. Moreover,
it takes account of the practice of the Council and,
in particular, of the agenda adopted on the occasion
of the 1498th meeting of the Council, which was held
on 13 August 1969. Therefore, if there are no objec-
tions, I shall take it that the agenda is adopted.

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

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

The situation in the Middle East

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

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*):
I have received communications from the representa-
tive of Lebanon [S/9796] and the Permanent Represen-
tative of Israel [S/9797] in which they request to be
allowed to participate, without right of vote, in the
discussion of the question now before the Council.
4. In accordance with the usual practice and if there
are no objections, I shall take it that the Council agrees
to invite the representatives of Lebanon and Israel to
participate without the right to vote in the debate of
the Council, in accordance with the rules of procedure
and with practice.

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

5. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*):
The Security Council will now begin its consideration
of the item on its agenda. The first speaker on my
list is the Secretary-General of the United Nations,
U Thant, on whom I now call.
6. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: With regard to
the matter now under discussion in the Council, I have
received from the Acting Chief of Staff of the United
Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO)
thus far only the following information. The Lebanese
delegation to the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice
Commission (ILMAC) reported to the Acting Chair-
man of the Mixed Armistice Commission at 0830 hours
local time today that an Israeli armoured attack was
launched in the early hours of 12 May into Lebanese
territory in the general area of Mount Hermon. The
Acting Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission
has also reported to the Acting Chief of Staff informa-
tion given to him by a Lebanese representative to the
Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission who had
gone to the border point of Rosh Hanikra for a tele-

phone conversation with the senior Israeli representative. According to this information, the senior Israeli representative stated that the present action going on in the El Arqoub area, east of the Hasbani River, was aimed only at the destruction of *fedayeen* commandos, and that it was not the intention of Israeli troops to act against the Lebanese army or population provided that the Lebanese army and population did not support the *fedayeen*.

7. It was understood at the time of this report to the Acting Chairman of ILMAC that the Israeli ground troops had reached El Khraibe (MR 2105-3047) and were supported by artillery and air forces. There was no detailed information about strength, but apparently forty Israeli tanks were participating. The action was still in progress.

8. As members of the Council will be aware, I have for long sought to increase substantially the number of United Nations observers on both sides in this area, but without success. This accounts for the fact, among other things, that I cannot have detailed information of actions such as that now in progress in this area.

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

10. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): Mr. President, allow me first to express my thanks to you for your prompt action in convening this urgent meeting of the Security Council. My thanks go also to the other members of the Council for responding to your urgent call. I should have preferred other circumstances in which to convey to you the warm congratulations of the Lebanese delegation on the assumption of your duties as the representative of France to the United Nations and as President of the Security Council, and to pay you the tribute due to you for the excellent qualities of leadership which had another expression here in the debate of the Council yesterday. It is needless for me to dwell now on the bonds of friendship and co-operation which have existed between France and Lebanon for a great many years.

11. Yesterday was a happy occasion in the Council: there was unanimity and positive action; there were even cheers and poetry. The aspirations of the people of Bahrain for independence were fulfilled and endorsed by the Council; we all rejoiced.

12. Today we witness an anticlimax. For that matter, it is an ominous one, for a large-scale aggression against Lebanon has been launched by Israel today. At 4.45 this morning, Beirut local time, Israeli armoured and infantry units crossed the Lebanese border into areas in the southern and eastern parts of the district of El Arqoub, situated in the south-eastern part of Lebanon. The Israeli air force and heavy artillery have, since then, been bombarding civilian towns and villages in the districts of El Arqoub, Marjayoun, and Nabatiye.

13. The main thrust of the Israeli ground forces is directed against heavily populated agglomerations and

the defensive positions of the Lebanese army. Our armed forces have been engaged since this morning in heavy fighting with the invading aggressor. There is vast destruction, and there have been many casualties.

14. At this stage we do not have full details, but ample information will be communicated to the Council as it is received from the field.

15. This aggression has come in the wake of several threats made by Israeli officials against Lebanon in the last few months. Notable among them is the threat which I duly relayed to the Secretary-General and communicated to the Security Council in my letter of 7 March 1970, from which I quote the following paragraph:

"Israel, which is to be held solely responsible for this developing tension, has not ceased to proffer her threats against Lebanon. Only today, press reports referred to Israeli threats to turn a six-mile stretch of southern Lebanon into scorched earth desert." [S/9683.]

16. As a matter of fact—to set the record straight here and now—that threat was conveyed to the Lebanese Government through various channels and it was a matter of more than mere press reports.

17. Note must be taken of the official calculating thinking of the sinister planners of aggression in Israel. More sinister still have been the latest threats by the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister, the Minister of Defence of Israel, the Chief of Staff and other Israeli officials. One of those threats promised to turn southern Lebanon and the towns and villages therein into an area comparable to the area of the Suez Canal zone and its cities, where Israeli acts of aggression are constantly threatening the peace in the Middle East. The Israeli acts of aggression have turned this area into an area of death, destruction and dislocation. Since 28 December 1968, Israel has set in motion a cycle of murderous and wanton attacks against peaceful and peace-loving Lebanon. I do not have to remind the Council of the treacherous and cowardly attack by the Israel air force against the open, defenceless international airport of Beirut. The Security Council strongly condemned Israel for that attack in its resolution 262 (1968) of 31 December 1968, in which it issued a solemn warning to Israel that if such acts were to be repeated the Council would have to consider further steps to give effect to its decisions.

18. As I was entering the Council chamber I received the following information from the Lebanese Government. It is the text in French of a note delivered this morning by the Lebanese Government to the ambassadors of the four great Powers, members of the Security Council, which have special responsibility for the maintenance of peace in the world. I shall read it out:

"On Tuesday morning at 0430 hours Israeli armoured troops supported by aircraft began an invasion of Lebanon on the pretext of putting an end

to acts of resistance carried out by Palestinians on Lebanese territory with the aim of carrying out reprisals against Lebanon, which was permitting these acts of resistance.

“First, the whole world is very well aware from experience which history has recorded in all countries and at all times that resistance simply increases in proportion to the violence used to meet it. Israel cannot afford to disregard this when in all the Arab countries, including the occupied territories, it is meeting with fresh outbreaks of resistance in direct proportion to the force used in putting down such resistance.

“Secondly, the whole world is aware also that it is not Lebanon but Israel which should be held responsible for the presence and activity in Lebanese territory of those very people whom Israel is trying to drive out of their country.

“Thirdly, ever since the act of aggression against the Beirut airport in 1968, the whole world has been aware that Israel, which today is invoking its complaints connected with recent events as reasons for attacking our country, hardly bothers to find pretexts for encroaching upon the territorial integrity of Lebanon and the Lebanese people. It is not enough to realize that no country in the Arab Middle East can enjoy a return to tranquillity without the return of justice throughout the region. The whole world must understand that the dimensions of the conflict are bound, by an unlimited chain reaction, to become world-wide in scope economically, politically and militarily.

“While we are doing everything in our power to exercise our right of self-defence, we request the Security Council—and particularly the four great Powers which bear permanent responsibilities in it—not only to condemn and halt Israeli aggression against Lebanon but also to find sufficient reason in this act of aggression to impose upon Israel respect for international law, for the United Nations, for its Charter and for its decisions and for the requirements of justice in the interests of world peace, which is threatened more gravely every day.”¹

19. At this stage I should like to say only this. We have come to the Council on many occasions seeking justice, seeking redress, seeking action to stop the acts of aggression of Israel against Lebanon and against the Arab States. Now, for three years, since June 1967, international diplomacy has been dilly-dallying with semantics to find a solution to the problem of the Middle East. While our people suffer, while our towns are destroyed and while our peace is constantly threatened on the international level we always find excuses to disagree about the meanings of sentences and words. It is high time, we believe, that this Council should take positive, decisive action against the aggression of Israel.

20. Israel thinks that Lebanon is a small country with a small army, that by nature we are peaceful. So we are. We have no apology to make about the fact that

we try to use our resources for the betterment of our people: to raise their standard of living, their standard of culture; to promote the relations of Lebanon in friendship and co-operation with the United Nations and with all the nations of the world. We have no apologies to make. On the contrary, we are proud of the fact that Lebanon enjoys esteem in the world because we follow a path of friendship, co-operation, peace and moderation.

21. But all this has been constantly menaced by the many threats of Israel and its action against our towns, against our villages, against the peace of our nation. I might recall here that a French general, after the invasion of France, mentioned to Mr. Churchill that England would surrender, would be completely destroyed, would have her neck wrung like a chicken. And Churchill replied: “Some chicken! Some neck!”

22. If Israel thinks that because we are peaceful, because we are a people of good will in the world, we are like a chicken whose neck could be wrung, it is very badly mistaken. It is not the strength of arrogant arms, Phantoms, Skyhawks and tanks—the arrogance of power—that makes a nation. It is not the use of that arrogant power against Syria, Jordan and the United Arab Republic and against the people of Palestine that makes a nation. It is how much a nation can muster in the way of respect, dignity, tolerance and moderation in international affairs.

23. We come here to the Security Council not as usual. We would like to set the record straight from the beginning. To go into long deliberations and consultations about a resolution which in one form or another condemns, deplores the actions of Israel and at the same time tries to find a certain balance in order to preserve unity in the Council—this is not the method that we are seeking. What we are seeking is action by the Council, and we have every right, as a small nation, as a founding Member of the United Nations, to come to the Council for this action.

24. The action we seek is the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli troops from Lebanese territory, a strong condemnation of Israel and the application of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. If we do this, then, after twenty-two years of beating around the bush on the question of Palestine, we will be taking an action on the level of justice, to be expected from the United Nations and its Charter, especially since this year we are celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Organization.

25. This is the kind of anniversary that Israel is trying to celebrate. This is the kind of manifestation that Israel is trying to lead the world into to commemorate the anniversary of this wonderful Organization and the wonderful and lofty objectives and principles of its Charter. This past Sunday we watched Zionists moving on the streets of New York. Commemorating what? The twenty-second anniversary of the birth of Israel rooted in 4,000 years of history, rooted in 4,000 acts of aggression. While those people were marching, wav-

¹ Quoted in French by the speaker.

ing Israeli flags, headed by American politicians and calling for peace, the Israeli military hawks were hatching in darkness their sinister plan of attacking Lebanon.

26. Those are my remarks for today. I reserve the right to speak at a later stage.

27. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I have just received letters from the representatives of Morocco [S/9799] and Saudi Arabia [S/9798] asking to be allowed to participate in the debate in the Security Council on the question before us. If there are no objections, I shall take it that the Council agrees to invite the representatives of Morocco and Saudi Arabia to take part in this debate, without the right of vote, in accordance with the rules of procedure and the practice of the Council.

28. Because of the limited number of places available at the Council table, I shall, as customary, invite the representatives of Morocco and Saudi Arabia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, it being understood that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when their turn comes to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. T. Benhima (Morocco) and Mr. J. M. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) took the places reserved for them.

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

30. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I should like, on behalf of my delegation, to express to you, Mr. President, our highest respects and the hope that your term of office will be a fruitful one.

31. On instructions from my Government I requested you this morning to convene an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the acts of armed attack, shelling, incursion, murder and violence perpetrated from Lebanese territory against the territory and population of Israel, in flagrant violation of the cease-fire and the United Nations Charter. Particulars of these acts of aggression are contained in my letters to the President of the Security Council of 5 January 1970 [S/9621], 27 February 1970 [S/9670], 4 March 1970 [S/9678], 10 March 1970 [S/9691] and 10 May 1970 [S/9790].

32. During recent months Israel has repeatedly drawn the Security Council's attention to the intensification of aggression from Lebanon. In the letters addressed to the President of the Security Council I described how Lebanese territory has become a base from which continuous attacks were being carried out against Israeli towns and villages and their civilian population. Since 1 April 1970 alone, there have been sixty-one such acts of aggression; twenty-two Israeli villages and towns have come under attack: Misgav'Am, Metulla, Zar'it, Kfar Ajur, El-Wazani, Dan, Dafna, She'ar Yashuv, Avivim, Qiryat Shemona, Margaliyyot, Manara, Dovev, Malkiyya, Yir'on, Yuval, Ramat

Shalom, Adamit, Yiftah, Kerem Ben Zimra, Ma'yan Baruhh, Bet Hillel. The town of Qiryat Shemona was shelled five times in this period by Katyusha rockets. Three of these attacks occurred in the course of the last week. In the last ten days alone seven Israelis were killed and eighteen wounded.

33. This is not a matter of statistics, however. The endless armed attacks from Lebanon have turned the life of the Israeli border population into a constant struggle against violence and death. The inhabitants of the border villages and towns have become the main targets of murderous assaults. With diabolical blood lust the attackers perpetrate their crimes on innocent civilians asleep in their homes, on workers in the fields, on children at play.

34. Time and again Israel has called on the Government of Lebanon to abide by its international obligations, to observe the cease-fire and to put an end to these attacks. Time and again Israel has requested organs of the United Nations and Governments of Member States to apprise Lebanon of the gravity of the situation created by the continuation of warfare from its territory. The acts of aggression have not ended, however. On the contrary, they have grown in number and scope, compelling Israel to act in self-defence.

35. This morning Israel defence forces took action against the bases of aggression situated in Lebanon. This action is directed solely against the concentration of the terror organizations in south-east Lebanon. The following leaflet was distributed by the Israel defence forces in Lebanese territory:

"One who sows thorns does not pick grapes, and one who ignites fire may be burned by fire. To the inhabitants of the area:

"More than a year has passed since your villages, houses and fields were turned into nests and bases for saboteurs, for their comings and goings and for their firing positions.

"Out of consideration for the decades of tranquility and good neighbourhood, the Israel authorities have done all in their power to refrain from applying all of the available means.

"The Israel defence forces have restricted themselves to limited warnings, in the hope that you would understand that there is an end to patience. There comes an end to patience when the terrorists of darkness penetrate to sabotage the homes of civilians in Israel and to shoot at women and the elderly.

"We did not come to hurt peaceful civilians. We come to warn you that if you do not cease to attack us and our population there will be no tranquillity within your borders.

"Draw a lesson from what happened in Jordan to the inhabitants of the areas in which saboteurs found shelter and endorsement of their aggressive acts. Chase away the terrorists and you will live in peace and security."

36. The Israel forces are operating in the area of south-east Lebanon, east of the Hasbani River, in which irregular forces engaged in terror warfare against Israel are concentrated. The purpose of the action is to comb the area for terrorist squads, and Israel defence forces will leave the area on completion of their mission.

37. The Lebanese Government and its representative at the Security Council this morning have tried to whitewash aggression and to shift responsibility from the attacker to the defender. It is a fact, however, that Lebanon, not Israel, has proclaimed that warfare must continue. It is a fact that Lebanon, not Israel, has set aside large areas as bases from which incessant aggression is carried on. It is a fact that Lebanon, not Israel, has concluded special agreements to promote terrorist warfare against its neighbour. It is a fact that Israeli, not Lebanese, towns and villages are being attacked daily, that Israeli, not Lebanese, citizens are under constant threat of murder.

38. The attitude of the Government of Lebanon is in flagrant violation of the cease-fire established by the Security Council and of the Charter of the United Nations. Under the cease-fire and the Charter, the Government of Lebanon bears full responsibility for armed attacks carried out from its territory against Israel—whether by regular or irregular forces. This responsibility is evident, in particular, in the light of the official agreements between the Government of Lebanon and the regular forces operating against Israel from Lebanese territory.

39. The Lebanese Government has tried to justify aggression against Israel by various specious claims. No pretext whatever can justify such aggression. Especially baseless is the argument that its continuation is inevitable because of the presence of Palestinian refugees in Lebanon. The Palestinian refugee problem was created by the invasion of Israel in 1948 by Arab States, including Lebanon. This problem has remained unsolved because the Arab Governments, among them that of Lebanon, have persistently for over twenty years refused to achieve an equitable and humane solution of the question, keeping in mind international experiences in settling refugee problems. The refugees have lived in Lebanon for more than two decades. During most of this time the Israel-Lebanese frontier has remained peaceful because the Lebanese authorities desired it to be so. Today it is not peaceful because the Lebanese authorities have changed their policy and openly permit armed attacks against Israel from Lebanese territory. It is this change in Lebanon's policy, which occurred recently, that is responsible for the present violence on the cease-fire line and not the refugee question dating back to 1948, which, as the Lebanese Government has demonstrated in the past, does not prevent the maintenance of tranquillity on the frontier.

40. In fact, the Government of Lebanon is fully aware of its responsibility for the acts of aggression committed from its territory against Israel. Speaking in the Leban-

ese Parliament, the Minister of the Interior, Kamal Jumblatt, said, on 6 January 1970:

"A year and a half ago, we knew that *fedayeen* activities would be transferred to the south of Lebanon because it borders on Upper Galilee and Israel has fortified its border on the Jordan River, making it impossible for the raiders to cross. As a matter of fact *fedayeen* did enter Lebanon; they are there and cannot be ignored. Their presence is an inescapable reality which must be taken into account."

As early as 8 August 1969, Prime Minister Karamah declared: "The Government of Lebanon must assume its share of responsibility for the activities of the commandos".

41. The world, of course, knows of the role played by other Arab Governments, and in particular by Syria, in turning Lebanon into a base of aggression against Israel. The world knows that the irregular forces engaged in terrorist operations, which have established themselves on Lebanese soil, originate from Syria. It is an established fact that Syrian regular army officers are in command of some of these forces. Moreover, the Syrian Government participates in their training, financing and operational planning. No wonder, therefore, that the Syrian armed forces tried this morning to interfere with Israel's defence action directed against the terror organizations. Syria's role does not, however, absolve Lebanon from its duty to observe the cease-fire and to maintain tranquillity on its borders.

42. In the course of this statement I have just received an urgent communiqué issued by an Israel army spokesman. The operation has now been concluded and our forces are deploying to leave the area. The operation was carried out according to plan. After the six villages had been surrounded, a curfew was imposed and arrangements were made to identify terrorists and to investigate their activities. Seven Israeli soldiers were slightly wounded. A detailed statement of the entire operation will be issued later this evening.

43. Experience has shown that war does not pay, that war brings grief and suffering to both sides. Experience has shown that Israel will not acquiesce in the continuation of war against its people, that it will defend itself, that it will not falter under the impact of aggression in its efforts to achieve peace and security. It is high time to end the war. It is high time to terminate a conflict which has plagued the Middle East for twenty-two years and to resolve the differences between the parties. One does not do that, however, by pursuing war, as the Arab States are doing. One does not do it by acrimonious debates in the Security Council or by demanding the adoption of one-sided resolutions. The present conflict will be resolved when all the parties to it restore the cease-fire and engage in negotiations for peace. Israel is ready for this and awaits an indication that Lebanon and the other Arab States are also ready.

44. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Without prejudice to my right to speak on a later occasion to set forth the views of my delegation,

I must say that there is—above and beyond any other considerations brought forward by the parties in this debate—one fact which, in the opinion of my delegation, is of paramount importance: the military invasion of Lebanon by Israeli armed forces.

45. The Council will have ample opportunity to adopt the appropriate measures and to form an opinion about the events that have occurred, but the continuation of this invasion while we are meeting here cannot be condoned no matter how many promises are made that there will be an immediate withdrawal, for this invasion is in flagrant violation of the Charter.

46. In the circumstances, my delegation wishes at this meeting of the Council to put forward the following draft resolution² for approval. We trust that it will be distributed to members of the Council very shortly. I shall now read it out:

"The Security Council

"Demands the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli armed forces from Lebanese territory."

It is the desire of my delegation that this draft resolution be put to the vote as soon as it is in the hands of all the representatives. We believe that matters have reached a very serious pass, and we do not feel that it is possible for the Council simply to remain indifferent to events which the parties have recognized as having actually occurred.

47. Mr. MWAANGA (Zambia): I have asked to speak at this rather early stage in the debate in order to second formally the draft resolution which has just been presented by the representative of Spain.

48. My delegation has listened with great interest to what the parties directly concerned in this conflict have had to say in the statements they made a few minutes ago.

49. The reports emanating from the Israeli-Lebanese border would indicate that the situation is extremely grave. We believe that the Security Council should do something to bring an immediate end to the senseless loss of life which is currently taking place. We believe further that this is an interim and humanitarian draft resolution which does not in any way prejudice our position or that of other delegations with regard to the substantive item on our agenda. We therefore trust that the members of this Council will be able to pronounce themselves unanimously on this draft resolution with a view to bringing to an end the ugly situation which has developed on the Israeli-Lebanese frontier.

50. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Council has heard the proposal of the Permanent Representative of Spain, supported by the representative of Zambia. It is an interim proposal which in no way prejudices the discussion and the continuation of the debate. The Permanent Representative of Spain

has requested that this proposal be put to the vote immediately at this meeting.

51. First of all, I should like to consult the Council to determine if anyone wishes to speak on this subject; otherwise I shall put the proposal to the vote immediately.

52. The representative of Israel has asked for the floor.

53. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): Point of order.

54. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Syria on a point of order.

55. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): When the representative of Spain submitted his draft resolution it was on an immediate and urgent basis. Hence we are engaged right now in the procedural process of the debate in the Security Council. There are two points. First, this was put forward by the representative of Spain as an urgent demand, and secondly, it is now a procedural matter, so that a non-member of the Security Council has no right to take the floor at this particular time.

56. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Council knows that in the case of a vote the representative of a country which is not a member of the Security Council cannot take part in the vote. But this is a debate which has not been closed and before proceeding to the proposal made on the actual substance of the matter, the participants in the debate may speak. I therefore think that we should hear the representative of Israel and then immediately proceed to the vote.

57. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I wish to speak on a point of order, without going into the substance of the matter for the present. The situation at this moment is that the representative of Spain has submitted an urgent proposal intended to halt the aggressor. It is quite clear from the information given by the Secretary-General and from the statement made by the representative of Israel that the aggressor has perpetrated an attack. To open a discussion will be to the advantage of the aggressor. There will be a prolonged debate; after his statement there will be one by the representative of Lebanon, then by the representative of the Arab countries and finally by each member of the Security Council—for they all have statements prepared.

58. We are faced with a problem: whether to involve the Security Council in an endless discussion and permit the aggressor to continue his bloody deeds, or to vote forthwith on the Spanish draft resolution and then continue the discussion.

59. I feel that, in view of the realities of the situation, it would be more sensible and more expedient to vote on the draft resolution before resuming our discussion. That procedure would be sensible and would thwart the designs of the aggressor, who hopes to employ

² Subsequently circulated as document S/9800.

obstructionist tactics in the Council in order to prolong the debate and gain time as he did at the time of the aggression perpetrated against the United Arab Republic. On that occasion, Israeli troops advanced 60-100 kilometres towards the Suez Canal in spite of the fact that the Security Council had adopted a resolution calling on the aggressor to halt at a great distance from the Canal. The same situation now exists.

60. The Soviet delegation therefore requests you, Mr. President, to take this situation into account and proceed immediately to a vote.

61. Mr. YOST (United States of America): If the members of the Council so desire, we are of course ready to proceed rapidly to a vote on this draft resolution. I wish, however, to concur in your ruling, Mr. President, that the debate has not been terminated and that a member of the Council or a representative participating in our debate therefore has every right to be heard before the vote if he so wishes.

62. This is clearly not a procedural but a substantive draft resolution, and therefore comment upon it by non-members is entirely appropriate. I would suggest that the most expeditious way of dealing with this matter is to permit the representative of Israel to make whatever statement he wishes and then to proceed to the vote. I think the most effective way of delaying proceedings would be to engage in a prolonged procedural debate on whether he has the right to speak or not.

63. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): After the statement of the representative of the United States it becomes quite clear who wishes to prolong the debate and who wishes to allow innocent civilians in Lebanon to be killed at this moment and to allow the sophistry of the representative of Israel in coming to speak here. This draft resolution has been submitted as an urgent one, to stop the killing of civilians, and now the representative of the United States, an accomplice in the crime, wishes to give the right to his protégé and lackey to prolong the debate and speak nonsense.

64. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I think everyone here agrees on the need to proceed urgently to a vote on the draft resolution. However, several proposals have been made, and I should like to ask the representative of the Soviet Union whether he is making a formal proposal that the Council should immediately proceed to vote on the draft resolution submitted by Spain. If he is making a formal proposal, I will put his proposal to the vote, and then, if it is adopted, we shall proceed immediately to vote on the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Spain.

65. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): First of all, I see no validity in the United States representative's contention that the representative of Israel should be given the floor. The representative of Israel has already made a statement here in which he set forth in detail the position of his Government and his delegation. What can he

have to add to that? It is on the basis of the explanations we have heard from Lebanon and Israel that the representative of Spain has submitted his proposal. Consequently, there is no justification for continuing the discussion.

66. As far as a formal proposal is concerned, as I understand it the representative of Spain made a formal proposal that the Council should proceed immediately to a vote. I support this proposal and I, for my part, am also making a proposal for an immediate vote on the draft resolution.

67. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In the circumstances I would ask the representative of Spain whether he insists that the Council proceed immediately to vote on his proposal.

68. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, my delegation will not assume the presidency of the Security Council until next October, and we certainly do not want to usurp your functions.

69. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I think that we have an important decision to take. We certainly have an important draft resolution before us. All of us would agree that that draft resolution must be taken urgently and there must be no undue delay, because by its nature it requires immediate consideration. So I believe that we would all of us around this table wish to proceed without undue delay to vote upon the draft resolution which has been put before us.

70. I would also most earnestly suggest to the Council that if we have prevented the Ambassador of Israel from speaking on the draft resolution—and I imagined he would speak with due regard to the urgency of the matter—and then proceed to the draft resolution, whatever conclusion we come to will not have the same force as it would have if we had heard him.

71. I have been in the same position as you are now, Sir, and I consider that it is in the good reputation of this Council that we should always be prepared to hear within reason the parties immediately concerned before we take a decision. I believe that it is the right action to permit the Ambassador of Israel to be heard and then to proceed—I hope without undue delay—to the vote on the draft resolution before us. I would defend that action on a principle which is a very sound principle and which we must preserve in this Council, I should have thought, as much as anywhere else—the principle of the right of free speech on a matter which is of direct concern to the party who wishes to speak to us.

72. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I would draw the attention of the Council to the fact that we are prolonging the discussion. However, the Ambassador of Zambia has asked to speak. I call on him.

73. Mr. MWAANGA (Zambia): When I spoke earlier it was not my intention to try to prolong the debate,

but it would seem that I have in the process become the victim of circumstances. I do not wish to speak in respect of whether or not the representative of Israel should be given an opportunity to speak before we proceed to this rather urgent draft resolution which has been submitted by the Ambassador of Spain and formally seconded by my delegation. I wish only to seek some clarification concerning the rules of procedure. Rule 30 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council states:

"If a representative raises a point of order, the President shall immediately state his ruling. If it is challenged, the President shall submit his ruling to the Security Council for immediate decision and it shall stand unless overruled."

74. The position as I understand it is this. The representative of Israel asked to speak. The President was just about to call on him when a point of order was raised by the Ambassador of Syria. The President stated his ruling. The ruling was subsequently challenged. Therefore, I would have thought that under the circumstances the best thing would have been to submit this entire proposal to the Security Council as a whole in order to make a decision.

75. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I must reply immediately that that is precisely the procedure which I was following. The representative of Israel was going to speak. There was a point of order raised, and that is why I asked the Council whether it considered that we should immediately proceed to the vote or whether we should allow the representative of Israel to speak. But no one requested that there be a formal vote on the problem of whether or not we should proceed immediately to the vote. In the circumstances, I call now on the representative of Syria who had asked to be allowed to speak previously.

76. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): The representative of the Soviet Union made a formal proposal to the effect that we should proceed to the vote immediately. I second that motion.

77. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): That is precisely what I asked just now. Now that there is a formal proposal to proceed immediately to the vote, I shall put that proposal to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Burundi, Finland, Poland, Sierra Leone, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Zambia.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: China, Colombia, France, Nepal, Nicaragua, Spain.

The result of the vote was 7 in favour, 2 against, with 6 abstentions.

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

78. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Israel and I ask him to be extremely brief.

79. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I shall indeed be very brief. I should like simply to refer to the draft resolution proposed by the representative of Spain, to point out that in submitting it the representative of Spain referred to the Charter and found it appropriate to describe Israel's action against continued aggression as a violation of the Charter, without, however, referring to the warfare which is being waged against Israel in flagrant breach of the Charter.

80. I already emphasized in my statement this morning that no contribution to peace in the Middle East can be made by the adoption of one-sided resolutions. I also informed the Council that the Israel action has been terminated and that Israel is already in the process of withdrawing its forces from Lebanese territory.

81. Now, in these circumstances the draft resolution proposed by the representative of Spain is clearly divorced from reality. It would be unfortunate if the Council should now vote on and adopt a draft resolution marked not only by an absence of equity but also by a refusal to take cognizance of the plain facts of the situation.

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

83. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to remind the representative of Israel that when we introduced our draft resolution we said that this Council would have "ample opportunity to adopt the appropriate measures and form an opinion on the events". As you correctly pointed out, Mr. President, this is a purely interim measure, in view of the seriousness of the events.

84. For this reason, my delegation, above and beyond any other consideration, and so that there can be no possible misunderstanding, introduced this draft resolution, because the action taken by Israel, in the opinion of my delegation, runs counter to Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter, which provides that:

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

85. Because of this Article, which leaves no room for doubt, my delegation submitted its draft resolution. Whatever other events are discussed will be studied and considered, and the Council will take action on them, after the vote on the draft resolution which my delegation had the honour of introducing.

86. May I repeat: we introduced that draft resolution in view of the fact that a principle had been violated, without prejudice to whatever further action the Security Council may wish to take in determining responsibilities for other matters. My delegation was of the view that the Council cannot remain inactive when so many lives are at stake and when acts of aggression have been committed in violation of a sacred principle of the Charter.

87. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before putting the draft resolution to the vote, I call on the Permanent Representative of Lebanon.

88. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): I do not want to delay the debate while there are Lebanese lives being victimized by Israeli aggression—while our territory is occupied. But I was astonished to hear another concoction from the Israeli representative, reporting that his military forces are being evacuated from Lebanon after having accomplished an investigatory mission, as the self-appointed *gendarme* of peace in the Middle East has the right to do.

89. We know the acts of aggression of Israel; we know the lies of its military chiefs; we know it has occupied the territories of three Arab States for nearly three years now; and I am astonished that we still find some members of the Council ready to listen to these concoctions from the representative of Israel.

90. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): before proceeding to the vote, I call in turn on the two remaining speakers whose names are on my list. I call on the representative of the United States.

91. Mr. YOST (United States of America): I repeat that I do not want to delay our action, but I must confess that I am a little concerned about the relevance of the draft resolution. The representative of Israel has just said that the Israeli armed forces are in the process of withdrawing from Lebanese territory. I would suggest for the consideration of the sponsor of this draft resolution and of the Council that the draft resolution would be strengthened and made, I believe, more relevant to the situation as it now exists if there were added to it the phrase "and an immediate cessation of all military operations in the area". That would, I suggest, facilitate and expedite the withdrawal, which is what we have in mind, and bring to an end all military operations in the area.

92. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Security Council and all those present here have for the second time witnessed the scandalous activities of the Anglo-Saxon team. Not so long ago, this pair used its double veto to prevent the adoption of a draft resolution submitted by the African and Asian delegations condemning racism in Southern Rhodesia. Now attempts are being made to block the adoption of a draft resolution directed against the aggressor Israel, which is being defended and protected by the United States, supported by the United Kingdom. Even the vote on the

procedural motion has shown who stands where, who is on whose side, who is defending the victim of aggression and who is giving moral, political and financial support to the aggressor and supplying him with arms and aircraft. This is a tangible demonstration of the realities of the present-day world and of the interplay of forces in the Security Council.

93. If the Anglo-Saxon team votes against the draft resolution submitted by Spain and supported by the Arab delegations, it will give the whole world a clear picture of its position, of the position of the two countries which it represents here in the Security Council.

94. Accordingly, we should take an immediate vote on this substantive draft resolution lest we fall in with the aggressor's plans and permit him to entrench himself in the territory which he has seized. The Israeli representative has told us stories about troops leaving. Where are they going? They are going into Lebanese territory, and it is the Security Council's responsibility to vote immediately on the draft resolution demanding Israel's withdrawal from the territory of the victim of aggression.

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

96. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I should like to submit respectfully to members of the Security Council that following the cue of Arab-Soviet propaganda will bring us nowhere. We still remember how the Soviet Union by false propaganda reports in May 1967 prodded the Arab States to aggression against Israel. Apparently the Soviet representative today is repeating the same tactics.

97. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

98. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): We are discussing a draft resolution, not the policy of the Soviet Union. I protest against these slanderous attacks by the representative of Israel, who is in the habit of making such attacks and who dreams at night of how to seize every opportunity to subject the Soviet Union to the usual dose of slander. I propose that we should proceed to a vote on the draft resolution.

99. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Israel and would request him to conclude his statement as soon as possible.

100. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): As for Arab propaganda and the distortion of facts by Arab Governments and Arab representatives, we have been given a taste of that today. The representative of Lebanon has based his entire argumentation on the fact that the Israeli armed forces are engaged in an encounter against the Lebanese army, that Israeli armed forces are in fact

attacking the Lebanese army. I should like to deny most unequivocally that particular distortion of the truth. There has been no encounter whatever between the Lebanese and Israeli forces. The Israeli action this morning is directed solely against the terrorist bases imposed on Lebanon against Lebanese interests under protest from a great number of Lebanese leaders. I do not believe that the Security Council should proceed to take any action whatever before clarifying those facts positively and definitively.

101. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall give the floor immediately to the representatives of Finland and the United Kingdom, after which we shall proceed to the vote.

102. Mr. JAKOBSON (Finland): I wish to make a brief explanation of vote. My delegation has always upheld the principle that all parties to a dispute must be heard before a decision is taken. In this case this was done. Both the representative of Lebanon and the representative of Israel have been heard and the draft resolution submitted by Spain arose from those two statements as an urgent and interim measure. It was submitted on the explicit understanding that the debate would then continue.

103. In the course of the debate all the members of the Council as well as the representatives invited to participate will have every opportunity to state their views. It was for that reason that my delegation considered it logical that we should proceed to the vote on the draft resolution first and then continue the debate.

104. Accordingly, while there is obviously incomplete information from the area from independent sources, as was stated by the Secretary-General at the beginning of this meeting, my delegation believes that the Security Council should proceed without further delay to vote on the draft resolution.

105. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I merely wish to say with reference to the comments made by the Ambassador of the Soviet Union that if it is an Anglo-Saxon principle to preserve the rights of free speech, and if it is an Anglo-Saxon principle to give to anyone accused the right to reply, then it is a principle not to be ashamed of but a principle to be proud of, and it would be well if that principle could be imported into the Soviet Union.

106. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I do not intend to prolong the debate; I merely wish to give the members of the Security Council some information. For more than a year the position jointly adopted by this duo has prevented an agreement from being reached in the intensive consultations regarding the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). Their policy of protecting the aggressor and violating the fundamental rights of the victims of aggression is impeding a political settlement in the Middle East and exacerbating the situation.

107. Mr. YOST (United States of America): The representative of the Soviet Union seems to be determined to delay the vote on this draft resolution by broadening the subject to include matters which are being dealt with outside. We shall comment fully during our subsequent debate in regard to the basic issues involved in the conflict in the Middle East and the role which the four Powers have been playing in endeavouring to bring about the implementation of resolution 242 (1967).

108. I should like to assure the Council immediately, however, in the light of the totally unjustified statement of the representative of the Soviet Union, that my Government has been pursuing with the greatest earnestness and persistence its efforts to bring about the full implementation of that resolution. And if those efforts have been thwarted, it is not the responsibility of the United States Government.

109. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We shall immediately proceed to the vote. There is a proposal from the delegation of Spain and an amendment from the delegation of the United States. In accordance with rule 36 of the rules of procedure, I shall put the amendment of the United States delegation to the vote first. I would remind members that it consists in adding to the Spanish proposal the following words: "and an immediate cessation of all military operations in the area".

110. I call on the representative of Syria on a point of order.

111. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): Did the representative of the United States propose his amendment formally? Is this a formal proposition by the representative of the United States?

112. Mr. YOST (United States of America): It is a formal proposal.

113. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I formally propose an amendment to the United States amendment. Instead of "immediate cease-fire" we would propose "immediate stopping of aggression and withdrawal". Instead of the word "cease-fire" we would propose "stopping of aggression".

114. Mr. YOST (United States of America): I am afraid that the representative of the Soviet Union has not been listening to our proceedings very carefully. We did not use the word "cease-fire". The amendment I suggested was to add to the Spanish draft resolution the words "and an immediate cessation of all military operations in the area". I am curious to know whether the representative of the Soviet Union is opposed to the cessation of all military operations in the area.

115. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): When my delegation introduced its draft resolution, we were prompted by the urgency of the matter. The fact that Israeli armed forces have invaded

Lebanon has not been questioned. May I advise those wishing to include in the draft resolution concepts which have not been duly considered by the Council to introduce any such amendments to the draft resolution which the Council will be adopting after due consideration of the whole question.

116. My delegation, as I say, has been prompted by the urgency of the situation, and we have been thinking in terms of adopting a provisional measure that will put an end to this invasion. If we start adding amendments now, without there being a sufficient debate thereon, I believe that we will not achieve the purpose that we had in mind when we introduced our draft resolution. I would appeal, then, to members of the Council to withdraw any draft amendments they have submitted to the draft resolution that we had the honour of introducing.

117. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): As the representative of FRANCE, and not as President of the Security Council, I should like to associate myself with the appeal made by the representative of Spain that we should vote without further delay on the draft resolution.

118. Now, resuming my functions as PRESIDENT, I give the floor to the representative of the Soviet Union.

119. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I will not take the floor because you have already said what I wanted to say. Thank you.

120. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Does the representative of the United States maintain the amendment that he has proposed?

121. Mr. YOST (United States of America): Yes, Mr. President. It seems to me that this is entirely consistent with the intent of the representative of Spain and, as I said in presenting this amendment, would strengthen the draft resolution and bring about more expeditiously the ends that he has in mind. I would hope, therefore, that it might be formally acted upon.

122. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Does the representative of the Soviet Union maintain the amendment he has submitted to the United States amendment?

123. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I shared your view and the wish of the Spanish representative that we should proceed immediately to a vote without amendments of any kind. If we begin submitting amendments, there will be more amendments. I therefore ask you to appeal to the United States representative not to press his amendment, so that we may vote on the draft resolution in the form in which it was submitted by the Spanish delegation.

124. Mr. YOST (United States of America): I think that it will not delay us more than a few moments

to take a vote on the amendment, and we shall, of course, accept the judgement of the Council.

125. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In the circumstances, I shall put to the vote the amendment of the United States.

126. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I request the United States representative to read out the exact wording of his amendment once again.

127. Mr. YOST (United States of America): My amendment would propose to add to the language submitted by the representative of Spain the following words: "and an immediate cessation of all military operations in the area".

128. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I propose the following amendment to the United States amendment: "and stopping of Israeli aggression against Lebanon".

129. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with rule 36 of the rules of procedure of the Security Council, I shall first of all put to the vote the sub-amendment of the Soviet Union.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Poland, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Burundi, China, Colombia, Finland, France, Nepal, Nicaragua, Sierra Leone, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

The result of the vote was 3 in favour, none against, with 12 abstentions.

The sub-amendment was not adopted, having failed to obtain the affirmative votes of nine members.

130. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now put the United States amendment to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Burundi, China, Colombia, Finland, France, Nepal, Nicaragua, Poland, Sierra Leone, Spain, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Zambia.

The result of the vote was 2 in favour, none against, with 13 abstentions.

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

131. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by Spain.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.³

132. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Syria, who has expressed the wish to speak.

133. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Spain in

³ See resolution 279 (1970).

accordance with Article 40 of the Charter, which reads as follows:

“In order to prevent an aggravation of the situation, the Security Council may, before making the recommendations or deciding upon the measures provided for in Article 39, call upon the parties concerned to comply with such provisional measures as it deems necessary or desirable. Such provisional measures shall be without prejudice to the rights, claims, or position of the parties concerned. The Security Council shall duly take account of failure to comply with such provisional measures.”

The meeting rose at 1.45 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.
