

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FIFTH YEAR

**1541**<sup>st</sup> MEETING: 15 MAY 1970

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1541) .....	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 FORTY-FIRST MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 15 May 1970, at 10.30 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/1541)

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

*The agenda was adopted.*

#### 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)**

#### 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. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with decisions taken previously by the Council [1537th meeting], I invite the representatives of Lebanon, Israel, Morocco and Saudi Arabia to participate in the debate without the right to vote. In accordance with the practice followed in the past, I propose to invite the representatives of the parties directly concerned, that is, the representatives of Lebanon and Israel, to take seats at the Council table. The other representatives will be invited to take the seats

reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber on the understanding that they will be invited to sit at the table when it is their turn to address the Council.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. E. Ghorra, representative of Lebanon, and Mr. Y. Tekoah, representative of Israel, took places at the Security Council table, and Mr. A. T. Benhima, representative of Morocco, and Mr. J. M. Baroody, representative of Saudi Arabia, took the places reserved for them.*

2. Mr. VALLEJO-ARBELAEZ (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, the need for me personally to make a statement in the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Second Development Decade made it impossible for me to be present at the first meeting over which you presided in the Council, and I was therefore unable to welcome you and express my appreciation to the colleagues who were good enough to speak generously regarding the Colombian presidency of the Council.

3. The traditional friendly relations between France and Colombia make it a special pleasure for Colombia to work with you this month.

4. This week with deep concern we have carried out an analysis of the situation in the Middle East.

5. Not only are we perturbed over the loss of lives and of course the material damage caused, but also at the proof of the impotence of the organs responsible for the maintenance of peace and security.

6. An objective analysis of the facts must obviously take into account the complaints voiced from both sides of the Israeli-Lebanese frontier. But that analysis must also not be circumscribed to the present conflict, for that would be to overlook the more complex causes, some of historic nature, both recent and remote, others of the alien interests which extend over the region but primarily the lack of effective instruments wherewith to guarantee international public order.

7. It is true that the United Nations marks indisputable progress when it allows the facts to be examined at meetings such as these of the Security Council, where the presence and co-operation of other representatives of peace-loving States allow the explosive tension of many conflicts to be released. And it is also true that at times moral force can be wielded to impose certain measures, such as was the case with the recently unanimously adopted provisional resolution [279 (1970)].

8. But it is precisely this interim or provisional nature that forces us to consider stable solutions, since Article 40 of the Charter, on which provisional measures rest, implies that those measures extend to all the parties concerned, and not only to one of them. It is obvious that the withdrawal of the armed forces of Israel cannot by itself eliminate the causes which that country has submitted as justification for procedures which we cannot condone but to which that country had to resort when confronted with frontier violations by Palestine commandos in incursions and shellings.

9. Thus a judgement of responsibilities must be set up within the legal framework created by the Security Council resolution of 1967 and by the Charter of the United Nations in general. It is a known fact that these resolutions have not been complied with and that the six-day war has now in fact been prolonged for three years. Not only do we not glimpse any possibility of an end to it, but it constantly threatens to spread both in time and in space.

10. The Secretary-General has perseveringly struggled to re-establish peace in the Middle East. Very often, he raises a concerned voice to the world: he addresses the belligerents; he sets up observation bodies to detect the movement and sense of the violence; he shelters refugees, and he exercises good offices through his Special Representative, Ambassador Jarring.

11. The four great Powers have endeavoured to devise compromise political solutions, and in the course of the debates of this week they have allowed us to see how far they still are from an agreement that would allow the Security Council to expect a speedy solution. Proof of this is the fact that this meeting is being held today.

12. Perhaps there might be other formulas and, even should they be as precarious as negotiations by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General or as elusive as the fencing between the great Powers, the Council should not hesitate to explore them.

13. On a personal basis, the representative of Brazil, Mr. Araujo Castro, recently voiced an idea for *ad hoc* committees. We know that in the present case there is already in existence a special committee—the committee of Four—but it has its own specific features, those of political negotiations among the guarantors of peace: namely the permanent representatives on the Council.

14. Hence we might consider the possibility of setting up another committee composed of three members of the Council that are not directly linked to the conflict to hear the parties, to take note of the efforts at negotiation made by the Secretary-General and be given access to the political formulas of the great Powers and then, within a reasonable period of time, to present to the Council a series of solutions covering all aspects of the problem—namely, the refugees, the frontiers, Jerusalem, disarmament, etc. This would allow a truce

in the military operations which are now being resorted to in order to solve what should have been solved under the aegis of the United Nations.

15. My delegation has been weighing the possibility of submitting a formula flowing from ideas of this nature, and if those views were to commend themselves to the members of the Council we would be willing to consider the matter more thoroughly and to prepare such a proposal.

16. Lately we have heard statements from the Governments of Israel and the United Arab Republic in which possibilities of peace are opened up, although some of them are still overshadowed by threats. Surely the positive aspects of these offers should not fall on deaf ears. But my delegation considers that, together with any efforts made for peace, we must continue to ponder the need to open up some forum in which to review the flaws in our own United Nations institutional system, flaws that stand in the way of our tackling the causes of the war in their origins or effectively defusing the political movements which generate international tension.

17. Colombia is a peace-loving state. It enjoys friendly relations with both parties to the conflict because, among other reasons, it has welcomed immigrants from both those regions and, in turn, has received from them the benefit of their work and wisdom. We do not want formulas to be adopted that will be the seeds of future conflicts, and we hope that we will be able to offer our co-operation as a mediating Power in the study of just and realistic solutions.

18. The Colombian delegation deplores the fact that by gradual steps we have arrived at the present point in this conflict. The United Nations was created to preserve and guarantee peace. Very often in the past those objectives were successfully achieved for the benefit of the international community, but what we are confronting at the moment is a *status quo* declared on a state of war, with academic proposals of condemnation of one side or the other.

19. Colombia has supported those condemnations but we are not unaware of the fact that, far from drawing closer to what should be our ultimate goal, namely peace, we are indefinitely admitting the existence of a state of war as though our role were that of ensuring that war take place within the framework of international conventions, like so many umpires that must ensure compliance with the ground rules of war games. No. Our role is not to regularize war but to seek peace and the initiative I have hinted at would have precisely that purpose: to rescue the Organization from a role for which it was not created.

20. So we would echo the voices that have been raised here in the Council, particularly, Mr. President, your own, voices that have appealed to the peace-loving spirit of nations to seek solutions that will not perpetuate a state of war.

21. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On 12 May [1537th meeting] when my delegation submitted the draft resolution which was adopted unanimously as resolution 279 (1970), demanding the immediate withdrawal of the armed forces of Israel from the territory of Lebanon, we announced that we intended at some forthcoming meeting to make known our views regarding the subject on the agenda of the Security Council.

22. First and foremost, my delegation is gratified at the compliance by Israel with the terms of the above-mentioned resolution and we feel that this may well be a happy omen allowing us finally to solve the serious crisis besetting the Middle East.

23. Today we have to consider the aggression committed by Israel. Let us recall that in August this Council had to meet to weigh a complaint by Lebanon of the shelling with the most modern weapons by the Israeli Army of Lebanese villages. These facts, reprehensible by their nature, caused victims, and the moment has now arrived for the necessary measures to be adopted to avoid so much shedding of blood and so much violence.

24. Consistent with this view, my delegation wishes to stress some aspects of the matter: the delegation of Israel alleges that it suffers constant aggression from the Palestinian guerrillas; it very often refers to bombings, shellings, armed attacks and aggression of all kinds. My delegation laments the fact that there are constant violations of the cease-fire resolution, with the inevitable victims. Yesterday [1540th meeting] the representative of Syria recalled how, after having approved resolutions 233 (1967) and 234 (1967) the Israeli army proceeded to occupy the Golan Heights.

25. However, let us see what the nature of those resolutions is. We believe that they are purely temporary resolutions intended, by holding up a grave situation, to allow the cessation of hostilities and give the Security Council sufficient time to prepare a final resolution. From June 1967, when the first resolutions on the cease-fire were adopted, until resolution 242 (1967) was approved, five months elapsed. Once that last resolution was adopted it was only natural to hope that since it called for immediate implementation, or at least implementation within a prudent length of time, it might have been followed up. However, two and a half years have elapsed since the approval of resolution 242 (1967) and all efforts made to ensure compliance with it have failed. The debate that has taken place in the last few days has brought out facts that we may well have suspected or whose existence we may have imagined, but with the statements made to this Council an official stamp has been placed upon the desire to maintain under the military occupation of Israel certain portions of what is indisputably Arab territory.

26. It is only too well-known that the non-permanent members of the Security Council have been deeply concerned at noting a lack of progress in the conversations which have been held among the four permanent

members or the two super-Powers for the purpose of solving the conflict in the Middle East. Yesterday we heard important statements on behalf of the United States and the Soviet Union and we would hope that goodwill on all sides might allow us to find a just solution to this grave situation.

27. My delegation considers that the creation of the necessary climate is not furthered by violations of the cease-fire. However, how can we consider that the temporary nature of those resolutions can be indefinitely extended, and that mention is even made in the Council of a so-called cease-fire line? This concept is non-existent. There is no such line. Resolutions 234 (1967) and 235 (1967) should already have been superseded by the implementation of resolution 242 (1967). Resolution 242 (1967), which was unanimously adopted and sponsored by the United Kingdom, surely contains the necessary bases for a solution of the conflict.

28. Now, how can we expect the parties victims of the aggression to yield territories occupied by force and by the violence of arms? How can we expect that a resolution imposing a purely provisional cease-fire—I would even say a temporary cease-fire—can then be given long-range validity? Let us not deceive ourselves. To try indefinitely to maintain what is of a transitory and temporary nature is to expect the impossible, and it is not that my delegation does not deplore this, but by the very nature of things and because of the events that constantly recur and that are brought to our notice daily through our information media and by the documentation circulated by the United Nations Secretariat, we could hardly expect other results.

29. Once again my delegation reiterates that the main cause that gives rise to this situation is the lack of compliance with resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council. We cannot continue to allow the occupation of territories by force to be perpetuated, nor the decisions of this organ of the United Nations to remain unfulfilled. The longer we take to comply with the decisions of the principal organs of the United Nations the more we are contributing to the weakening of our Organization.

30. My delegation must condemn energetically the latest action undertaken by Israel against Lebanon. We in no way condone any of the attacks levelled against the former, but let us note that in the majority of cases they are violent acts carried out by guerrilla groups belonging to a people that has been displaced and that they are directed against a zone militarily occupied by Israel by force.

31. The fact that resolution 242 (1967) provides for a political solution satisfying all States of the area should stand as adequate guarantee for restoring peace in that sorely afflicted region. My delegation trusts that the meetings of the four permanent members and the resumption of the Jarring mission will allow, in this year of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, a re-establishment of peace, so that all the States in that region will be able to live free from

threats, and we trust that, without excuses or pretexts, there will be compliance as speedily as possible with resolution 242 (1967). Let us not forget that almost three years have elapsed since the six-day war, and the prestige of our Organization cannot be constantly eroded without the rest of the Members trying to fulfil our duties and ensure compliance with its decisions. Let us not forget that paragraph 1 of article 24 of the Charter states:

“In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its Members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf.”

32. One may criticize this Council as one wishes but, when it acts, it does so on behalf of all Members of the Organization, including those who censure and vilify the Council.

33. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): As President of the Security Council I now call on the representative of China.

34. Mr. LIU (China): The situation in the Middle East was last discussed in the Security Council in August 1969 [*1498th to 1502nd and 1504th meetings*]. At that time the Council was called upon to deal with the bombing of Lebanese villages by units of the Israeli Air Force. Now, more than eight months after that meeting, the Council has been convened on an urgent basis to consider a similar incident. This time the case involves a massive incursion by Israeli armed forces into south Lebanon. Now, as then, Israel has justified its action on the ground of self defence. Its purpose, according to the statement of the Israeli representative, was to destroy the bases on Lebanese territory used by Palestinian guerrillas to conduct raids on Israel. In other words, the Israeli action was in the nature of military retaliation.

35. My delegation has in this Council on a number of occasions voiced its disapproval of the policy of military retaliation, a policy which is as dangerous as it is futile. It cannot achieve the purposes for which it was intended. It can only accelerate the vicious circle of violence and counter-violence.

36. The Israeli military action is all the more regrettable in view of the fact that it was directed against a country which did not participate in the June 1967 war and which has played a moderating role in the affairs of the Middle East. Admittedly, the Palestinian guerrillas have been using the territory of Lebanon to launch attacks on Israel. It is a well-known fact, however, that the Government of Lebanon has tried to use every means at its disposal to restrain the guerrillas. It is for this reason that my delegation welcomed the unanimous action taken by the Council on 12 May in demanding the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli forces from the territory of Lebanon.

37. My delegation is gratified to have the report of the Acting Chairman of the Israeli-Lebanon Mixed

Armistice Commission [*see 1540th meeting, para. 84*] that the withdrawal of the Israeli forces has been officially confirmed by the Lebanese authorities and that the decision of the Council has thus been carried out. The Council must, therefore, at this time look beyond the current conflict and search for an acceptable final settlement of the Middle East problem. It is sad to reflect that almost three years after the war of June 1967 the prospects for peace are as bleak as ever. In fact the situation has been steadily deteriorating. A state of active warfare now prevails on all fronts. The cease-fire established by the Security Council as a first step towards the restoration of stability has become totally ineffective. The principles laid down in Security Council resolution 242 (1967) for a just and lasting peace remain unimplemented. The talks engaged in by the four interested Powers have so far proved unproductive. As matters now stand, there is little room for optimism.

38. Yet sooner or later a way must be found to resolve the present deadlock which has already caused so much misery and suffering. We therefore appeal to the parties concerned for compromise and conciliation. We are sure that all of them want peace. What is required is to do the hard things that are essential to that end. My delegation supports all efforts, including the talks of the four interested Powers, to bring about a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Above all, we hope that the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr. Jarring, will be enabled to continue his consultations with the parties immediately concerned, for the understanding and consent of those who control the destinies of the area are absolutely essential to any meaningful and durable settlement.

39. THE PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should now like to address the Council as the representative of FRANCE.

40. My dear colleagues, I am perfectly well aware of the restraint imposed upon the representative of France by his position as President of the Security Council. Although in this case the dual personality is authorized and even traditional, the Council expects from the man who presides over its proceedings that he will search for what unites rather than for what divides. This will be all the easier for me because that general policy, the policy of peace and international co-operation, is precisely what we believe France stands for.

41. I should like first of all to do justice to the Security Council. It has often been reproached for a lack of impartiality. Reference has been made to one-sided resolutions. No doubt there is some passion in our statements; the discussions are lively and sometimes what is said is less than courteous. I am the first to realize that. As President, I am the one who is supposed to keep order in our debates and who is supposed to see to it that everyone's rights are respected and to conduct our proceedings to their conclusion in good order and calm; a calm which is sometimes only relative. But the very diversity of the composition of the Council—geographic, political and ideological—is

a guarantee of the representation of all tendencies. I would add that, while we naturally express the points of view of our Governments, our responsibilities go beyond that. We are the guardians of the United Nations Charter, its principles and their application. I know no member of the Council who is not profoundly convinced of that—not only the permanent members, whose special duties have been so aptly pointed out just recently by the Ambassadors of Zambia and Finland, but also the non-permanent members who, through their election, have been delegated by the whole United Nations to work for the maintenance of international peace and security. A resolution unanimously adopted is not a one-sided resolution. It is the expression of the collective will. And that is why we should strive to bring about agreement between us, agreement which is the proper way of strengthening our action and, unquestionably, is a way of fulfilling the mission entrusted to us by the United Nations Charter.

42. When on the morning of 12 May the Council was faced with the situation in the Middle East and the serious events which occurred in southern Lebanon, I could not help being struck, like so many members, at the contrast between the understanding sealed the day before in the Security Council, which augured so well for the independence of Bahrain, and the military operations conducted against a pre-eminently peaceful and moderate country, Lebanon, a country with which we in France are united by so many links of history, culture and feeling. We cannot remain indifferent to what affects Lebanon, its independence, its sovereignty and its integrity. Two important communities live in Lebanon in equilibrium and harmony, a rare and one would like to believe, an exemplary phenomenon. In expressing once again our friendship to the people of Lebanon, we would express the hope that its unity will emerge strengthened from this new test.

43. Let us say clearly: the Israeli intervention is inadmissible. And not simply because it was against Lebanon, not simply because it is contrary to the spirit and the letter of the Charter to assure the right to send to a neighbouring country troops and armour, even to carry out what is called in military terminology a "hit and run raid"—if we are not to use the frightful term "sweep"—but also and particularly because this operation, which has no future militarily, constitutes an act of escalation which makes even more difficult the bringing about of a peaceful settlement.

44. We have heard the reasons alleged. Violations of the cease-fire are unfortunately a fact on both sides. And we deplore violations on both sides, because nothing but blood, tears and mourning can emerge from this exchange of raids and counter-raids, strikes and reprisals.

45. Without any doubt, in unanimously adopting the proposal of our Spanish colleague the Council has abided by the principle of doing first things first, and we have learned with satisfaction that the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from Lebanese territory was

carried out with effect from 1030 hours GMT Wednesday, 13 May. But that is not the end of our concern. Those events form part of a whole: the Middle East conflict, which is something which can have no solution but a political one.

46. We are not among those who resign themselves to the prolongation and the exacerbation of a war which is half latent and half over. Some people simply say: "It is insoluble. Confrontation is inevitable. The Jews will never come to an understanding with the Arabs. The Arabs hate the Jews and the Jews hate the Arabs." These ominous platitudes are nothing but an alibi for an ignorance of history and for an abdication of the spirit and the will. Ambassador Baroody, with his vast erudition and his great talent, quite rightly pointed out that for centuries Jews and Arabs lived and worked side by side without any problem. Is it worth remembering, for example, the tenth century when the Jews alone provided a link between the Moslem orient and the Christian west? To our great shame, we must say that the scourge of racism and of anti-semitism was much more widespread in Europe than it was in the east. And to come to more recent times and even to personal memories—and I apologize for this—I should like to say that I have had the privilege of having comrades in arms who were Arabs and comrades in the resistance who were Jews, and I never found among them any one but men who hated oppression, who wanted to fight for a world without hatred, men who loved liberty and dignity. What we must overcome today here in the Security Council and in the United Nations is the frightful historical inevitability which pits against each other peoples and men who should be brought close by every possible tie; the community of suffering and of humiliation, of destroyed and abandoned homes, of wandering and of persecution, and over and above those tribulations and those dispersals, the courage to persevere and the hope of a motherland.

47. We have never ceased to proclaim—and we are not in the habit of using different language in Paris, New York, Cairo, Amman, Beirut, Damascus and Tel Aviv—that Israel has the right to existence, to recognition and to security. Israel has the right to secure and guaranteed frontiers, and its neighbours must undertake clearly and unequivocally to live in peace with Israel. But those frontiers cannot be the frontiers of occupation or annexation. Our Foreign Minister, Mr. Maurice Schumann, stated recently in our National Assembly:

"The essential difficulty stems from what I would call a certain incapacity on the part of Israel to take a definite decision with regard to its fundamental problem: namely, what to do with the occupied territories and a million Arabs.

"How, in these circumstances, can Israel hope to convince those with whom it wants to deal directly and without any pre-condition that it is not thinking of taking advantage of the occupation to impose an expansion of its territory? How can it in this way ensure its own security?"

48. We have been reading recently that one of the most authoritative spokesmen of the Tel Aviv Government is reported to have stated that Israel was ready, in order to assure peace, to make concessions which would surprise the world. I do not know if that is exactly what he said, but we certainly do not ask so much. Let Israel, which owes its foundation to the United Nations, undertake simply and unreservedly to apply the terms of the unanimous resolution of 22 November 1967 of the Security Council of this same United Nations, and I think a great step forward will have been taken towards peace and towards the solution of the Palestinian problem, which grows more acute every day.

49. A year ago my Government took the initiative in convening a meeting of the permanent members of the Council in order to seek ways and means of facilitating an implementation of a settlement on the basis of resolution 242 (1967), and to enable Ambassador Jarring to resume his mission.

50. Despite the protracted nature of this work and the paucity of the apparent results, I think, as Lord Caradon does, that this effort of reflection was not futile, and the statements made here in the Council itself by the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union have convinced me that if, in good faith, we abide by the resolution which we all voted for, we can find, on the essential matters and rapidly, a large field of agreement.

51. If the distressing events in Lebanon could make it possible for us, with the encouragement and the support of the Council, to advance more boldly upon the only possible course at the present time, the course of peaceful settlement, then it will be a case of an ill wind having blown somebody some good. I would hope that the Government of Israel, like all interested Governments, would be convinced of this. Today, we have a unique opportunity once again, a unique opportunity for peace and security, which for the time being is the only constructive path, and certainly does not exclude any initiative or proposal which has the same end in view.

52. It is in the light of this fundamental necessity that we shall take our stand on any possible resolutions. This is no longer the time for pronouncing anathemas. Let us realize that we should not do anything to earn the condemnation of Guglielmo Ferrero: "We are a civilization which knows how to make war but no longer knows how to make peace."

53. Speaking again as PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers on my list for the moment. If everybody agrees, I shall set the next meeting for Monday, 18 May, at 3 p.m.

54. The representative of Isreal has asked for the floor and I now call upon him.

55. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I have just one word. I feel that I cannot pass over in silence the statement we heard today from the representative of Spain. I

cannot but wonder how far one can go in disregarding basic concepts of law, justice and humanity. The thesis propounded today by the representative of Spain can be summed up simply as follows: as the unconditional cease-fire established by the Security Council has unfortunately not yet brought about peace, it is all right to revert to war and to condone violations of the cease-fire. Of all the inequitable, one-sided, disastrous contributions to the present situation in the Middle East, this is one of the worst.

56. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I believe that the representative of Israel has not understood my statement. I shall reiterate what I said: "My delegation laments the fact that there are constant violations of the cease-fire resolution, with the inevitable victims" [*see above, para. 24*]. This will be found in the records and on the tape of my statement and anyone who wishes to refer to it can do so.

57. What I have contended, and again I shall quote myself, is:

"Yesterday we heard important statements on behalf of the United States and the Soviet Union and we would hope that goodwill on all sides might allow us to find a just solution to this grave situation.

"My delegation considers that the creation of the necessary climate is not furthered by violations of the cease-fire. However, how can we consider that the temporary nature of those resolutions can be indefinitely extended, and that mention is even made in the Council of a so-called cease-fire line? . . . Resolutions 234 (1967) and 235 (1967) should already have been superseded by the implementation of resolution 242 (1967)." [*See above, paras. 26 and 27.*]

58. My delegation feels that those resolutions are valid until resolution 242 (1967) is complied with and deplores the fact that two and a half years have elapsed and that that resolution, which provides for a political solution to the conflict, has not as yet been put into effect.

59. I presume that the representative of Isreal will agree with me that when that resolution has been implemented we will not have to recall cease-fires or the cessation of hostilities. The cause that created this grave conflict will I believe have disappeared. That is why my delegation again restates its desire to see resolution 242 (1967) complied with as soon as possible, for that will have solved a conflict which I believe has already gone too far.

60. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): I had occasion yesterday [*1540th meeting*] and the day before [*1539th meeting*] to quote the most important paragraphs of the two resolutions, resolution 235 (1967) and 236 (1967), which were unanimously adopted by the Council following the occupation by Israeli troops of Syrian territory. During the debates following the adoption of resolution 236 (1967) on 11 June, an interpretation of the cease-fire was given in the Security Council and never challenged. At that time, the representative of a non-permanent



member of the Security Council, the Ambassador of Nigeria, said the following:

"A cease-fire, as we understand it, must mean that the guns must be silenced and that the troop movements must be halted wherever they are. Any attempt to gain legal and geographical advantages from the current situation must therefore be deplored." [1357th meeting, para. 176.]

61. I wish to repeat the sentence: "Any attempt to gain legal and geographical advantages from the current situation must therefore be deplored." The representative of Nigeria went on to say:

"I have one last point. In the course of the debate this evening, a new phrase has gradually come into circulation, that is the phrase 'cease-fire line'. Let it be accepted merely by default, let me say, for my delegation at least, that we do not understand that there is a cease-fire line. There are the armistice lines. There is the cease-fire order which means that troops should stay where they are and that any movement, north, south, east or west, except such movement as to return from the scene of battle to one's own home ground, is a violation of the cease fire." [Ibid., para. 177.]

62. Following that, the representative of the United Kingdom, Lord Caradon, commented on the explanation of the cease-fire by the representative of Nigeria in the following words:

"I have only one point which I wish to make, very shortly. I wish to express my gratitude to the representative of Nigeria for raising an important point. I think that when I was speaking earlier I referred to the cease-fire line. If I did so, I did so inadvertently. I entirely agree with the important point which he has put to us. It is well, I think, to refer back to the actual words of the agreement reached by General Bull. I refer to the record of yesterday's meeting, the actual words of General Bull were: . . . 'I proposed a cease-fire together with no further movement of troops to be effective at 1630 GMT 10 June.' That is the proposal which he made to both parties, and it was accepted by both parties.

"I am very glad that I can confirm that, and if previously I used the word 'cease-fire line', I was mistaken." [Ibid., paras. 204 and 205.]

63. Now what do we conclude from this definition of the cease-fire, which was never challenged by the Security Council because the Council accepted that interpretation? What we conclude is the following: first, that no party—and in this case the party is the one that occupies the territory of the other State—can gain legal and geographical advantages from the current situation and, if any party can that must be deplored. But what is the situation now? Israel has, contrary to the Geneva Convention,<sup>1</sup> bulldozed villages and established settlements—twelve of them in the Syrian occupied territory, a large number in Jordan and in the Sinai—which is in full contradiction to the cease-

fire. The second point is the confirmation that there are the armistice lines. The armistice lines are the result of the armistice agreements concluded in 1948 and 1949. The armistice agreements are still valid. The Secretary-General and the United Nations are on record as declaring that they cannot be denounced unilaterally as they were by Israel, and that the armistice agreements provide all the machinery to preserve the peace in the area.

64. One last point. I listened carefully this morning to the statement made by our colleague and friend, the very distinguished representative of Colombia, who is a well-known and great statesman in his own country. I shall of course read the full text of his statement in the verbatim record, and if I misunderstood what he said I apologize in advance. But if, as I gathered, the representative of Colombia was saying that the solution to the problem arising from the complaint of Lebanon of an attack on Lebanese territory—and this is the third complaint by Lebanon, the first relating to the attack on Beirut and the second to an attack on southern Lebanon, not to speak of all the other attacks—is to have more observers, that is provided for by an agreement and a machinery that already exist, namely, the armistice agreement. Does a larger number of observers prevent Israel from continuing and perpetuating its attacks? The answer is in the records of the Security Council and of the United Nations.

65. The number of observers in the cease-fire sector between the United Arab Republic and Israel, or between Syria and Israel, has not prevented Israel from carrying out attacks daily against those two countries and against Jordan. Indeed, if I may, I shall only remind the Council of the number of violations against Syria alone, which I reported yesterday and which in 1969 amounted to 509, and in the first three months of 1970 to 1,045 plus those mentioned in the nineteen reports, which I read, covering the period from 8 April to 8 May.

66. The question is not a quantitative one; it is a qualitative one; it is the respect of the agreement—the armistice agreement is still valid—it is the respect of the principles of the Charter, more specifically Article 2, which among its principles states in paragraph 4 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 . . ."

67. This is a principle, and a principle cannot be compromised with. As to the actuality of the situation the armistice agreements are still valid and they provide the machinery. What the Security Council is seized with now is the complaint by Lebanon for which a very urgent solution and action by the Council is requested.

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

<sup>1</sup> Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75 (1950), No. 973).

69. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I should like to make only a brief *mise au point* following upon the words of the representative of Syria. I should simply like to recall that on 13 June 1967 the representatives of the Government of Syria signed a document and a map, not only accepting the cease-fire but establishing the cease-fire lines as they were on that date—about seven days after the end of the six-day war. Those documents are of course reproduced in various official United Nations documents distributed at the time by the Secretary-General to members of the Security Council.

70. Mr. VALLEJO-ARBELAEZ (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to explain to the representative of Syria that Colombia's proposal was not a formal one. I merely hinted at the possibility of considering a formula similar to that suggested by Mr. Araujo Castro of Brazil in an academic meeting in California, regarding the setting-up of small *ad hoc* committees. This is different from the group that already exists in the Security Council, composed of four permanent members of the Security Council—the four great Powers, as we term them—and also different in function from the action which the Secretary-General is at present carrying out through Ambassador Jarring.

71. In the first of these cases, the committee of the Four, there is political work being done which goes beyond the direct interests of the countries concerned and touches upon world peace, the balance of world forces. It is the four countries which are the guarantors of peace in the Security Council that have to speak of this balance of forces in the world. They are carrying out their duties in doing so, and I believe that, as the President has himself told us, they are progressing effectively. Some day, perhaps unexpectedly, we shall get results—I hope so.

72. Then, again, we know that Ambassador Jarring is carrying out his good offices of amicable negotiator between the two parties, and we trust too that at some time we may obtain some formula that will allow us to weigh the proposals that we have lately heard from the Prime Minister of Israel and the President of the United Arab Republic: both generous proposals for a peaceful settlement.

73. However, we felt that neither of these two systems had itself been entirely exhausted; that the matter could still be considered along those lines but that the Security Council should not reject the goodwill of three small countries that are not linked directly to the conflict and want to offer their services not as observers at the place of conflict but to hear the views of the Arab side and those of the Israeli side—a group of three that would have available to it the information received from the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and would also have access to the political formulas that are being discussed in the Four. In possession of all the historic factors and bearing in mind Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and those that preceded it, which have been cited, and which are still to be complied with, this group of three countries might then present a complete formula, a study, in which it would consider the very grave refugee

problem that is weighing so heavily upon the entire situation in the Middle East, and conduct a thorough study of the problem of the frontiers and of the fulfillment of resolutions still pending. Then, from the formulas that would be submitted to the Security Council, there might be devised a formula for peace. This would not differ from the work being done by the Four nor be contrary to the work that the Secretary-General is engaged in. It is not incompatible with these nor does it conflict with them—they complement one another—and we would use these elements of judgement.

74. We find that the situation of the four great Powers is very different; they have to defend their dangerous political positions concerning the balance of power in the world to discuss a concrete problem of the Middle East. On the other hand, these three countries, which, as I said, are not linked to the conflict, might with greater freedom of action be able to devise generous formulas which the Security Council might be in a position to consider.

75. What I asked on behalf of the delegation of Colombia was whether the Security Council felt that a formula of such a nature might be viable, so as to study it thoroughly. I am not making a formal proposal. It is not a question of replacing the armistice commissions nor the observers that the Secretary-General has sent to the Middle East to do their duties, nor is it the suggestion of Colombia that there should be set up a group of amicable negotiators for it will not act as intermediary between the parties. It would be, as Ambassador Araujo Castro has called it, an *ad hoc* committee that would draw up an entire system of solutions to the problems besetting the countries of the Middle East.

76. I think I have explained to Ambassador Tomeh the purport of the Colombian suggestion. However, I too intend to revise the interpretation of the statement I have made in order to make sure that it is correct and to see if we can find some path. Colombia would be ready to serve in a body of that nature. It would be a neutral, impartial *ad hoc* committee not linked to the conflict itself.

77. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): I wish to express my most sincere thanks and appreciation to the representative of Colombia for the very constructive explanation that he has given me in his reply.

78. With regard to the remarks made by Mr. Tekoah, I wish to make two points: first, that agreeing on a cease-fire arrangement does not mean at all that we agree on the cease-fire line becoming the frontier of a new and greater Israel; secondly, the interpretation of the cease-fire line, as I read it verbatim from the records of the Security Council, stands and remains unchallenged.

79. Mr. Tekoah has attempted time and again, as he has done today, to make the Council accept as an international concept what the Council itself has denounced as a fraud. Therefore the members of the Council and the Council itself, in the spirit of respect for the law,

should accept what the Council has already interpreted to be the cease-fire line. Furthermore, on the cease-fire arrangement, as in the armistice agreement, the reservation has always been made that that arrangement does not prejudice in any way the legal rights of any party concerned. This remains the case, but it is known

to all of us that there is already a map of greater Israel, officially published by the Israeli Government, including all the occupied territories behind the cease-fire line, and that is what we deny to Israel.

*The meeting rose at 12.20 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. Наведите 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.

---