

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SEVENTH YEAR

UN LIBRARY

1643rd

MEETING: 26 FEBRUARY 1972

NOV 24 1975

UN/SA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1643)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 25 February 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10546);	
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 25 February 1972 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10550)	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.

SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-THIRD MEETING

Held in New York on Saturday, 26 February 1972, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Mohamed FAKHREDDINE (Sudan).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Argentina, Belgium, China, France, Guinea, India, Italy, Japan, Panama, Somalia, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1643)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 25 February 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10546).

3. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 25 February 1972 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10550).

The meeting was called to order at 11.25 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like to recall that during its meeting yesterday the Council agreed to hold a meeting this morning to consider the question raised by the Permanent Representative of Lebanon in his letter dated 25 February 1972 [S/10546]. Later yesterday evening a letter from the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel [S/10550] requesting a meeting of the Security Council was received. The provisional agenda has thus been drawn up in accordance with the practice of the Council in similar cases.

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 25 February 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10546)

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 25 February 1972 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10550)

2. The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform the Council that I have received letters dated 25 February 1972 containing requests for participation in the discussion of the items just inscribed on the agenda from the delegations of Lebanon [S/10549] and Israel [S/10551]. With the consent of the Council and pursuant to these requests, I would invite the representatives of Lebanon and Israel to participate, without vote, in the discussion of the items on the Council's agenda.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. N. Kabbani (Lebanon) and Mr. J. Doron (Israel) took places at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: The Council will now begin its consideration of the items inscribed on its agenda. The first name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Lebanon, on whom I now call.

4. Mr. KABBANI (Lebanon): Mr. President, I wish to thank you for your prompt action in convening this urgent meeting of the Security Council at the request of the Lebanese delegation. My thanks are also extended to the other members of the Council for responding to your urgent call. It is a great satisfaction to my delegation to see you presiding over this august body in these difficult circumstances.

5. Yesterday, 25 February 1972, at 6 a.m., a battalion of the Israeli armed forces, composed of 60 tanks and armoured cars, entered the region of Aitaroun and Bint-Jbail, under heavy air force cover. They were also supported by units of Israeli infantry stationed at the border. The Israeli forces attacked the villages of Ain Aata, Aihā, Heloue and Deir-el-Ashair, between 7.15 a.m. and 7.30 a.m., destroying many houses—the exact number cannot be determined as yet.

6. The Israeli air force also bombarded the villages of Rashaya-el-Fakhar and Kfar Hamman at 12 noon. One Lebanese civilian was killed and another wounded.

7. A force, carried on military vehicles, encircled the village of Hebbarie at 12.30 p.m. and withdrew at 4 p.m.

8. Moreover, at 9 a.m. Israel delivered a warning to Lebanon through the Mixed Armistice Commission. The contents of this warning are unprecedented in arrogance. Allow me, Mr. President, to read out this warning:

“Murderous activities were committed by terrorists that came from and returned to Lebanon. There were three

cases within 24 hours: the murder of a couple near Shomera; the planting of two katyushas near Kabri, which were aimed towards 'Akka; and the attack on an Israeli patrol near the bridge called Ben, where eight people were wounded. These events occurred although promises had been made by the Lebanese authorities to stop any activity against Israel.

"The Israeli defence forces are acting according to the warning which was transmitted on 14 January 1972. The operation is aimed against the terrorists. We are finishing the operation and withdrawing our forces. We do not accept your views that the terrorists can act in Israeli territory. If such activity does not cease, we shall carry on with our operation of incursions into and destruction in Lebanon. You are responsible for each terrorist that stays in Lebanon, and it is not important to us how he operates.

"In the future, if we continue with our operations, Lebanese citizens might get hurt, because we might be compelled to hit roads, villages, and any place where we think that the terrorists are located.

"If we and you are interested in avoiding that, it is very desirable for us to know more of the locations and places of the terrorists, so that we will be able to hit them with minimum damage to the population."

9. My delegation has just received information from my Government that the Israeli aggression against Lebanon is still continuing today, Saturday. Between the hours of 8 and 10 a.m., Israeli artillery bombarded the area of Al-Habbariya. At 11 a.m., waves of Israeli Skyhawk and Mirage aircraft participated in the bombardment of the same area. Each wave was composed of 10 planes.

10. The result of the aggression of Israel against Lebanon on 25 February 1972 was the death of two Lebanese, one of whom was a soldier; three other persons were wounded, and 32 houses completely destroyed; several dozen towns were badly damaged. At this very hour, several bulldozers are still operating on Lebanese territory, opening roads towards villages in Lebanon and paving the way for further military operations.

11. Before I speak further on this morning's aggression and on yesterday's aggression and warning, I should like to recall briefly some relevant facts of the not-too-distant past. In addition to its records of grave acts of aggression against the people of Palestine and other Arab peoples, Israel has committed many acts of aggression against Lebanon during the past few years. These acts have been the object of 29 letters addressed to the President of the Security Council since the attack on the civilian International airport of Beirut in December 1968 [see S/8945, of 29 December 1968].

12. Lebanon came to the Council because of that attack of 28 December 1968. The Council condemned Israel unanimously for "its premeditated military action" and 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" [resolution 262 (1968)].

13. On 26 August 1969 the Council adopted its resolution 270 (1969), in which it condemned "the premeditated air attack by Israel on villages in southern Lebanon in violation of its obligations under the Charter and Security Council resolutions" and further declared that "such actions of military reprisal... cannot be tolerated and that the Security Council would have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such acts".

14. On 19 May 1970 the Council adopted its resolution 280 (1970), in which it condemned Israel for "its premeditated military action in violation of its obligations under the Charter"; the Council went on to declare that: "such armed attacks can no longer be tolerated" and it repeated "its solemn warning to Israel that if they were to be repeated, the Security Council would, in accordance with resolution 262 (1968) and the present resolution, consider taking adequate and effective steps or measures in accordance with the relevant Articles of the Charter to implement its resolutions".

15. Furthermore, the Council on 5 September 1970 adopted its resolution 285 (1970), in which it demanded "the complete and immediate withdrawal of all Israeli armed forces from Lebanese territory". The complaint of Lebanon contained in document S/9925 of 5 September 1970 is still valid.

16. It had been the hope of the Lebanese Government that the resolutions of the Security Council and its repeated warnings would be sufficient to restrain Israel from committing any further incursion into Lebanon. As usual, however, Israel has continued to defy the resolutions and authority of the Security Council, choosing instead to rely on its military power to threaten the territorial integrity of Lebanon and the peaceful life of its inhabitants, and to perpetuate a situation of tension, turmoil and terror in the Middle East.

17. Confident that it will go unpunished and will continue to receive all the military and financial aid it demands, Israel has used its power to commit more aggression and block every effort to bring about a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

18. The warning issued by Israel yesterday, which I quoted at the beginning of my statement, has even further implications. Not only does it contain threats of further escalating the aggression against Lebanon, which demonstrates that Israel continues to believe that the only law which exists in the international community is the law of military power, but it also reveals a new impudence on the part of Israel: that of asking Lebanon to be an accomplice with it against the Palestinian people whose land and country has been usurped by the Zionist colonialists and who for 26 years have been waiting for justice to be meted out to them. It is a despicable invitation to the Lebanese Government and people to be party to a treacherous and murderous act against the Palestinian people. It involves more than threats. It is pure blackmail and a direct insult to the Lebanese Government and people.

19. My delegation would like to draw the attention of the Council to the following. First, the Israeli aggression of

yesterday was of the largest magnitude ever directed against Lebanon and involved the entire southern part of the country.

20. Second, the military operation which Israel began yesterday in Lebanon, and which is continuing today, was enormously out of proportion with the alleged acts in Israel attributed to the *fedayeen*.

21. Third, my Government categorically rejects the Israeli allegation that the incidents which occurred on Israeli-held territory originated from Lebanon. Israel seems to believe that there can be no resistance in Israeli-held territories. Active resistance has spread all over Israeli-held territories against the occupier. The areas adjacent to Lebanon and other neighbouring countries are no exception.

22. Fourth, as clearly stated by the Israeli warning itself, all the alleged acts took place inside Israeli-held territory. Not one single shot has been fired from Lebanese territory for the last 40 days. Furthermore, Lebanon cannot be held responsible for the security and safety of Israel.

23. Fifth, if Israel had not paralysed the Israeli-Lebanese Mixed Armistice Commission, the international observers would have been in a position to ascertain the facts regarding the origin of the incidents. Instead, Israel has unilaterally denounced the 1949 General Armistice Agreement between Lebanon and Israel¹ and thus nullified any action to be undertaken according to its provisions. This Armistice Agreement cannot be denounced unilaterally; that has been and remains the view of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

24. Sixth, although it does not assume responsibility for the maintenance of order in Israeli-held territories, Lebanon has done its utmost to control its border. But experience in other parts of the world has shown that no Government can entirely control its borders.

25. The warning issued by Israel yesterday is based on the original warning conveyed to us on 14 January 1972, which threatened us with occupation. On 11 January, we related [S/10502] the latest acts of aggression against Lebanon until that time and, in an additional letter dated 14 January [S/10509], we brought to the attention of the Security Council the text of the Israeli threat of that date relayed to the Lebanese authorities through the Mixed Armistice Commission. That threat revealed once more the hawkish and militaristic attitude of the Israeli military authorities. It constitutes a flagrant violation of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter concerning "the threat or use of force". Threats have been reported to the Council by my delegation also in another letter dated 14 January [S/10508].

26. In these circumstances, and in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, it becomes incumbent upon the Security Council to adopt the measures which would prevent Israel from resorting to its chronic acts of aggression against Lebanon, or against any other Arab State. It is

the considered opinion of the Lebanese delegation that the aggregate acts of aggression undertaken by Israel against Lebanon since December 1968 are sufficient basis for the Council to determine that these acts of Israel constitute a breach of the peace and a threat to the peace and aggravate the conditions of tension and insecurity in Lebanon and the Middle East.

27. It therefore becomes necessary not only to safeguard the territorial integrity of Lebanon, its sovereignty and the peaceful conditions of life of its people, but also to impose on Israel the appropriate sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, in the interest of maintaining and preserving peace and security in the Middle East and the rest of the world.

28. By Israel's occupation of territories of three Member States since 1967, by its constant refusal to solve the problem of Palestine, Israel's policy remains the main obstacle to the establishment of conditions of peace and security in the Middle East.

29. Because of all those considerations, and because the Council, in its previous resolutions on this subject, has constantly warned Israel against the repetition of such acts against Lebanon, but to no avail, the Lebanese delegation requests the Council to take positive and decisive measures against Israel that will prevent it from committing further acts of aggression against Lebanon.

30. The PRESIDENT: The second name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Israel, on whom I now call.

31. Mr. DORON (Israel): Mr. President, first of all I should like to extend to you my delegation's respects and good wishes. May I also be allowed to pay our respects to the Secretary-General.

32. I am authorized to state definitely that there is no action proceeding in the area concerned. Everything has been quiet there for many hours. The Security Council is again faced with a situation for the creation of which the Government of Lebanon is completely responsible and for which it should blame only itself. It is only too well known that, for a long time and contrary to its explicit obligations under international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the cease-fire established by the Security Council and accepted by the Government of Lebanon on 31 July 1967, the Government of Lebanon has permitted a number of terrorist organizations not only to set up their headquarters in Beirut but also to establish bases and encampments, some within Lebanese villages and others near such villages.

33. It is of course a cowardly act to set themselves up in or near those villages, as the presence and activities of the terrorists there may entail, in certain circumstances, dire consequences for the villages. But, obviously, the terrorists do not care for the welfare of the villagers. In their perverted logic they believe that any damage and injury suffered by the villagers because of their presence will cause the villagers to join the ranks of the terrorist organizations.

34. From these encampments and bases the terrorists undertake armed attacks against Israel, directed mainly

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 4*

against civilians and also against members of our armed forces, as well as causing damage to property by acts of sabotage.

35. The Government of Lebanon has even gone so far as to enter into a written agreement with the man who claims to be the recognized leader of the organizations that engage in terrorist activities against Israel and who has obviously been recognized as such by the Government of Lebanon. This agreement was signed in Cairo on 3 November 1969 between the then Commander-in-Chief of the Lebanese Army, General Emil Bustani, and Yasser Arafat.

36. Now, what kind of situation is this? A Government of a country, Member of the United Nations, in complete disregard of its obligations under the Charter of the Organization and international law, makes an agreement with a group of terrorist organizations which have the avowed aim of carrying murder and sabotage into a neighbouring country, also a Member of the United Nations, with the intention of bringing about the destruction of that country? That agreement provides for full co-operation between the Government of Lebanon and the terrorists; it permits them to set up camps and to carry arms and extends to them all the facilities for their nefarious activities. It is a long and detailed agreement that has been published in full in the press—for example, in the weekly English edition of *Le Monde* of 29 April 1970. It has been referred to here on previous occasions and suffice it if I would only mention at this stage that one of its points reaffirms that the terrorists' armed struggle was in Lebanon's interest as it was in the interest of the Palestinian revolution and of all the Arabs in general.

37. On many occasions, before and after the signature of that agreement, the then President of Lebanon and the Cabinet Ministers, including the present Prime Minister, Mr. Saeb Salam himself, have expressed their support for the terrorists in their actions against Israel. So, on 1 January 1972, Radio Beirut quoted the Prime Minister of Lebanon as having declared: "We always endeavour to help our *fedayeen* brethren and to supply them with whatever we possess".

38. On 6 January 1972 the Prime Minister of Lebanon made another statement, reported by the Associated Press, in which he said: "Lebanon has participated and will participate in the struggle against Israel. Military action is one of the ways to participate in this struggle".

39. It is one of the basic tenets of international law that every Government not only is bound to refrain from attacks or threats of attack against another country, but also is obliged to prevent any group, organization or any other body from using its territory for attacks or threats against another country. But for years now in the case of Lebanon we have been faced with an incredible situation of which the Cairo agreement, which I have just referred to, is an eloquent illustration.

40. The same Government of Lebanon which comes from time to time to the Security Council with complaints against Israel quite openly and unashamedly permits its territory continuously to be used for attacks by armed

bands, mostly against civilians but also against other targets in Israel, and not only does nothing to put an end to these murderous activities but officially expresses its support for them. Just as it is the duty of every Government to prevent attacks from its territory against another country, so there exists a duty for every country to protect its citizens from attacks perpetuated against them.

41. My Government has on many occasions brought to the attention of the Security Council literally hundreds of attacks committed by terrorists operating from Lebanese territory against towns, villages, schools, kindergartens, men, women and children in Israel. It is most unfortunate that nothing has been done by the Council on previous occasions to impress on the Government of Lebanon that it cannot extend facilities and co-operation to the terrorists and at the same time expect the Government of Israel to refrain from carrying out its duty, namely that of protecting its citizens and property.

42. At the 1551st meeting of the Security Council, on 5 September 1970, the representative of Israel informed the Council that in a period of about four months preceding that meeting there had been more than 200 terrorist attacks against Israel from Lebanon in which 15 Israeli civilians and 5 Israeli soldiers had been killed and 38 civilians and 55 Israeli soldiers had been wounded. These attacks included the murder on 22 May 1970 of 7 children and 3 adults in a school bus which had been attacked by terrorists from Lebanon while travelling on the road some 300 metres from the Israel-Lebanon line. In addition, 23 other children on the same bus were wounded, some of them very seriously. That outrage took place within a couple of days of a Security Council resolution [280 (1970) of 19 May 1970] which had completely ignored the incessant acts of murder and sabotage committed against Israel from Lebanese territory and which had only dealt in a most one-sided manner with Israel's reaction against those criminal acts.

43. With all the facilities and co-operation assured to them by the Government of Lebanon, the terrorist organizations feel free to disrupt any comparatively quiet period by renewing attacks against Israel from Lebanese territory. Thus I wish to refer to the letters from the representative of Israel to the President of the Security Council on 21 June [S/10239] and 30 June 1971 [S/10244] and the terrorist acts enumerated therein. The terrorists have turned Beirut into their centre of propaganda and incitement and use radio facilities in Beirut for the brazen announcement of their exploits, such as taking credit for the grenade outrage on 19 September 1971, in which a terrorist organization based in Lebanon killed a little Arab girl and wounded a number of American tourists on a Sunday morning on Via Dolorosa in Jerusalem.

44. Quite recently, on 12 and 13 January 1972 [S/10505 and S/10507], my delegation was again obliged to draw the attention of the Security Council to a new series of attacks from Lebanon against my country. The latest outrages which were perpetrated by terrorists from Lebanon occurred on 23 and 24 February. The two Israeli civilians who were killed on 23 February near the Lebanese border, as stated in my letter of 24 February [S/10543], were a young married couple, the parents of three small children,

who were returning in a civilian vehicle to their home in Zara'it village. Their car was brought to a halt when its tires were punctured by nails that had been scattered by the terrorists on the road, and they were killed by bazooka fire directed at them from close range by the murderers, who had come from Lebanese territory and returned to Lebanon after perpetrating their dastardly act.

45. This murder resembled in its *modus operandi* the murderous attack on the school bus near Bar-Am, in which 7 children and 3 adults were killed and 23 more children wounded on 22 May 1970, to which I just referred. But the present attack involved an additional refinement, namely, the scattering of nails on the road in order to force any vehicle arriving on the spot to stop and thus provide an even easier target for the firing of the bazooka.

46. That very night our security forces were able to discover, whilst searching for the terrorists who had fled to Lebanon, two rocket launchers ready and set to bombard the town of Acre. The following day terrorists who had penetrated from Lebanon opened fire on a patrol of the Israel border police travelling along the road near Biranit, in Upper Galilee, wounding 8 men, 3 of whom died subsequently.

47. Is there any country among those represented around this table, or among the Members of the United Nations, or in general, which takes seriously the duty to protect its citizens, that would not take defensive and protective action in the face of such attacks? Surely it is the right and the duty of any Government to act in self-defence and to protect its citizens and its property against attacks from a neighbouring territory. The action taken by Israeli forces was minimal and was directed only and specifically against the terrorists in their encampments. Israeli forces returned to their bases immediately after the operation.

48. The only way to deal with the present situation is to make the Lebanese Government understand what its duty is, namely, to spell out again that it must put an end to the activities of the terrorist bands which have ensconced themselves in Lebanese territory with the permission of the Lebanese Government.

49. The Government of Lebanon has in fact allowed its country to become a haven for terrorist organizations which operate freely, openly and with no hindrance from their headquarters in Beirut.

50. It is reported in the press today that the Minister of Transport of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Georg Leber, stated yesterday that the payment of ransom, in the sum of \$5 million for the Lufthansa aircraft hijacked by Arab terrorists in India and forced to fly to South Yemen, was effected near Beirut to the representatives of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. This "Popular Front" is one of the terrorist organizations covered by the Cairo agreement of 3 November 1969 and has its headquarters in Beirut, from which it is free to carry on its criminal activities, turning the route into an international clearing station for terrorist transactions.

51. Once the acts of aggression against Israel from Lebanese territory come to an end, peace and order will

reign in that area. So long, however, as the Government of Lebanon is unwilling or unable to prevent armed attacks from its territory against Israel, it should not be heard to complain against actions taken in self-defence by the Government of Israel, and Lebanon must not be given comfort and encouragement by any resolutions of the Security Council in utter disregard of the factual and legal situation. On the contrary, Lebanon should be condemned for flouting the cease-fire by its acts and its omissions and be ordered to take immediate action to put a stop to all terrorist activities from Lebanese territory against Israel.

52. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Security Council is meeting today, Saturday, which is usually a free day, as an extraordinary measure in order to consider new information relating to the continuing aggression by Israel against the Arab States. This time a large-scale armed attack has been launched on the territory of Lebanon.

53. The representative of Lebanon, Ambassador Kabbani, has given a detailed exposition of the facts relating to this new act of international piracy by the Israeli aggressors. Units of the Israeli armed forces including tanks and armoured cars, like a thief in the night, invaded territory in the southern part of Lebanon on the night of 25 February. Peaceful inhabited localities have been subjected to fierce and barbarous bombardment with high explosive shells and rockets. There have been casualties. These facts show that the international crime of aggression committed by Israeli troops in June 1967 is not only continuing in the form of the military occupation of the territory of three Arab States—Egypt, the Syrian Arab Republic and Jordan—but is being expanded by new acts of aggression against a fourth Arab State, Lebanon. And, as the representative of Lebanon has informed the Security Council, the Israeli aggression is still continuing today, 26 February.

54. In considering this new act of aggression by Israel, the Council must pay particular attention to the fact that the current Israeli aggression against Lebanon is a large-scale military attack by the Israeli aggressors against an Arab State, following the war and attack of June 1967. We are therefore dealing with a premeditated and preplanned act of aggression committed in accordance with the decision of the Israeli Government, an act which is a further manifestation and proof of the continuing policy of aggression which the enemies of peace and tranquillity in the Middle East, the high-handed Israeli leaders, are systematically and purposefully following with respect to neighbouring Arab States. This policy being followed by Israel is one of aggression, constant threats and blackmail against the Arab countries, and piratical and gangster-like incursions into their territory; it constitutes a particularly dangerous threat not only to peace and security in the Middle East, but to world peace as a whole.

55. In considering the question of Israel's latest criminal act, the Security Council must remember that Israel has already been condemned three times for premeditated military action against Lebanon and for failing to comply with its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations to live in peace and friendship with its neighbours. Israel's acts of aggression have been described by the Security

Council as a threat to peace in the Middle East. The Israeli troops' barbarous attack on areas inhabited by civilians in Lebanon and the savage reprisals against Arab civilians were exposed and branded, before the whole world, as international banditry and a crime against humanity. Nevertheless, Israel has again proceeded openly and cynically to threaten Lebanon with seizure of its territory and has undertaken another premeditated and preplanned act of aggression against this peace-loving Arab country.

56. Israel's blackmail, threats and direct attacks against Lebanon, which have been reported time and again in letters from the representative of Lebanon to the United Nations circulated as official Security Council documents, and, in particular, the most recent military invasion of Lebanese territory on 25 February are new links in the chain of never-ending attempts by Israel to heighten the already acute and explosive military tension in the Middle East, that hotbed of military danger, and to crush any new attempts to achieve a peaceful settlement in that area so that it may retain the occupied Arab territories and strengthen its position in those territories.

57. Israel's latest acts of aggression against Lebanon are particularly criminal and deserving of international punishment because they are being carried out at a time when the Israeli Government is once again openly following a policy of disregarding, sabotaging and frustrating the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) calling for a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East, and the recent General Assembly resolution on that question, resolution 2799 (XXVI) of 13 December 1971. As you know, after the General Assembly adopted this resolution, in which the United Nations expressed its full support for the efforts of Ambassador Jarring of 8 February 1971 relating to the key issues involved in a settlement in the Middle East, namely, the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces and conditions of peace, and called upon Israel to respond favourably to Ambassador Jarring's initiative, the Government of Israel once again arrogantly rejected that request of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General.

58. The Council cannot ignore the fact that Israel's attack on Lebanon on 25 February was carried out on, and indeed timed for, the very day when Ambassador Jarring, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, arrived in Israel for talks with Israeli leaders on a Middle East settlement. Israel has thus once again challenged the United Nations and world public opinion. It goes without saying that the actions of Israel, as a Member of the United Nations, cannot and must not be allowed to pass without being duly condemned and without appropriate counter-measures being taken by the United Nations.

59. Israel's negative attitude towards a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East, its continuing policy of aggression against the Arab States, and its latest attack on Lebanon demonstrate that Israel is, in an insolent and criminal manner, continuing to flout all the rules of international law, flagrantly violating the Charter of the United Nations, and sabotaging Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, and has made aggression the main doctrine of its foreign policy.

60. We have witnessed a cynical attempt on the part of Israel to follow a sinister policy of imposing on the Arab countries and peoples its will as an aggressor, carrying out policies from a position of strength in regard to neighbouring States, and continuing its policy of appropriating foreign lands and refusing to withdraw its armed forces from those lands which have been seized as a result of aggression.

61. This policy of international piracy, of seizing foreign territory and making outrageous attacks on neighbouring States, cannot but give rise to deep concern, indignation and justifiable condemnation throughout the world. It is not difficult to realize that such a policy finds support with no one except the most reactionary and aggressive Zionist circles and political leaders in some countries who find themselves political prisoners of, or in electoral dependence on, the Zionists. But it is clear to everyone that in present conditions and in the current world situation such a policy, wherever and by whomever it is followed, has absolutely no chance of approval or success and has no future.

62. No one believes any longer the Israeli fables that the essence of the Middle East crisis is that Israel is, as it alleges, defending its existence and its security. In disseminating this false myth, the Israeli leaders, their Zionist and non-Zionist friends and their defenders throughout the world were unsuccessfully attempting to conceal the real aims of the piratical and gangster-like policy of aggression which Israel has been following against the Arab States from the very first days of the establishment of the State of Israel in the Middle East. Now this false myth has been fully exposed and shattered once and for all and Israel and its leaders have themselves been mainly responsible for exposing it through their stubborn and defiant policy of aggression and sabotage and by their obstruction of a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East. Now it has become quite obvious and extremely clear to the whole world that the essence of Israel's policy is not to ensure its security, but to continue its military adventures and unlimited expansion, carried out with the active support of international Zionism and its one friend among the States Members of the United Nations, the one which encourages and defends it, the United States of America.

63. The hypocritical and completely unfounded attempts by Israel to justify its policy of aggression and the piratical attacks by Israeli armed forces that have invaded the territory of Lebanon by referring to some kind of "right" to take preventive measures to combat the heroic Arab patriots, those avengers of their people, have long since been completely exposed here in the Security Council as amoral and criminal international acts which have no basis or justification in international law. The Council has on more than one occasion strongly condemned similar arbitrary acts committed by Israel under the pretext of what it calls retribution or counter-measures. All these attempts by the Israeli clique of international gangsters to find some cover and justification for their acts of piracy have often been exposed and condemned as contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and the generally recognized norms of international law governing relations between States.

64. The struggle of the courageous Arab patriots to liberate their lands from the Israeli racist usurpers is as just, justifiable and legitimate as the struggle of the heroic African freedom fighters to liberate their Territories and the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Southern Rhodesia, and Guinea (Bissau) from the white racist and fascist oppressors who have usurped their native lands. The United Nations has recognized that the struggle is legitimate and, accordingly, justified. And no one but the foreign usurpers and invaders themselves can be held responsible for the consequences of their invasion and occupation of foreign lands, and for the subsequent legitimate and just wave of hatred, resistance and struggle against the usurpers by the enslaved population of the occupied territories through their self-sacrificing patriots and partisans, the best sons of those peoples.

65. The representative of Israel has referred here to what the Arab partisans are doing in the territories occupied by Israel. But this is a perfectly natural reaction by the population of the occupied territories against the foreign usurpers and occupiers. We know this ourselves from our own experience in the heroic struggle of the great Soviet partisans against the fascist occupiers in those territories of the Soviet Union which were occupied by Hitler's armies. Is the representative of Israel so naïve as to assume that the people living in territories occupied by Israel will accept and bow down to the usurpers and occupiers? There can be no embraces, only killing and a pitiless struggle against the foreign usurpers—that is how it has always been, how it is now and how it will always be; do not expect embraces from the Arab peoples who are being oppressed in the territories occupied by Israel.

66. The aggressor must understand that only the withdrawal of the occupying forces from the illegally seized Arab territories, and not acts of piracy under the piratical pretext of retribution, can open the way to the establishment of peace and security in the Middle East for both the Arab peoples and the people of Israel who are suffering from their leaders' aggressive madness.

67. The short-sighted politicians in Tel Aviv, relying on military threats, on blackmail and on help from outside, should long since have understood that the patriotic liberation struggle of the peoples against aggressors, against foreign enslavers and usurpers of other people's lands, is not merely just, legitimate and justifiable from the point of view of international law and the provisions of the Charter, but is also inevitable and will necessarily triumph. As experience of the heroic struggle of the people of Viet-Nam and the peoples of Indo-China has shown, such a struggle cannot be defeated by any means, by threats, blackmail, terrorism or oppression.

68. In making another armed attack on Lebanon, Israel has flagrantly flouted previous Security Council decisions condemning Israel as an aggressor for its premeditated acts of aggression against the Arab country of Lebanon, for its gross violation of the Charter and for its disregard of the decisions and demands of the United Nations and its main organ for maintaining peace and security, the Security Council.

69. As you know, on 31 December 1968, having condemned Israel as an aggressor, the Security Council declared in its resolution 262 (1968) that if acts of aggression by Israel against Lebanon were to be repeated, "the Council would have to consider further steps to give effect to its decisions" concerning Israel.

70. Less than a year later, on 26 August 1969, having once again condemned Israel, the Security Council declared in its resolution 270 (1969) that Israeli military reprisals in Lebanon could not be tolerated and the Council "would have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such acts".

71. The following year, on 19 May 1970, the Security Council, in its resolution 280 (1970), once again confirmed that armed attacks by Israel could no longer be tolerated and repeated "its solemn warning to Israel that if they were to be repeated the Security Council would . . . consider taking adequate and effective steps or measures in accordance with the relevant Articles of the Charter to implement its resolutions".

72. The essentially aggressive intent of Israel's policy towards Lebanon has thus been irrefutably and unconditionally established and it has been condemned in many decisions taken by the Security Council, the main organ of the United Nations with responsibility under the Charter for strengthening and maintaining international peace and security. This irrefutable and generally recognized fact is well known and is quite obvious and clear to all people throughout the world and to all States, whether or not they are Members of the United Nations.

73. The interests of international peace and security require that the Security Council condemn Israel even more strongly for its most recent armed attack on Lebanon. The Council should also take decisive and effective measures to restrain and punish the Israeli aggressors in accordance with the provisions of the Charter and to give effect to its previous decisions, and it should even apply the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter and consider expelling Israel from the United Nations as an aggressor and an incorrigible violator of the Charter.

74. In view of the decision taken by the General Assembly [*see resolution 2799 (XXVI)*], which I have already mentioned, to reactivate the Jarring mission, the question arises as to whether the Security Council, and in particular its permanent members, should take steps to give assistance and support to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Jarring, in implementing the noble mission entrusted to him of trying to achieve a Middle East settlement.

75. The Soviet delegation calls upon all members of the Security Council, including those who are deliberately blocking the reactivation of the consultations between the five permanent Council members on this important question, to reactivate those consultations, to give support and assistance to Ambassador Jarring and to inform the Council regularly of the measures they have taken to help Ambassador Jarring to discharge the very noble mission which has been entrusted to him.

76. The PRESIDENT: I have just received letters from the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia in which they ask to be allowed to participate, without vote, in the current Council discussion of the complaint by Lebanon which is inscribed on the agenda.

77. If there is no objection, I intend to invite the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that they will be called upon to take places at the Council table when it is their turn to address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. G. J. Tomeh (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. J. M. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) took the places reserved for them.

78. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Saudi Arabia. I now invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

79. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Council, for allowing me to address myself to the item of which you are seized this morning.

80. Lebanon is a small country that has never committed aggression in modern times. It did not commit aggression in ancient times, throughout its history, against any neighbour. The Lebanese, for the most part, are mountaineers. Whenever there was a dearth of food, they did not engage in raids against their neighbours: they took to the sea. They became great sailors during the Canaanite period. They were called the Phoenicians by the Greeks. They circumvented the continent of Africa for the Pharaohs. They established what is known today as Marseille. They had settlements in North Africa and as far as Ireland. But they were not known to have exploited any people. They were traders and they are still traders. Aggression was committed against them, but they were so small throughout history that they had no power except to defend themselves in their own territory.

81. History speaks for itself. But if I have recalled these facts, it is so that members may know the background of Lebanon before I embark on my statement.

82. It is most ironical that at a time when the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, none other than Ambassador Jarring, is visiting Jerusalem for so-called peace talks, Israel, the usurping State, should launch such a dastardly attack against peaceful Lebanon that knows how to set the balance between the Moslem and the Christian sects, which live there in peace. Members need only look at the delegation of Lebanon seated at this table. We have no animosity, either religious or ethnological, and here come alien people, who consider themselves Semites, from Europe, and with the help of the Anglo-Saxon Powers—none other than the United Kingdom and subsequently the United States of America—establish themselves in our midst. And when I say “in our midst”, I mean in the midst of the Arab land. And for what purpose? Was it for the beauty of Jewish eyes? No, I submit it was because in 1917

the Zionists railroaded the United States into the First World War, through the British. And we know that in 1947—I was sitting at the meeting at Lake Success—the partition was effected so that one of the Presidents of the United States could ensure that he would get the votes. And we have to suffer. And they say, “It is our land because it is mentioned in the Bible.”

83. It is not necessary for me to go into the origin of the political Zionist movement. We would respect spiritual zionism, but here we are contending with a political zionism, which is a colonial incursion in our midst. All of us deplore what has happened to Jews on the basis of their religion. Sometimes we deplore it when the Christians cut one another's throats, as they did in the two world wars. But if the Jews of Europe, who were mostly converted to Judaism in the 8th century A.D., suffered under Hitler, why should the Arabs pay the price? And now peaceful Lebanon must also pay a stiff price because of the incursion of that usurping conglomeration of people. For it is not one people, it is a conglomeration. Those Zionists come from the four corners of the earth. They have different cultural backgrounds and they want to forge a nationality out of a religion. I have told them time and again for the past 30 or 40 years that it backfired in Europe. Look at the Christians and how they fight one another. Look at the Moslems and how they fight one another. But they want to go against history and try to forge a nationality out of a religion. That is their privilege, but not at the cost of the people of the area. This should be known. Look at what the Crusaders did. They advanced wave after wave, and where are the Crusaders now? We still have some fortresses to which the tourists go.

84. I am not speaking with vindictiveness because, after all, the Jews are people and we do not want them to suffer, especially the innocent among them. There is no rancour or hatred in our hearts against any person of any religion. But for heaven's sake, some of you big Powers planted them in our midst and you had no right to do that. And you come and serve your petty narrow national interests at our expense.

85. We heard the representative of Lebanon tell us that about 60 tanks and armoured cars had invaded southern Lebanon and that those usurping Israelis had had the arrogance to send a communiqué through the United Nations Mixed Armistice Commission, telling Lebanon to co-operate with them to suppress the Palestinian freedom fighters, and then everything would be peaceful. I shall come to that point a little later.

86. One thing that is quite evident is that the attacks on Lebanon were premeditated. They were not spontaneous. It was not as if there was a detachment of Israeli patrols on the southern frontiers of Lebanon which took action because a couple of Israelis were allegedly shot by Palestinians who crossed the border. It was planned in Tel Aviv—or wherever the planning takes place—in order to chastise and to punish the peaceful Lebanese people because they harbour Palestinian refugees, some of whom are freedom fighters.

87. Now, what do they expect the Lebanese to do? Do they expect the Lebanese to suppress and subsequently

liquidate the Palestinians who want to regain their homeland? I dare say that those Palestinian fighters will liquidate any Arab Government, sooner or later—if not sooner, then later—which tries to suppress them. Why should those Lebanese suppress and liquidate Palestinians who want to reclaim their homeland? By what yardstick of logic? By what humanitarian precepts?

88. Let me tell the Zionists, very frankly, that the Palestinians who are dispersed all over the Arab world and have even gone to Europe and to America have leavened the youth of the Arab world. The youth—not necessarily the Palestinians—the emerging generation of the Arab countries, will make short shrift of any Arab Government which tries to suppress those Palestinians.

89. Let us assume that, tyrannically, some Arab Government suppresses those Palestinians. What will happen? Sooner or later that part of the world will erupt and kill the tyrant. And if he is dead in bed, they will label him a traitor. Is it not funny—it is really ridiculous!—that Israel should transmit a communiqué through the Mixed Armistice Commission asking the Lebanese Government to co-operate with the suppression and subsequent liquidation of the Palestinian fighters on their territory?

90. The representative of Israel alluded to the alleged killing from across the border as a cowardly act. How short his memory must be. A cowardly act? What about the more than 400 Palestinians living in Deir-Yassin who were surrounded at dawn by military detachments, machine-gunned, killed: men women and children. Their animals were killed and the trees were cut down. This was a heroic act because it was the prelude to intimidating the Palestinians into fleeing their country, so that you Europeans could come with a new colonialism to take the land. Wash your mouth, Sir, before you use such language as “a cowardly act”.

91. The Lebanese did not perpetrate any aggression against Israel. It is the frustrated Palestinians who, in trying to regain their country, have to resort, unfortunately, to killing those who have robbed them of their homeland. You mentioned self-defence, you Israeli representative. The establishment of Israel was an aggressive act against a whole people. Why do you not put it that way? Of course, you look at it from your own point of view.

92. We have been reminded—though not lately—that the partition took place through a majority. I would say that it was a contrived majority. I was present at Lake Success. We know how the powerful Zionists even sent prelates to Latin America to get the votes to tip the balance for the partition of Palestine. We know how a certain country recognized the State of Israel before anybody knew it. We know how they went beyond the frontiers, which should never have been made a demarcation in the Holy Land of Palestine. And the representatives of certain big Powers sit smugly here and deal with this situation in an academic manner.

93. No doubt, there will be a draft resolution asking for sanctions in accordance with the provisions of the Charter. With what results? And what results have there been from condemnations, for that matter? Twenty-two condemna-

tions have been levelled against Israel, and what has happened? They are words. The Israelis do not pay attention to condemnations. Yesterday, I told the Council the same thing about sanctions when we were dealing with the Rhodesian question. All right then, what is this? Is it an oratorical manifestation here, oratorical and rhetorical, a display of zeal and ardour by one side or the other, with certain Powers trying to calm things down?

94. Let it fizzle out, they say. We will give Lebanon a chance to speak—which the representative of Lebanon has done very ably, in a quiet and dispassionate manner. And with what results? Okay, they got it off their chest and they said what they wanted to say; the Israeli representative said what he wanted to say, and the matter is disposed of—until another round of aggression takes place. This in no way redounds to the dignity, let alone the effectiveness, of the Security Council.

95. The representative of Lebanon spoke about these alleged crimes, murders. Of course, I do not think that the Palestinians would relish killing a human being, but it is kill or get killed, as in war. Therefore, as the representative of Lebanon said, these alleged murders took place on Israeli soil, not within the frontiers of Lebanon. So, premeditated action is launched against Lebanon, as I have mentioned, in hot pursuit of the alleged culprits, with the result that several villages are subjected to bombardment and houses of villagers are destroyed. You expect the villagers to tell the Palestinians: “We will kill you if you ever do anything, or even speak of aggression, against Israel.” That is what you want. But they will liquidate the villagers, they will liquidate anybody, who comes to them with such a plan.

96. What will the Security Council do? I am sure you will do the same thing again, and with impunity, because certain major Powers are not prepared to interfere with the progress of zionism in our midst. I say “progress of zionism” because Israel can survive only through the disintegration of the neighbouring Arab lands. The Israelis want Lebanon to disintegrate, they want Jordan to disintegrate; Egypt cannot disintegrate because it is too big, but they want anarchy in Egypt. That is what they want, and there are certain countries that are abetting that plan—unwittingly, if not intentionally. From my humble experience of this question for the past 50 years, I submit that that is how Israel survives. Israel has no chance of surviving in the long, long term. If it is not dissolved by war, it will be dissolved by osmosis and assimilation, as were the crusaders and the Greeks and the Ptolemies who came there in the days of Byzantium and later. We absorbed them. We are the Semitic people; you are Khazars. You do not fool us. You are Khazars, converted like the British, who brought you there. What are the British? Great Britain is 95 per cent a Christian country—nominally because nowadays Christianity is failing. Saint Augustine converted them to Christianity. They are not Semites even though they have a Semitic religion. And most of you Israelis who hail from Europe are of Khazar origin. You cannot label yourselves Semites. Most of you speak Yiddish. You have different cultural backgrounds—not one background. How many times shall I tell you that Heine, the Jewish German poet, wrote in the idiom of Germany, just as Mendelssohn wrote music in the musical idiom of Germany and Offenbach,

who, I think, originally was from near Strasbourg, did not write in your oriental Jewish musical idiom.

97. There is nothing wrong with Khazars. Many of the Khazars also became Christians and some of them atheists in the Soviet Union . . .

98. The PRESIDENT: I am sorry to interrupt the representative of Saudi Arabia, but I should like to ask the visitors to maintain order in the Council chamber and refrain from laughter.

99. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I feel sorry for the visitors. If some of you are of the Jewish faith, you will weep one day because you are being made scapegoats here. I feel sorry for you. They come into our midst and want to lord it over us as a colonial force. They say: "Baroody has been speaking on this question for the past 24 years. Is there anything new he can bring to us here in the Council?"

100. While I was thinking of what to say, a colleague and friend of mine marked for me the sanctions provisions in Chapter VII, Article 41, of the Charter. Among other things, those sanctions "may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations".

101. We do not expect an iota of this Article 41 to be applied against Israel. Why? It is because the Zionists have permeated the Western world, and I am afraid they are bringing pressure to bear on the socialist world through the campaign they are waging against anyone who, like the Soviet Union, is allegedly against them. Through pressure, I am sure, 15,000 emigrants to Israel have been released by the Soviet Union. What kind of pressure? Pressure of public opinion. And how is public opinion roused? It is roused by the mass media of information, which is controlled by the Zionists all over the Western world. And the Soviet Union would like to trade with the Western world and they are having contacts—I mean, since the days of Khrushchev, the coexistence sort of policy. The Zionists want to blackmail the Soviet Union. They have even subjected their Mission here—some of the activists—to being shot at; children sleeping in one of the rooms were endangered. So even the Soviet Union, with all its might, is temporizing by sending emigrants. So how can this Article 41 be applied? Eighty per cent of the major newspapers in the United States are owned by those who are sympathetic to zionism, and some of the proprietors are Jews—as in the case of *The New York Times* and the *New York Post*. All the gentile newspapers in New York have faded out of the picture. You see, the Jews are an enterprising people; they like private enterprise. You Americans have become only members of corporations; you work for a salary and your taxes are deducted. More power to the Jews, but do not let them hurt us. I am talking to you and you are a representative of the United States. They have hurt us enough in small, tiny Lebanon where you Americans have great interests—educational, diplomatic, everything.

102. Why am I picking on my good friend Ambassador Bush of the United States? I do not relish that. I think he

is friendly to all of us, regardless of our ideology or way of life. It is simply because it is within their power to stop Israel. We do not want to say "chastise". But are you stopping Israel? The only power that can stop Israeli aggression is the United States Government, which supplies Israel with Skyhawks and other diabolical arms. Of course, the United States will say that the Soviet Union is supplying Egypt with arms. But the Soviet Union is cautious because were it to bolster the Arab forces to a point which would be considered by the United States as tipping the balance of power in favour of the Arabs, it is quite likely that there would be a confrontation between the two big Powers, and that would mean a world war.

103. The Zionists are capable of pushing the United States and the Soviet Union into a war, and I feel sorry for those Jews who are good Americans, because the Jews will be blamed, although they are innocent. The Jews will become the scapegoats, and the masses, which lose control of their own emotions, will make short shrift of the Jews. This has happened in history. I have watched the psychology of the mob at work in many parts of the world, including Europe and the Arab East.

104. This is no laughing matter. This is a serious question. Somebody must stop Israel, or Israel will push the whole world into a holocaust. However, there will still be some Arabs left. I feel sorry for any human being in trouble, regardless of his religion or ethnic origin.

105. There is something quite unusual about the fact that those usurping Zionists choose a time when Mr. Nixon is on a mission to the People's Republic of China, when he and the Chinese are trying to bring about—and this is the least I can say—a state of *détente* in the world. I believe Mr. Nixon is planning to visit another major Power—none other than the Soviet Union—some time in May, with the same purpose, to try to find out how people can live in peace. Were you afraid, you Israelis, that something could be concocted there at your expense? This is your problem. Why does Lebanon have to pay?

106. The hour is late. This is but a preface to what I will have to say if any draft resolution emerges from the deliberations in the Council. But let me leave a thought with my good friend and colleague Ambassador Bush of the United States, so that his Government may toy with my idea. I use the word "toy" because perhaps the United States Government does not take a small country very seriously—or rather, to use the jargon of the United Nations, I trust that my idea may receive the considered opinion of the Government of Ambassador Bush.

107. I know it is an election year in the United States. I know your system, Ambassador Bush, for I have lived here long enough. Everyone wants to propitiate the minorities in order to get their votes. But this is your domestic affair, Ambassador Bush, I do not interfere in it.

108. However, if the Council were to think of a draft resolution instituting sanctions, its fate would be the same as that of other resolutions that recommended sanctions. I want the United States to go back to the records of the United Nations whenever some of us have asked the United

States to take more drastic measures. Even in 1956 I went to my good friend Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, when he was confronted with what was a case of sheer aggression. The United States played an honourable role in 1956 during the so-called Suez affair because it had a very powerful Secretary of State at that time in the person of John Foster Dulles. When I asked Mr. Lodge to go a little further in one of the draft resolutions, he retorted, "We cannot go further because we do not want to undertake anything which we do not mean to do." If my memory serves me right, he said: "We mean what we say in those draft resolutions".

109. I am not going into what we did in 1956 and rehash the whole crisis of those days. But I should like to remind my good friend and colleague Ambassador Bush that the United States was one of those countries which voted for drastic measures—I am paraphrasing—to be taken against Israel when on a former occasion Israel aggressed against Lebanon. In that decision, in which the United States voted, there was an allusion to the use of sanctions.

110. I am not proposing this to my good friends the Americans, and I say "friends" because we have economic relations with them. And, as we said the other day, did we not, economics are more important than politics. But I think the major Powers would agree with what I am about to say. This is a novel idea. You do not have to ask for complete sanctions here because even if such a proposal received all the votes it would be academic in the light of what I said yesterday on sanctions with regard to Southern Rhodesia. But what about the United States willingly applying sanctions by not sending diabolical arms to Israel—those arms, those Skyhawks which the United States maintains are to maintain the balance between Russian arms to Egypt and United States arms to Israel? This would not be to chastise Israel. But what are we, a checkerboard? Why should we be the checkerboard of the United States and the Soviet Union? We have had enough of those wooden pieces playing in our area. You are playing with the destiny of our people, and not with wooden pieces. Why should Lebanon pay? Why do you not choose another checkerboard? The Soviet Union has exercised a great deal of restraint because it knows—I believe, although I stand to be corrected—that the Zionists are powerful enough to push the United States into a world war.

111. One of the most sagacious statesmen in the world was General De Gaulle. He withheld the export of Mirage planes to Israel, and I believe that France recently repaid the amount that had been deposited by the Israelis for an order of Mirage planes. In view of this colonialist incursion of Israel in our midst, not only against Lebanon but also against the neighbouring Arab States, is the United States willing to do this: not to punish Israel because we do not expect the United States to punish Israel? The Zionists permeate the fabric of society and the Government here.

112. Therefore we Arabs will ask for the possible, not the impossible. Will the United States be willing to lend its considered opinion and to withhold arms shipments, especially shipments of tanks and military aircraft, so that a tiny country like Lebanon may be spared the arbitrary punishment by those European Zionist usurpers who have established themselves in our midst?

113. I will follow up my statement with whatever emerges from the deliberations of this Council. In the meantime I should like to address a few words to our new Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim. Mr. Waldheim is making a trip to his homeland, and I wish him well. I do not need to wish him a wonderful reception, because I can feel how proud the Austrian people are that one of their sons—the son of a neutral country known for its heritage of art, literature and culture—is Secretary-General of this international Organization. I know that Ambassador Jarring, a very capable diplomat, is the Secretary-General's Special Representative. But would it be asking too much of the Secretary-General—either with the Council's authorization or on his own initiative—to pay a visit to Beirut, at least to show that he feels sympathy? This is not partisanship. It is a small country that cannot commit aggression against anybody, as I said at the outset of this statement. But at least they would know that the Secretary-General, whether on his own initiative or with the Council's authorization—perhaps privately, not necessarily as the result of a resolution—made a short stop to express the sympathy of the United Nations or at least of himself as the Chief Executive of the Organization. He would not have to stay long. He is going to South Africa—which is also a good thing—anyway. So why not go to Beirut, not to broach political issues but to show that Lebanon is as dear to the United Nations and to the Secretary-General as any other State when aggression is committed against it?

114. Having said that, I do hope that wisdom will prevail in the long run and that Lebanon will be let alone whatever the circumstances. I say "whatever the circumstances" because this is not the first aggression against Lebanon by its usurping neighbour, nor will it be the last. And if you gentlemen would authorize our colleague from the United States, either privately or officially—by way of action by the Council, not to apply sanctions, but to withhold the arms shipments that are making Israel more arrogant, thinking that the only way it can survive is by paving the way for the disintegration of its neighbours.

115. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (*interpretation from French*): Is it a deliberate coincidence or is it fortuitous that at the very time when Ambassador Jarring is attempting to resume his mission of conciliation and peace a new Israeli military intervention has just struck Lebanon? If we do not as yet have the complete background to the story we do, I think, have a number of findings to make and a number of conclusions to draw right away.

116. First, it is quite obvious that these deplorable events cannot be understood and judged outside the context of the general situation prevailing in the Middle East—a state which is not exactly peace nor exactly war, which at every moment threatens to bring about confrontations about which no one can foresee when or where they will come to an end.

117. Actually, through the non-application of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and because the Security Council and the five permanent members in particular have failed to exert the necessary pressure either individually or collectively to have everyone apply the provisions of resolution 242 (1967), such incidents can only multiply

and worsen and finally degenerate into open conflict. It is therefore high time for the international community to take a grip on things and to become aware of its responsibilities.

118. Since the attack carried out in 1968 against the Beirut international airport, the Council has adopted no less than five resolutions denouncing Israeli interventions into Lebanon. But today, because of its violence, because of its scope—reference has been made to artillery, aviation, bulldozers, armoured cars and engineering—the Israeli intervention goes beyond everything we have known up till now, and it would appear to be quite clear from reading the letter from Ambassador Doron and hearing his statement that there is no comparison between the measures of reprisal and the acts being complained of by Israel. In addition, the threats made on 14 January, as reported to us, are fraught with fresh danger for the future, and threaten the integrity of Lebanese territory.

119. We have no doubt that the Lebanese Government is doing everything it can to control the activities of the *fedayeen* in its territory. But it cannot be held responsible for what happens in Israeli territory. We are furthermore obliged to note in this connexion that if Israel were to give the Armistice Commission and the United Nations observers the necessary means to enable them to fulfil their mission it would have been easier for them to appreciate the actual situation. If it is true that the Israeli authorities have asked Beirut to provide them with information on the whereabouts of the *fedayeen* in order “to be able to strike with minimum damage being involved for the population”, what Government worthy of the name could agree to such a demand, which is contrary both to law and to political realities?

120. As soon as these operations in Lebanese territory were announced my Government made it known to the Israeli Government that we could not agree with reprisals against any State, and particularly against a peace-loving and respected State whose integrity, sovereignty and independence I have already referred to in this chamber, stating how much importance we attach to them.

121. We must reiterate these principles of our policy, which are simply those pertaining to international law and morality. We believe that the Council intends to give Lebanon as a victim of these intolerable reprisals the assistance which it expects from us. It is important meanwhile that an end be put to the military actions, whether they be by air or on land, and that Israeli troops should immediately be withdrawn from Lebanese territory.

122. We should like to reserve our right to speak subsequently, if necessary, in the course of the debate or on possible subsequent draft resolutions.

123. Mr. KOMATINA (Yugoslavia) (*interpretation from French*): I shall be brief, and at this time I should like to limit myself to a few comments while reserving the right of my delegation to speak later, should it be necessary, on the question before the Security Council. The facts are known and have been stated clearly and in detail by the representative of Lebanon and furthermore plainly admitted by the representative of Israel himself.

124. My delegation has always emphasized two undeniable facts when discussing the question of the Middle East, both in the General Assembly and elsewhere. These two aspects are the following: first of all, failure to solve the Middle East crisis, or any delay in solving it, creates a situation conducive to conflicts which may at any time escape the control of the international community. Whether they are local incidents or broader ones, the crisis in the Middle East bears within it the seeds of a conflict of uncontrollable size.

125. Secondly, the evolution of the crisis proves in an increasingly obvious manner that there is only one obstacle to a solution to the crisis and I refer to the single cause of all the conflicts, and that is Israel's intransigent policy of domination and annexation of occupied Arab territories. Such a policy can only be based on the permanent use of force, premeditated and planned in advance, as has been noted in several Security Council resolutions in the years 1968, 1969 and 1970.

126. In our opinion, such is the case in the present situation which we are considering. The representative of Israel, furthermore, has not denied this but has endeavoured, as usual, to shift responsibility onto the victim of its policy of force.

127. The Security Council has often deliberated on similar acts of aggression on the part of Israel. In previous instances, the Security Council has condemned this policy. It has adopted several resolutions, with which Israel has consistently refused to comply. In this case once again they are not frontier incidents but an attack which is acquiring the magnitude of a breach of the peace, despite and in defiance of the United Nations resolutions, of world public opinion and of international law.

128. Is it not anachronistic to discuss the repeated incursions by the armed forces of Israel against Lebanon, at the very time when the Special Representative of the Secretary-General is endeavouring to find areas of agreement within the framework of resolution 242 (1967), which was unanimously adopted by the Security Council, and General Assembly resolution 2799 (XXVI) which was adopted on 13 December 1971 and against which, if I am not mistaken, only seven States voted? Unfortunately, this anachronism is familiar to us because of Israel's stubborn refusal to give in to the opinion of the international community, which has more than once expressed its almost unanimous desire to find a peaceful political solution to the Middle East crisis on the basis of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all States, which would of course mean doing away with all the *faits accomplis* resulting from the pursuit of a policy of force.

129. The danger that the Security Council and all of us run is to be satisfied with mere warnings and proclaim routine condemnations. It goes without saying that, in our opinion, the Security Council should condemn more severely than ever these Israeli attacks but also take effective measures to forestall these attacks and make them impossible in the future. Israel can convince no one that its aggressive activities are dictated only by the protection of its security. This theory has been disproved on several occasions and the Security Council has rejected it in its

resolutions. The only reply given by Israel to the constructive attitude of the Arab States is to refuse to withdraw from the occupied territories and continue armed attacks, which now symptomatically coincide with Mr. Jarring's presence in the area.

130. We should therefore condemn and prevent and above all we must ponder the root-cause of the Middle East crisis and seek a solution to it on the basis of the documents of the Council and of the General Assembly which I have mentioned and arrive at the proper judgement about a policy which is a constant challenge to our Organization and its efforts to restore peace.

131. Mr. OGISO (Japan): My delegation regrets deeply that once again the Council has been seized of a serious incident between Lebanon and Israel. My delegation particularly deplores the loss of life and damage to property inflicted as a result of violations of Council resolutions. Having said this, I am not at this late hour going to speak on the substance in detail, but I should like to mention one point that may have some relevance in future deliberations on the matter: I wish to recall the proposal made by the Secretary-General in the third paragraph of a letter dated 16 August 1969 with respect to a question of the same nature, which was as follows:

"In view of the increasing seriousness of the situation in the Israel-Lebanon sector, I consider it to be my duty to propose to both Governments concerned, as I now do, that United Nations observers, in adequate number to observe effectively, should be stationed on both sides, with the function of observing and maintaining the Security Council cease-fire. As in the case of the stationing of United Nations military observers in the Suez Canal sector in July 1967, I am making this approach with a view to improving the situation in the Israel-Lebanon sector. I believe that the establishment of an observation operation at this time in this sector would be of real service to both parties and would provide an important means, at present lacking, of deterring incidents and of maintaining the cease-fire. I would be grateful if you would communicate this suggestion to your Government for its urgent consideration. It is my earnest hope that your Government will regard this proposal favourably and will advise me of its position promptly." [See S/9393.]

This proposal was addressed at that time to the parties concerned; unfortunately it was not accepted by all the parties concerned. If it had been accepted at that time by all the parties concerned and effective observation machinery had been established, the recurrence of tragic border incidents might have been avoided and prevented.

132. At this stage I am not making any proposal or suggestion but, in view of the possibility that the same point may be raised by some delegations in future informal consultations as well as in the formal debate and also in view of the fact that the Secretary-General will be away from New York on important visits for a few weeks, I wish to ask him to give the necessary instructions to his Special Representative so that he can explain the views of the Secretary-General in detail in case this question is raised in future proceedings of the Council.

133. Mr. JAMIESON (United Kingdom): I understand that it is the general wish that the Council should adjourn in order to consult on the action it should take. If it is not jumping the gun, I believe that that is right. Before we do so, however, I should like to put my delegation's views briefly on record.

134. I must make it clear in the first place that my delegation deplores deeply any acts of murder and terrorism perpetrated in the territory of Israel by elements of the *fedayeen*. The views of my Government on violent actions of this sort anywhere in the world are well known. That being said, there is no dispute that large-scale military activity by Israeli land and air forces took place yesterday on a wide front against Lebanon and that air attacks were resumed this morning. We have listened attentively to the explanation of the representative of Israel, but nothing that he said can lead my delegation to accept that recourse to those measures against Lebanon—measures on that scale—was justifiable. Had it not been for the assurance of the representative of Israel that all activity had ceased and that Israeli forces had been withdrawn, it would perhaps have been appropriate for this Council to call upon Israel to desist from all military activity against Lebanon. Whatever action the Council may later decide to take, it is the fervent hope of my delegation that Israel, having desisted from such activity, will continue to refrain from it.

135. I do not wish to discuss or make suggestions at this stage about what further consideration the Council should give to the matter. But, although this may be a statement of the obvious and no more than a repetition of what we have said in the past, my delegation believes that the biggest contribution to the ending of the circumstances in which these incidents have taken place will be the support and co-operation which all Member States of the United Nations give to Ambassador Jarring in his mission and the settlement of the problems of the Middle East in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

136. Mr. VINCI (Italy): More than one year has elapsed since the Security Council has had to deal with a complaint of Lebanon similar to the one we are now considering. Although during this time the over-all situation in the Middle East has been somewhat quieter, raising hopes that at long last the peoples of the region could be turned from the sterile use of violence to the search for a settlement through peaceful means, ominous disturbances have occurred now and then along the lines between Israel and Lebanon which have recently taken an unfortunate turn towards escalation.

137. According to the statement we have heard today, it seems clear that a military operation on a wide scale was carried out on 25 February by the Israeli armed forces against Lebanon, allegedly in reprisal for an act of terrorism which had caused the death of two Israeli civilians.

138. Unfortunately, the United Nations does not have direct sources of information on the spot which could provide us with a complete picture of the events. However, as we have learned from the statement of the representative of Lebanon, the Israeli military operation has brought death and ruin to the Lebanese people. The Italian

delegation is extremely distressed at the sad news of this new outbreak of violence in the Middle East, which seems to bring us back to the months following the 1967 conflict, a very sterile and sorrowful period for all the peoples of the Middle East.

139. We are particularly distressed by the complaint before us for two main reasons. The first is that grave losses have been inflicted on Lebanon, greatly increasing the political difficulties the Lebanese people is facing—a people with which Italy has very ancient ties of deep friendship, co-operation and common interest. On several occasions the Italian Government has expressed Italy's attachment to the preservation of the integrity, political balance and welfare of Lebanon.

140. The second reason, which was also mentioned by previous speakers, is that such a vast military operation, which can negatively affect the whole situation in the Middle East, has been carried out at a time when the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Jarring, has been visiting the capitals of the main parties concerned in an effort to resume his mission of peace in conformity with the will of the overwhelming majority of the Members of this Organization.

141. Whatever the reasons given for it, we cannot condone the military raids on Lebanese territory. At the same time we cannot fail to deplore any acts of violence from whatever side they come, the more so when they involve the loss of lives of innocent civilians, bringing tragedy to peaceful homes.

142. However, an operation such as the one carried out by regular Israeli armed forces seems to disregard even the most rigid rules of the law of war, since the dimensions and intensity of the Israeli reprisal exceeded by far the events that allegedly prompted it. It infringes the principles of the Charter and, in the first place, the commitment of all Member States not to resort to the use of military force to settle their disputes.

143. In accordance with these considerations and principles which I have outlined, my delegation was ready to support any decision which would request Israel to desist immediately from any further military action against the territory of Lebanon. My delegation is still ready to support any decision of the Council which would prevent a repetition of such unfortunate tragic events, striking especially a country well known for its dedication to peace and to the co-operation of all peoples and communities, regardless of their political and religious creeds.

144. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I now call on him.

145. Mr. DORON (Israel): The representative of the Soviet Union spoke of an alleged Israeli attack on populated points in the Lebanon. May I mention just a few broadcasts from Dera'a and Beirut on 25 February.

146. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union has asked to be allowed to speak on a point of order.

147. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The representative of Israel is referring only to the statement made by the Soviet representative in which he described and gave proof of the unprovoked aggression of Israel against Lebanon. The representatives of Saudi Arabia, France, Yugoslavia, the United Kingdom, Italy and Japan also spoke about this. Why does the representative of Israel refer only to the Soviet representative?

148. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel may resume his statement.

149. Mr. DORON (Israel): My reply concerning an alleged attack on populated points—I am speaking on the matter concerning populated points—will furnish a reply to anyone who mentioned or alleged that an attack had been mounted against such populated points. I was about to mention a few broadcasts from Dera'a and Beirut on 25 February.

150. Al-Fatah radio from Dera'a:

"The military spokesman of the General Command of the Palestine Revolution announced: 'One of our fighting units had set up an ambush for vehicles of the enemy on the road Saassa-Safad in the Upper Galilee. On 24 February two vehicles of the enemy arrived there. Our fighters fired at them with rockets and other arms which destroyed the vehicles and killed and wounded everybody in them.'"

151. Al-Fatah radio from Dera'a on the same day, 25 February, again quoting the military spokesman of Al-Fatah: "The attack by enemy planes on our positions in the sectors around Ikha, Kafr Kawk, Deir-el-Ashair and Hilwi had killed 5 of our fighters and wounded 12".

152. The Middle East News Agency stated on 25 February that the Al-Fatah office in Beirut had announced that in an action by *fedayeen* forces against Israeli forces in two sectors—Arkule and Bint Jbeil—three *fedayeen* had been wounded.

153. Again, Al-Fatah radio broadcast from Dera'a on 25 February in the afternoon: "The enemy has begun heavy shelling of our forces"—the forces of Al-Fatah—"in the sectors Rashaya-el-Fakhar, Kafr Hammam and Habbariya. Our artillery returns the fire of the enemy".

154. Thus, the terrorists themselves admit that the Israeli action has been taken against them, and not against the population of the Lebanon.

155. As for the resemblance seen by the representative of the Soviet Union between the resistance fighters, the partisans of the Second World War, and the Arab terrorists, let me quote from a resolution adopted by the Seventh Conference of the International Union of Resistance and Deportee Movements held in Brussels in April 1968. It says:

"No resistance fighter can accept so odious a perversion of the character and the aim of their struggle in which, moreover, participated thousands of men and women who have found haven in Israel and desire nothing but to

live in peace and tranquillity. There is no ground upon which to compare the resistance movement with the action of the terrorists and with odious blind crimes designed to provoke insecurity and fear and incite to violence when there is every possibility open to a loyal and constructive discussion of outstanding matters. The wish to liken fanatical groups incited by Arab leaders to the anti-Nazi resistance is, therefore, an insult painfully felt not only by the citizens of Israel who are so courageously defending their right to live, but by all the resistance fighters loyal to their values."

156. The representative of the Soviet Union has in his abusive and intemperate style, to which we have become accustomed, raised his usual baseless accusations and allegations against Israel. All this I categorically and emphatically reject.

157. The representative of the Soviet Union also thought it right to justify, and indeed encourage, the murderous attacks from Lebanon against Israel. Strange words from the mouth of the representative of a State, a great Power, that is a permanent member of the Security Council. Or perhaps not so strange when one recalls the role played by the Soviet Union in the outbreak of the war in 1967 and ever since in the Middle East.

158. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Lebanon wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply, and I now call on him.

159. Mr. KABBANI (Lebanon): Many allegations in the statement made by the Israeli representative call for comment. However, in view of the late hour I shall be very brief and limit myself to one essential point.

160. The Israeli representative stated that the Israeli armoured forces have withdrawn from Lebanese territory. On the basis of the last information received from my Government, I regret to say that this is not entirely true. Some of the military operations have ceased. It is now 8.30 p.m. and dark in Lebanon. The shelling and bombing of the villages have stopped for the time being. But Israeli bulldozers and military personnel are still on Lebanese soil busy opening roads in the direction of some villages inside southern Lebanon. These bulldozers are paving the way for Israeli tanks and armoured cars to carry out further attacks on these villages, maybe tomorrow. It will not be surprising if the Israeli aggressors carry out a new attack at dawn and then say here in the afternoon—by which time it will be evening in Lebanon—that they have withdrawn and hence cannot be blamed and condemned because it is all over.

161. Mr. LONGERSTAEY (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): I do not seek to conceal here the feeling of concern caused to the Government of Belgium by the grave events that have taken place in these last few days, and are going on even today, along the Israeli-Lebanese frontier. According to the latest press releases, the major land and air attack carried out yesterday by the Israeli armed forces against Lebanese villages has been resumed this morning.

162. On several occasions, my Government has branded any military or paramilitary action in that part of the world

as criminal, and we have appealed to all countries in the Middle East to comply scrupulously and fully with the cease-fire. We deeply deplore the fact that the grave incidents that have taken place this week along the Israeli-Lebanese frontier have brought mourning to so many families and caused so many victims, often innocent ones, and so much irreparable material damage.

163. Once again we launch an urgent appeal that the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all States in the Middle East be fully respected and that Governments refrain from resorting to lethal brute force to provide themselves with protection which is often illusory. Most particularly, we address an appeal for moderation to the Government of Israel.

164. In its resolution 280 (1970) of 19 May 1970, the Security Council declared that the armed attacks against Lebanon "can no longer be tolerated", and at the same time it repeated "its solemn warning to Israel that if they were to be repeated, the Security Council would ... consider taking adequate and effective steps".

165. We would appeal to the authorities of Tel Aviv to exercise the utmost control, and to refrain from any attack, assault or armed incursion within the national territory of Lebanon. At the same time, we would ask the Government of Lebanon to take effective measures and to do everything possible to prevent the Palestinian fighters who have taken refuge in Lebanon from taking advantage of the hospitality so generously offered them in order to undertake isolated attacks or lay ambushes, which are often deadly ones, within the territory of Israel.

166. We cannot just confine ourselves to deploring and condemning the major military intervention of Israel against Lebanon, which was out of all proportion with the facts and incidents which Tel Aviv attributes to the activities of the *fedayeen*. We consider that, in view of the worsening situation along the Israeli-Lebanese frontier, the international control organ established under the General Armistice Agreement of 1949 should function without delay and that Israel should agree to participate unreservedly.

167. We further express the hope that all the parties concerned will co-operate in a positive and constructive manner with Ambassador Jarring, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, so that the purposes of resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council may be implemented and so that peace may be restored in the Middle East.

168. My delegation wishes to reserve its right to speak again in the course of this debate and we shall state the position of the Belgium Government on any draft resolution which may be placed before the Council.

169. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Mr. President, it was not mere chance that I asked to speak on a point of order to interrupt the representative of Israel during one of his usual slanderous attacks against the Soviet Union. I wanted to stress that at this meeting of the Security Council no one

has supported the representative of Israel and the false and completely unfounded arguments with which he has attempted to justify the latest large-scale act of aggression by Israel against Lebanon.

170. Not only the Soviet representative, but the representatives of Saudi Arabia, France, Yugoslavia, the United Kingdom, Italy, Belgium, and Japan have all spoken and have all expressed concern over this act of aggression and have referred to the frequent condemnations of Israel as an aggressor. Instead of trying to cover up Israel's actions by making the usual attacks on the Soviet Union and the statements made by its representatives, it would have been wiser for the representative of Israel to inform his Government immediately that all the members of the Security Council who spoke today, 26 February, during the consideration of the latest act of aggression by Israel against Lebanon, expressed their concern and fears that this aggressive Israeli policy is fraught with danger not only for peace in the Middle East but for international peace in general, and that they referred to the well-known fact that the Council has on more than one occasion condemned Israel for its acts of aggression against Lebanon and that the widely held opinion of the majority of members of the Council is that Israel should cease these acts of aggression. It would be more useful if the representative of Israel informed his Government of this and did not try to justify Israeli aggression against Lebanon.

171. These are the facts, and accordingly it is time for Israeli representatives to stop referring to statements made by the Soviet delegation in order to distract the attention of the Council and of all the representatives of Member States here present from the actual fact of Israeli aggression.

172. I would like to add a few further comments to what I said previously. I would like to draw the special attention of the Council and its members to the fact that the Israeli aggressors are drawing on the experience of the unsavoury and criminal activities of German fascism in their savage crimes against the Arab countries and their peoples. It was the German fascists who first gave the name of "bandits" to those patriotic fighters of the resistance movement, the best representatives of their people, who waged a selfless and self-sacrificing struggle against the Hitlerite invaders in the territory of countries in Europe, including Yugoslavia, and in the territory of all countries occupied by Hitler's troops, including the Soviet Union.

173. The President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the late Mikhail Ivanovich Kalinin, described partisans and what they did in the following terms: "Partisans are the most noble citizens of a country which has been invaded." This will be understood by any citizen, any representative of any country which has at any time been subject to aggression or a victim of aggression. It is possible that it may be understood by those who have been lucky enough during their lives and in their history never to have had their territory invaded by an enemy or crushed under the jackboot of an occupying force, members of their family killed in their houses, or their houses destroyed and burned by an invading enemy. Obviously it is difficult for such representatives to understand that parti-

sans are in fact the most noble citizens of a country which has been invaded. We ourselves know this from our own experience.

174. But who was it that called these most noble citizens bandits? May I quote from a document, a book I have here in front of me. It is a historical account of the noble struggle waged by Soviet partisans against the Hitlerite usurpers. It contains only documentary evidence. In every line one can feel the burning breath of war and the beating of the noble hearts of patriots striving to defend their right to live and work freely. On page 133 of this book there is a photocopy of an order by Himmler, *Reichsführer* of the SS, renaming partisans "bandits". It is translated from the German. The heading reads "Riga, 30 July 1942. The chief of the SS and of the police for the northern district of Russia". I shall read the text of the order: "The *Reichsführer* of the SS requests that the word 'partisan' should no longer be used. In orders, reports and so forth the term 'bandit' shall be used in future."

175. That is a historical document. It shows who was the first to describe as "bandits" the heroes of the European peoples, the heroes of the Soviet Union, who, not sparing their own lives, struggled against the occupiers and usurpers for freedom and the independence of their countries and their peoples. And to whom was the *Reichsführer* order sent? To the police division of the North, army group *Jetel*, reserve police battalions Nos. 2, 112 and 132, and police battalions 305, 306 and 310. Received 5 August 1942.

176. That is the document, the unsavoury source from which the Israeli aggressors and racists draw their vocabulary, in an attempt to blacken and slander the most noble people of the Arab nation, the partisans who are waging a selfless struggle against the Israeli usurpers. Even here, in the highest organ of the United Nations, the Security Council, the representative of Israel is trying to cover up with the heinous words "bandits" and "terrorists", the crimes of the Israeli army and the Israeli aggression against the peace-loving country of Lebanon, to which all members of the Council who have spoken have referred.

177. These are the facts. These are the successors of the Hitler racists—the Zionist racists of Israel. This is where the danger to peace and security, not only in the Middle East, but throughout the world lies. And the Security Council must draw the necessary conclusion from this.

178. I would also like to reply briefly to my distinguished friend, the representative of Saudi Arabia, Mr. Baroody. He referred to Soviet Jews who had emigrated to Israel. He tried to interpret that emigration as the result of pressure exerted by Zionists on the Soviet Union. My dear friend, Mr. Baroody, I can assure you that the Soviet Union and its great multinational family of peoples has never yielded and will never yield to any pressure exerted by anyone. The permission given by the Soviet authorities to Soviet citizens of Jewish nationality to leave for Israel is in its own way a test of acceptability of the "Israeli paradise" that Israeli and Zionist propagandists write about so often and so deceitfully for the benefit of Soviet citizens of Jewish nationality. And what has this experiment proved?

179. Before me I have a long list of quotations from letters received by the Soviet authorities from Soviet Jews who have had a taste of the "Israeli paradise". One of the Soviet Jews who went to Israel wrote as follows: "For half a century we have watched the metamorphosis of Zionist claims, from the modest beginning of having a 'national home', as proposed after the First World War by the Englishman, Lord Balfour, up to the idea of 'Israel the great'."

180. Nowadays every armed conflict unleashed by the Tel Aviv aggressors with the direct support of the imperialist Powers inevitably culminates in the seizure of Arab territories.

181. Many people have sent us anonymous pamphlets and many have sent us signed declarations. These are letters full of despair, regret and hope. The authors of these letters write with grief in their hearts of the day they received permission from the Soviet authorities to leave in exchange for their Soviet passport.

182. "Everything they promised us is lies"—that is an excerpt from a letter from Karl Abramovich. "We beg and beseech permission to return to our homeland, because it is only in the Soviet Union that a worker can enjoy human rights..."—an excerpt from a letter from Rosa and Kurt Rosenberg. "In emigrating to Israel, I made a catastrophic mistake and I would ask you to save me..." wrote Semën Rabinovich. "I ask you on bended knees to forgive me..." wrote Moses Golz, who continued:

"My sister deceived me. We came here and she doesn't want to know us. She has become callous and heartless. People here in Israel hate one another and the last drop of blood is being squeezed from the working class. We Soviet people are not accustomed to such a society. We urge you to forgive us and to give us an opportunity to return home as soon as possible. We are aliens here..."

183. Here is another quotation; this is from a letter from the Zeltser family:

"On 16 April 1971 our misfortune occurred. This is like a nightmare.... We are writing to our son in Chernovitsy"—a town in the Ukraine—"telling him to kiss the Soviet soil where he is living three times a day—something we can no longer do. To a person that has been born and lived under socialism, the Israeli system is unacceptable."

184. On 1 September 1971 a long communication was received from Vienna addressed to the Soviet Government by a group of Soviet citizens of Israeli nationality who had emigrated to Israel. They wrote:

"The inhuman exploitation and the insulting and degrading labour imposed by fanatical owners, and their inhuman attitude towards us, Soviet Jews, all helped to make life in the 'promised land', as the Zionists call Israel, agonizing and intolerable."

185. These are actual letters from Soviet Jews who have had a taste of the Israeli paradise. I have quoted from so

many letters just to show Mr. Baroody and the members of the Security Council and the representative of Israel how the Soviet Jews who have yielded to Zionist propaganda and left our homeland have been deceived.

186. Not long ago an old Jewish man with a Soviet passport came to our Mission and said:

"I beseech you, for God's sake, let me go home to Kamenets-Podolsk. The Zionists promised me that Soviet immigrants were given oranges at every street corner in Tel Aviv, but when I had had a taste of the Israeli paradise I realized I had to flee from it; I have a brother here in New York so I came to him; now I have come to the Soviet Mission and I am beseeching you to help me return to my homeland."

187. These are the facts concerning the emigration of Soviet Jews who have yielded to the deceptive Zionist and Israeli propaganda.

188. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Having heard the speeches made by the representatives of Lebanon and Israel, we have become clearly aware of the following facts: Israel has launched naked armed aggression on a large scale against Lebanon. This constitutes a grave violation of the United Nations Charter and this is an iron-clad fact which no amount of sophistry on the part of Israel can obliterate. The Chinese Government and people feel great indignation at the renewed naked armed aggression launched by the Israeli Zionists against Lebanon. The Chinese delegation maintains that the Security Council must condemn most sternly Israel's aggressive acts and calls upon Israel immediately to stop its armed aggression against Lebanon, to withdraw all its armed forces from Lebanese territory and to refrain from the repetition of such acts of aggression. The Chinese delegation reserves the right to make further statements on the essence of this question and on the decisions which the Security Council should take.

189. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel in exercise of his right of reply.

190. Mr. DORON (Israel): In view of the late hour, I merely wish to repeat what I have already stated this morning, in accordance with authoritative information received, that there are no Israeli forces or activities whatsoever on Lebanese territory.

191. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I apologize for speaking once again, but, in connexion with the Israeli representative's denial that an attack had been made on populated areas in Lebanon, I should like to quote from a report in today's *New York Times*: "Between 40 and 50 buildings were reported destroyed in the communities that were invaded..."² That is an actual report from an American newspaper which cannot be suspected of sympathizing with Lebanon, but on the contrary is well known as a newspaper which always sympathizes with Israel and the Zionists. This is a specific reply to the statement by the representative of Israel that there was no attack on populated areas in Lebanon.

² Quoted in English by the speaker.

192. And just one more comment. The distinguished representative of Japan referred to the letter dated 16 August 1969 from the Secretary-General [S/9393] regarding United Nations observers at the border between Israel and Lebanon. I should like to point out just two things. First, it is a fact that the proposal was made by the Secretary-General without the agreement or knowledge of the Security Council. I believe that, in accordance with existing practice and the provisions of the Charter, the Secretary-General should have made a proposal of that nature only on a decision by the Security Council, and not independently. Secondly, such a proposal does not seem to have been adequately thought out, since it places the aggressor, Israel, and the victim of the aggression, Lebanon, on the same footing. Accordingly, it hardly seems advisable to refer to that letter as some kind of useful precedent which should be imitated.

193. Our attention has also been drawn to the observation made by the representative of the United Kingdom concerning consultations. As the experience of the Security Council shows, consultations are useful in many cases. But when consultations are used in order to prevent the adoption of a decision by the Council on a urgent question, to prevent it from condemning aggression and demanding that the aggression cease and that the armed forces of the aggressor be withdrawn from the territories they have occupied, then these consultations can only be harmful. The Soviet delegation would therefore be inclined to support the proposal that today's meeting of the Council should not adjourn without any results, and that a short resolution should be adopted today, condemning the aggressor, ordering him to cease his aggression and demanding the immediate clearing of foreign territories by the aggressor and the withdrawal of troops. That would be a positive way of concluding today's debate on this matter.

194. If we postpone a decision on the pretext that consultations should take place, the matter might drag on to the detriment only of the victim of the aggression and not of the aggressor; in that connexion, I am thinking of certain specific sad facts. We all remember the discussion of the proposals submitted by the representative of Jordan on the aggression and outrages committed by Israel in the Jordanian part of Jerusalem. We discussed this question in the Council and many spoke in condemnation of such a policy and practice on the part of Israel; but then, on the pretext of consultations and as a result of pressure exerted by one of the permanent members of the Security Council, or perhaps two, there has been no further discussion of this matter and consultations have been going on for several months now. As you see, there can be many different kinds of consultations. The Soviet delegation, for its part, is against consultations of that kind.

195. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): My delegation has listened carefully to the statements of the representatives of Lebanon and Israel concerning incidents that took place within the territory of Lebanon on 25 February. It is important that at this stage of our debate we remind ourselves of some pertinent provisions of the Charter, because we cannot discuss a problem of this nature without reference to principles we have accepted as a guide for international relations.

196. The Preamble to the Charter says:

"We the peoples of the United Nations . . . [will] unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest . . .".

197. We must remind ourselves of the contents of Article 2, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Charter, according to which:

"All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

"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 . . .".

198. It is evident from the statements made by the representative of Lebanon that there is great danger of the conflict developing and spreading and that the incidents of the past days have been confined to one armed incursion but that several armed incursions have taken place, as have aerial bombardments of Lebanese territory.

199. We should not in this issue confuse Israel's relationship with the Palestinian people and Israel's relationship with its neighbours—its neighbours being sovereign, independent States and Members of this Organization.

200. In my delegation's view, taking into account the danger that exists, this Council should at this stage arrive at a decision which would call upon Israel to respect fully the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon. After all, it is the armed forces of Israel that have violated the territory of Lebanon. Lebanese armed forces have not violated the territory of Israel.

201. Secondly, this Council should demand that Israel immediately desist from any military action against Lebanon and cease forthwith any incursions by land or sea or air by its armed forces into Lebanese territory.

202. Now, those are prerequisites which are important to enable the Council to arrive at a proper solution. Once a resolution of this nature is adopted by the Council, we can look into the rights and wrongs of the allegations and complaints made by the two parties.

203. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Lebanon.

204. Mr. KABBANI (Lebanon): I shall be very brief. The Israeli representative has once more affirmed that the Israeli armed forces have withdrawn. This is not the first time the Israeli delegation has here in this Council declared that Israeli armed forces have withdrawn completely from Lebanese territory, only to admit later, after a vote had been taken, that it was not possible for them to complete the withdrawal at the time the statement was made.

Meanwhile, they were busy carrying out destruction and other criminal acts they did not have time to complete by the time the statement was read out here.

205. That was the case on 5 September 1970 [1551st meeting], and I am sure many members of the Council remember that occasion. In view of that precedent we cannot rely—nor can the Council—on a statement made by the aggressor itself. Unfortunately, we do not have reports from international observers because Israel does not allow them to perform their duties.

206. In view of this situation our national security does not allow us to take chances, and even less does it allow us or the Council to rely on an Israeli statement regarding its armed forces at the very moment they are carrying out their aggression against Lebanon.

207. Mr. OGISO (Japan): I apologize for speaking again, but in view of the reference made by the representative of the Soviet Union to part of the statement I made earlier I wish to clarify my delegation's position. In that statement I said that I wished to ask the Secretary-General to give his Special Representative the necessary instructions so that he could explain the views of the Secretary-General in detail if this question of an observer were raised in future proceedings of the Council. I did not at all say that the

Secretary-General should proceed without informing or consulting the Security Council on the matter.

208. The PRESIDENT: I should like at this stage to mention that, while giving due consideration to the point raised by the representative of the Soviet Union and Somalia with regard to the need for urgent and decisive action by the Council, I understand that the members of the Council are generally inclined to think that it might be advisable to adjourn the meeting now and continue consideration of this matter at a later stage. I shall certainly keep in close contact with members of the Council until we decide—and we should do so soon—upon an appropriate time for our next meeting on this item.

209. With the agreement of the Council, I propose to adjourn this meeting. Before doing so, however, I should like to recall that yesterday, at its 1642nd meeting, the Council decided to resume consideration of the question of Southern Rhodesia early next week, when it may wish to act upon the revised draft resolution contained in document S/10501/Rev.1. I propose, with the consent of the Council, that that meeting be held on Monday, 28 February, at 3 p.m. There being no objection, I shall take it that it is so decided.

The meeting rose at 2.30 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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