

UNITED NATIONS

UN LIBRARY

APR 19 1972



UN/SA COLLECTION

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SEVENTH YEAR

1644th MEETING: 27/28 FEBRUARY 1972

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1644)	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-FOURTH MEETING

Held in New York on Sunday, 27 February 1972, at 8 p.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/1644)

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 9 p.m.

1. The PRESIDENT: The Council meets tonight at the urgent request of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon, who earlier in the evening informed the President of certain incursions of Israeli forces into Lebanese territory during the day.

Adoption of the agenda

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: Members of the Council are aware that these items were inscribed on the agenda at the request of the delegations of Lebanon and Israel. With the consent of the Council and pursuant to the requests contained in documents S/10549 and S/10551 of 25 February 1972, 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. E. Ghorra (Lebanon) and Mr. J. Doron (Israel) took places at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council are also aware that during our meeting yesterday I received letters from the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia in which they asked to be allowed to participate without vote in the current Council discussion of the complaint by Lebanon which is inscribed on the agenda.

4. 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) took the place reserved for him.

5. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now continue 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.

6. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): I thank you, Mr. President, and the members of the Security Council for meeting on Sunday evening. I shall not apologize for asking for this meeting at such an hour on such a day. If it were not for important, indeed overriding, considerations we would have abstained from imposing on you the ordeal of such a meeting. But we know it is the call of duty which imposes on us the obligation to make sacrifices and to come at any time when the peace and security of any State Member of the United Nations are at stake.

7. My colleague Ambassador Kabbani yesterday presented to the Council the case of Lebanon. He related to the Council the events that took place on 25 and 26 February. Those events resulted from a naked Israeli armed attack against Lebanon, a premeditated and unprovoked attack against the peaceful country of Lebanon, which is well known here in the United Nations and in the world for its efforts in the service of peace. We are here again tonight because of new developments, the new Israeli attacks of a massive character against my country—I would say, the continuation of the aggression of Israel against Lebanon.

8. Yesterday the Council heard the representative of Israel stating here that the Israeli troops had withdrawn from Lebanon, after having perpetrated their crimes against my country and my people. That was refuted by Ambassador Kabbani. It may be technically true that perhaps for a few moments the Israeli forces might have happened at that particular time to have been outside the Lebanese border. But the aggression itself was continuing because the attack by the Israeli air force was continuing against my country.

9. I should like now to acquaint the Council of the new facts—facts about events that happened today. At 8.30 this morning, Sunday, 27 February, squadrons of the Israeli Air Force and heavy units of Israeli artillery bombarded areas of southern and south-eastern Lebanon. Heavy bombardments were directed at the villages of Al-Habbariya, Kfar Hamman, Rashaya-el-Fakhar and the heights and valleys surrounding those towns.

10. At noon today Lebanon time, units of the Israeli armoured forces crossed the border to the villages of Kfar Shouba, Kfar Hamman, Rashaya-el-Fakhar, and Al-Habbariya. They were engaged by units of the Lebanese armed forces. One Israeli tank was destroyed at the entrance of Rashaya-el-Fakhar.

11. At 2 p.m. today units of the Israeli armed forces were able to occupy the village of Rashaya-el-Fakhar. They destroyed eight houses and set them ablaze. At the same time units of the Israeli Air Force bombarded the heights north of Rashaya-el-Fakhar. Lebanese anti-aircraft defences forced them to retreat from Lebanese air space.

12. At 3.5 p.m. units of the Israeli Air Force composed of Skyhawk jets bombarded a Palestinian refugee camp at Al-Nabatiya. It is so far known that at least 10 persons were killed and 30 wounded, most of them children.

13. At 6.25 p.m. units of the Israeli armed forces were proceeding to the villages of Al-Fraydis and Al-Habbariya. They were engaged by the Lebanese Army. One Israeli tank and two Israeli troop carriers were destroyed. Ten casualties were inflicted on the Israeli soldiers. An Israeli helicopter was seen evacuating the casualties. Two Lebanese soldiers were wounded. One Lebanese tank was hit.

14. The latest information, which I have just received, states that the three towns of Kfar Shouba, Fardis, Al-Habbariya and Rashaya-el-Fakhar are occupied by the invaders. Those attacks have resulted in the mass destruction of scores of houses in the various towns. The population of the area, taken by panic, has started a large-scale exodus toward the central and the northern parts of Lebanon. Not only are these acts of aggression by Israel—which the Israeli representative yesterday denied were continuing—in fact continuing, but the Israelis are projecting further attacks against Lebanon, because they have been engaged, as we were told yesterday, in opening some roads in the area to prepare for such further attacks.

15. On 14 January we brought to the attention of the Security Council [see S/10509] a warning that was relayed to the Lebanese authorities through the Israeli-Lebanese

Mixed Armistice Commission. Allow me to remind the Council of that warning. I quote from our communication:

“Severe warning: We are asking that terrorist activity from Lebanon toward Israel will stop totally. If that is not done, we have to carry permanent stay in the region in one form or another. Of course, the consequences might bring the people to leave which is completely against our wish.”

In the same communication, we went on to state:

“Such threats, added to Israel’s repeated violations of Lebanon’s territorial integrity, gravely endanger international peace and security. By following this dangerous course, Israel assumes full responsibility for her acts under the Charter and International Law.

“The Lebanese Government forewarns that unless Israel desists forthwith from pursuing the perilous course she has undertaken, the Security Council will be duty bound to shoulder its responsibilities.”

16. The crude Israeli warning, which reminds us of the language of the barbaric Middle Ages, has been carried through, and we have presented to the Council enough evidence, yesterday and today, to substantiate our statements with regard to the situation prevailing now in Lebanon. The Council is facing a situation where one small, defenceless, peaceful country has been subjected for many years to merciless and murderous attacks and aggression by a militaristic State drunk with its own military power, arrogant in its attitude towards the United Nations and the Security Council and defiant of its decisions. We believe the time has come for the Council to take action against the aggressor. The Council, as we related yesterday, has adopted several resolutions solemnly warning Israel against a repetition of its acts of aggression against Lebanon. But what was the result? Further attacks and further aggression.

17. The Council has warned Israel that if it repeats these attacks, these aggressions, against Lebanon, which the Council has stated it regards as intolerable and unacceptable, the Council will have to take steps or measures under the pertinent Articles and provisions of the Charter. We think that the time for that has come.

18. I do not want to go into any more details. What we have said constitutes, we think, sufficient proof for the Council to act and to act promptly in order to force the invader, the aggressor, to withdraw its troops immediately from Lebanese territory. The time has come not only to force the aggressor out of Lebanese territory but also, at a subsequent stage of the Council’s deliberations, to take the necessary measures that the Council has stated on previous occasions it would take in order to forestall any future acts of aggression against Lebanon by Israel.

19. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Once again an incident in the Middle East with serious implications is taking up the attention of the Security Council and is again endangering the precarious situation prevailing in that region. Yesterday we had a

meeting to consider the complaint by the Government of Lebanon as a result of a large-scale attack against that country by Israeli land and air forces, causing a number of victims and substantial material loss.

20. The statement by the representative of Lebanon and his note of 25 February [S/10546] report a large-scale military undertaking with the participation of many tanks, armoured cars and infantry forces. This information was not denied here. Furthermore, they were confirmed by dispatches from various press agencies.

21. Let us confine ourselves to the facts. What provoked this action by Israel? According to the representative of that country in his letter of 24 February [S/10543]:

“Last night, 23 February, shortly before midnight, two Israeli civilians from Zara’it village were killed, when a bazooka rocket, fired by a terror squad who had penetrated from Lebanon in the Metulla area (Upper Galilee), hit the car in which they had been travelling from the town of Nahariya to Zara’it, about four kilometres west of Metulla village.

“The terrorists had also strewn nails on the road on both sides of the spot where the car was hit, which punctured the tires of the vehicles that arrived on the scene after the murderous attack.”

22. In another letter, dated 25 February [S/10550], the same representative told us:

“In addition to the... murderous attack of 23 February referred to in my aforesaid letter of 24 February 1972, two further armed attacks have since been committed against Israel from Lebanese territory.

“On the night of 23 to 24 February 1972 two rocket launchers were discovered that had been set up by terrorists from Lebanon, ready to be fired against the town of Acre.

“On 24 February at 1940 local time, terrorists who had penetrated into Israel from Lebanese territory opened fire against an Israel Border Police patrol, travelling along the road near the village of Biranit (Upper Galilee). Eight of the Israelis were wounded by this fire, and one of them subsequently died of his wounds.”

23. It is of course regrettable that those lives were lost and it is obvious that the Government of Lebanon has an obligation to prevent incursions of this kind from its territory.

24. But here a primary issue should be brought out very clearly. Israel alleged prior provocation and consequent self-defence in order to justify its attacks against various points in Lebanese territory which serve as a base for the *fedayeen*. Self-defence and legitimate self-defence are concepts recognized in international law for responding to illegal or aggressive acts committed against States, provided that two indispensable requisites are met: need and proportionality.

25. In accordance with the principle of need as commonly proclaimed in doctrine and by treatise writers, it is necessary that such measures be indispensable and immediate; there must be no alternative and no time must pass in deliberating or reflecting on the desirability of a reaction. This means that the reaction must immediately follow the illegal attack.

26. In accordance with the second principle, proportionality, the measures adopted in self-defence must be of a similar nature or reasonably in keeping with the means used in the illegal act against which action is being taken. Any use of force on a considerably larger scale or on a scale which goes beyond the events or the provocative circumstances obviously exceeds the general framework of self-defence and is considered illegal in accordance with the uses and practices of the law.

27. The United Nations Charter too recognizes in Article 51 the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence in case of an armed attack against a Member State. But it also requires that the measures thereby taken be reported immediately to the Security Council.

28. It is regrettable to note that neither of the principles to which I have referred is applicable in the case before us. It cannot be validly asserted that the vast military operation launched against Lebanon is in strict keeping with the principle of need or that the deployment of large units of aircraft, infantry and artillery is in proportion with the means used by a group of *fedayeen* whose repression in Israeli territory—and it is important to bear this in mind—would normally have required mere police action.

29. Proportion has not been respected, either in terms of the scale of the action, or even in terms of the duration. Faced with this situation, we must conclude that the events described in the complaint are in the nature of a punitive expedition, and these acts, as well as preventive war, are completely incompatible with the purposes, principles and tenets of the Charter.

30. Today, the news is even more alarming. We have just heard a report from the Ambassador of Lebanon on further air and artillery attacks. Even assuming that their purpose was solely to punish those who carried out those incursions, it does not seem logical to regard aerial bombing or artillery fire as the most appropriate means to achieve this objective. When planes bomb or when artillery is used at long range, the projectiles make no distinction between *fedayeen* and peaceful civilians. Both are victims.

31. We have said here and elsewhere in the United Nations that incidents of this kind, which are not mere border skirmishes, can precipitate yet a further conflict in the Middle East, with unpredictable consequences and implications. We have also said that unfortunately they may be repeated constantly until such time as a lasting peace is established in the area by complete compliance, on a reciprocal basis and with no restrictions; with Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

32. But in this painful crisis we have warned that time does not work for peace. On the contrary, emotions may

run even higher and may make any peaceful settlement even more remote. Time and time again, we have placed our hopes in the negotiations being carried on by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Jarring. It is really a matter of great regret that his presence in Israel has been greeted by a further outbreak of hostilities.

33. As for the present, the Security Council should adopt a resolution requiring a cessation of all military operations at present under way, and the complete and immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces which may be in Lebanese territory.

34. My delegation deplores acts of violence perpetrated against Lebanon and would support a draft resolution along those lines.

35. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): In a letter dated 25 February 1972 [S/10546], the Permanent Representative of Lebanon requested an emergency meeting of the Security Council. That request was motivated and justified by the violent aggression and the violation of the territory of Lebanon by the Israeli army at dawn on 24 February 1972.

36. Forty-eight hours after the request was filed by Lebanon, Israeli aggression against Lebanon is continuing, with the deployment of air forces and bombardments by Israeli artillery.

37. In considering the facts and the way events have occurred, we cannot but note the premeditated nature of the Israeli attack of 24 February 1972 against the southern part of Lebanon. In point of fact, according to present information from all sources, all of which corroborates the statements made before the Security Council by the representative of Lebanon during its 1643rd meeting, more than 50 armoured cars, backed up by 100 Mirage and Phantom jets, Skyhawks and helicopters, penetrated Lebanese territory to the villages of d'Arta Chaab and Ain Ata, creating a vast front of attack. The Israeli artillery at the same time bombarded the region, while napalm was spread from planes all over the countryside and the crops.

38. Following up this attack on a scale unprecedented since the June 1967 war in the Middle East, Israeli bulldozers went into action simultaneously to destroy houses and to open access roads for the armoured cars, thus preparing the way for future new aggression.

39. The results of this military operation, of a type at which the Zionist State is a past master, are quite clear: the toll, for the time being, is more than 10 civilians killed and more than 25 dwellings destroyed.

40. The representative of Israel in the Security Council invoked legitimate self-defence and the excuse of reprisals in an effort to justify a flagrant act of premeditated aggression against Lebanon, whose peaceful posture, which has never been denied, was surely the easy target chosen by the Israeli aggressor in order to intimidate the Arab resistance and at the same time to maintain the necessary degree of blackmail pressure so as to perpetuate its occupation of Palestine.

41. The Israeli Government is confining the Security Council in a vicious circle, from which it is the only one to benefit. By indefinitely prolonging the unjustified occupation of Arab territories Israel is necessarily bringing about resistance on the part of the Palestinian people. The history of the world has taught us that brute force has never succeeded in breaking the will of people to reconquer their dignity and freedom, and even less in annihilating or impeding the liberation struggle of peoples. The explosive situation which prevails in the Middle East is the direct consequence of Israeli occupation of Arab territories. One may wonder why it is that the indefinite prolongation of the occupation of Arab territories by Israel continues. And the reply can be seen in the mass support of different types, particularly in the political, military and financial areas, which the State of Israel receives and which guarantees it a momentary superiority and certain advantages which enable it still to maintain its military domination in territories which have been conquered by force.

42. This is the rule of the world of injustice in which we live as the result of which Asia, the Middle East and Africa continue to be bowed down by arbitrary and brutal force. Palestine, Zimbabwe, Namibia, the Portuguese Territories of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) and other colonial enclaves are and remain one and the same thing.

43. The African countries, and singularly the Republic of Guinea, are familiar with the so-called policy of reprisals, this policy that has been erected a system by yet another, Portugal, which draws all its forces from the support it receives from Western Powers in NATO. We know the meaning of all the armed incursions, the intimidations and the large-scale ventures: they are all designed to put down the impetus of the liberation struggle of the subject peoples.

44. The problem of the Middle East must be at least partially solved by Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and the Jarring Mission. But today, more than at any other time, it appears to us that there is an imperative need for us to ask ourselves whether the task entrusted to mediator Jarring by the great Powers has not thus been put to a test which might well compromise its continuance. The concomitant fact of the Israeli attack against Lebanon, violent and intimidating by nature, and the presence of Mr. Jarring in Israel since the very outset of that aggression, gives one food for thought.

45. Hatred engenders hatred. Coming generations, born under arbitrary occupation and terror, can only be the fruit of violence. The Palestinian resistance has sworn to wage the struggle a hundred years, if necessary. The Security Council, which is the body responsible for maintaining peace and security throughout the world, cannot be a mute witness to this situation of war--which, it must be admitted, is no longer an embryonic war--in the Middle East.

46. The gravest aspect is the threat of the Israeli authorities to occupy by hook or by crook the south of Lebanon, with the alleged aim of neutralizing the resistance activities of the Palestinian fighters. The events which we have lived through in these seventy-two hours and which we are still

living through, all go to prove the expansionist will of Israel. The solution of the Palestinian problem cannot be found in the occupation of all the Arab countries, and still less in the military annexation of the southern part of Lebanon.

47. Before the punitive expedition of Israel against Beirut international airport in December 1968, Lebanon—which everybody unanimously recognizes as having a permanently peaceful attitude—had sent 29 letters to the Security Council. From 1969 to February 1972, three meetings of the Security Council were held and two resolutions were adopted. But today we are forced to face the fact that in the Middle East, and particularly on the Israeli-Lebanese frontier, an atmosphere of terror persists which is purposely maintained and nourished. Soon a quarter of a century will have elapsed, and the situation remains the same. The Arab people, the people of Palestine, are asking that justice be done.

48. In his statement at the 1643rd meeting of the Security Council, the representative of Lebanon, Ambassador Kabbani, emphasized the scope of the aggression which is being suffered by Lebanon, and the contrast between the seriousness of the attack and the so-called action on the part of the Palestinian fighters. He denied that the acts with which they were charged had taken place on occupied territory, stating that they had rather taken place on occupied territory where the Lebanese authorities, it goes without saying, have no control.

49. The representative of Lebanon asked the Security Council to prevent Israel from acting in this way, from breaching and threatening the peace. Today the Ambassador of Lebanon has come from his sick bed to repeat the same grievances to us.

50. The least which can be demanded of Israel by the Council at this stage of the debate is to end immediately the armed attack directed against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon, to withdraw immediately and unconditionally all Israeli troops from Lebanese territory, and also, at a subsequent stage naturally, to demand the imposition on Israel of the relevant sanctions provided for in the United Nations Charter.

51. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel.

52. Mr. DORON (Israel): The statements I made at the 1643rd meeting, on Saturday, 26 February, that there were then no Israeli forces in Lebanon were perfectly true in every respect. What has happened since?

53. Early this morning the terrorists, from their bases in Lebanon, opened fire with mortars and automatic weapons on our troops that were then outside Lebanon. The fire was returned and appropriate action taken against those terrorist bases, in the exercise of the inherent right of self-defence as recognized by the law of nations and embodied in the Charter of the United Nations.

54. Ensnared as the terrorists are in fortified positions located in difficult mountainous country, no action against

them by a few policemen could be of any use or effect. The forces employed by Israel were commensurate with the large number of terrorists they were facing and the terrain in question. If—I say “if”—as we were told tonight, peaceful civilians, especially women and children, were among the casualties of the fighting, we deeply regret this. The responsibility falls, however, on the terrorists who placed their military positions in and near villages and opened fire from there. Although all precautions and care are taken by our forces, even at the peril of their own lives, to avoid such civilian casualties, these cannot, unfortunately, always be prevented.

55. In the course of Saturday's meeting, a number of speakers said that the armed actions against Israelis of which Israel had been complaining had all occurred within Israeli territory, and the astounding view was expressed that for that reason Lebanon could not be held accountable for these attacks and murders.

56. We do not ask the Lebanese Government to assume responsibility for security in Israeli territory. There is no doubt but that this is the duty of the Government of Israel, but we do insist that the Lebanese Government carry out the duty incumbent on it, namely, keep order in its own house in matters that affect Israel.

57. What I have in mind, and we have said it often enough, is the bounden duty of the Government of Lebanon to put an end to the activities of the terror organizations established in Lebanon which use their bases in Lebanon for attacks against Israel. To close one's eyes to these facts, which are there for everybody to see, is to give active encouragement to the terrorists in their murderous activities.

58. It is completely inadmissible to permit Lebanon, a Member of the United Nations, to continue in its role of a sanctuary for terror and murder directed from its soil against another Member State.

59. Everybody present here knows full well the true state of affairs. The fact that terrorists from Lebanon infiltrate and penetrate into Israel and there lay mines or set up Katyusha rocket launchers or use bazookas against school-buses and then return to Lebanon does not relieve the Government of Lebanon of its obligation to stop these attacks.

60. Anybody here who chooses to ignore this basic, elementary and obvious aspect of the problem and limits himself to stressing the fact that the terrorist actions have been carried out in Israel deliberately sidetracks and confuses the issues, mentions the results but ignores the cause, and, worst of all, encourages the terrorists to persist in their murderous activities. It is against the cause of the situation that the Security Council should move.

61. It is the co-operation between Lebanon and the terrorists that the Council must deplore and denounce. It is Lebanon that the Council must call to order for its aiding and abetting of terror action, and not Israel for its lawful and justified reaction.

62. Just as the terrorists seek sanctuary in their bases in or near Lebanese villages, so does Lebanon seek sanctuary in the Security Council, presenting itself as the innocent victim, as it were, of an unprovoked attack—as we heard again tonight. It is therefore useful to look at the hard facts of the situation.

63. As early as three years ago the French journalist Yves Cau wrote in *Le Figaro* of 9 January 1969—this is an English translation:

“Any foreign observer landing in Beirut can within twenty-four hours contact the representatives of the three big organizations PLO, Al-Fattah and PLPF”.

Now, having contacted these gentlemen, what would the observer see? He would see the headquarters of the Palestine Liberation Popular Front—the PLPF—in the very centre of Beirut, in the building of the Lebanese weekly *Al Hurriya*. He would see the office of Al-Fattah in Tarik el-Abiri, on the road to Beirut airport. And he would see the office of the Palestine Liberation Organization—the PLO—near the UNESCO building in Beirut. He would also see training camps where the terrorists are openly being prepared for their murderous activities.

64. The Lebanese Government is, of course, fully aware of this, and maintains constant contacts with the terror organizations.

65. Even before the signature of the Cairo agreement of 3 November 1969 the Lebanese Government went on record in support of the terror organizations. So, for example, the then Prime Minister of Lebanon, Mr. Abdalla el-Yafi, declared on 30 December 1968 while in office as Prime Minister, “The *fedayeen* activities are legal and sacred”. Less than a year later the Cairo agreement was signed. I quoted a few points from it yesterday. Let me refer to some more, to show not only that freedom of action is accorded to the terror organizations by the Lebanese Government—which is bad enough, and unlawful—but that moreover there is active co-operation in the field between the terrorists and the Lebanese army and other Lebanese authorities.

66. There is a provision in the agreement for the designation of frontier access points and the facilitation of crossing for the *fedayeen*. Transport is provided by Lebanon to Arkoub in the southern region for the *fedayeen*. Joint patrols are provided for, consisting of Lebanese soldiers and the *fedayeen*. There is a provision for the apportionment of frontier positions between the Lebanese Army and the *fedayeen*. The Lebanese Army co-operates in the installation of supply, rest and aid posts for the *fedayeen*.

67. On 7 January 1970, after the signature of the Cairo agreement, the Lebanese Minister of the Interior, Kamal Jumblatt, was reported in the newspaper *El-Hayat* of Beirut as saying:

“Lebanon’s participation in the general Arab framework must find its expression in granting the *fedayeen* facilities on the border.”

And in fact on 31 December 1969 the Beirut newspaper *Al-Amal* reported that the Lebanese Army was paving roads for the *fedayeen*.

68. On 22 January 1970 the Beirut daily *As-Sayad* wrote:

“Lebanon considers the *fedayeen* as an allied and friendly army. We work for enabling them to do what they have to, in accordance with their national duty, in certain regions.”

69. The whereabouts and the activities of terrorists in Lebanon outside Beirut are also no secret.

70. On 16 January 1970 we could read in *The New York Times* that they maintained their bases in the Arkoub area of southern Lebanon, including the hills immediately south of Hasbayya, and that they had established headquarters in the small town in the Arkoub region.

71. The correspondent of *Al Amal* of Beirut painted the following more detailed picture after touring southern Lebanon in December 1969:

“The *fedayeen* used to pass along the route starting at el-Rafleh in Syria via Deir-el-Ashair, Yanta, Kufr-Qaog, Ikha, Rasheya al-Wadi, Bait-Lahya, Ein-Hurshe, Ein-Aata, Kfar-el-Zaite. . . . The road from Ein Hurshe to Kafir is a dirt track which has been paved by the Lebanese Army to make sure that the *fedayeen* will have a road of their own so that they will not be in need of using the civilian highway which runs from Rasheya-el-Wadi Junction to Kukaba-Hasbayya Junction. The *fedayeen* then make their way to Hasbayya, where from some of their groups turn to bases in Ein-Kinya, Shuya and Shouba”—mentioned this evening. “Other units turn to el-Habbariya”—also mentioned tonight—“where the principal base of most of the *fedayeen* organizations operating in southern Lebanon is situated.

“From el-Habbariye the *fedayeen* pass the front hills which face Israel in Rashaya el-Fakhar, Kafr-Hamman and Kafr-Shouba.” The names of all these places have been mentioned tonight. “The *fedayeen* now pass with their vehicles through Hasbayya-el-Habbariye highway. It has been reported that the Lebanese army is occupied now in paving a special road from Hasbayya to el-Habbariye in order to free the *fedayeen* from using the highway. The supervision on the passing of the *fedayeen* from Deir-el-Ashair to Hasbayya is carried out by common roadblocks of the Lebanese army and the *fedayeen*.”

72. The daily newspaper *El-Jarida* wrote on 1 February 1970:

“The Minister of the Interior of Lebanon has received a report stating that *fedayeen* in Rashaya have rented an office next to the Government hospital.” I am quoting a Lebanese newspaper. “The report said that the cars of the *fedayeen* occupy the parking places of the hospital physicians.” Even there they have parking problems. “The report details the consequences and dangers to which the hospital and patients are exposed. It ends with a request to transfer either the office of the terrorists or the hospital to another location.”

73. As far back as 23 June 1969, Mr. Edmond Hayek, member of the Lebanese Parliament, stated that the entire southern part of Lebanon was no longer under Lebanese control but was *de facto* run by the terrorists. The following is taken from the Lebanese daily *El-Hayat* of 4 June 1969:

“South Lebanon member of Parliament, Edmond Hayek, stated that the region of el-Arkoub, a part of the Rashaya region and most of the district of Hasbayya, are under the rule of the *fedayeen* and he added that the *fedayeen* in those areas continue to get heavy military equipment of the type which is deployed by the regular army.”

74. The Lebanese daily *El-Jarida* of 8 March 1970 describes the *fedayeen* operations which are carried out from southern Lebanon as follows:

“The *fedayeen* cross the line to Israel and return to their bases or sometimes they station their rockets’ launchers on the border, directed against an Israeli settlement and retreat to their bases.”

Where are their bases? In Lebanon.

75. The results of all this help, assistance and co-operation of the successive Governments of Lebanon provided to the terror organizations were not slow to show themselves. On 1 October 1971 *El Hawadeth* of Beirut writes that the number of terrorists concentrated along the border has reached the figure of 5,000. Continuous contacts between the Government of Lebanon and terrorist leaders are taking place and are being announced over radio stations from Cairo, Damascus and Dera’a.

76. On 14 January 1972 the Lebanese Prime Minister announced that a general understanding had been reached between the Palestine Resistance, as he called it, and the Lebanese authorities. He said this at the conclusion of a meeting on that day between the commander of the Lebanese Army and Yasser Arafat. Concerning this meeting, *El Nahar*, Beirut, writes on 15 January 1972 that, after talks concerning the areas in which *fedayeen* are being allowed to be present, an agreement has been reached on the roads and passes in use by the *fedayeen* when they carry out their actions and also in respect of the points from which they are allowed to fire the Katyusha rockets.

77. *Al Anwar* of Beirut wrote on 19 January 1972:

“The *fedayeen* have agreed to co-ordinate with the Government of Lebanon their actions before their execution against Israel from Lebanese territory.”

78. The Prime Minister of Lebanon, Mr. Saeb Salam, seems to be satisfied with the arrangements between this Government and the terror organizations. On 20 January 1972 the *Middle East News Agency* reports him as saying, in a speech on the previous day at a dinner of the Lebanese newsmen’s association:

“The mutual understanding with our Palestinian brethren is full and definite. The *fedayeen* have the

Lebanese interests at heart as we have theirs. We support them and help them in everything we can.”

79. The *Middle East News Agency* on 9 February 1972 reported that the Prime Minister of Lebanon, Mr. Salam, had stressed in a meeting with an American newspaperman delegation that Israel, in spite of its military strength and the millions that are at its disposal, will not be able to protect its borders from actions of the *fedayeen*. He denied that there were any difficulties whatsoever between Lebanon and the *fedayeen* and denied that the actions of the *fedayeen* on the borders of Lebanon were the cause of the attitude adopted by Israel on many occasions in respect of Lebanon.

80. Apparently, not everybody in Lebanon thinks as Prime Minister Salam does. The newspaper *Lissan el Hal* of Beirut, for example, writes on 13 January 1972:

“Sound logic and the general Arab interest make it imperative to prevent actions on the Lebanese border. Why does this irresponsible jihad continue and cause serious damage to Lebanon?”

81. The former Lebanese Foreign Minister, Charles Malik, writing in *El Hayat* of Beirut on 24 January 1972, said:

“I doubt whether Israel would be provoking Lebanon but for the provocations from Lebanese territory. If shelling of Israel from Lebanese territory continues, then Lebanon and all of us should expect an Israeli reaction to stop that shelling. I do not think that the policy of Israel is directed towards the carrying out of any aspirations in south Lebanon. If there should be a stop to the attacks from Lebanon against Israel, then Israeli attacks against Lebanon would also cease.”

82. Unfortunately, however, it is not the voice of reason that prevails in Lebanon but the voice of the terror organizations. Therefore Israel has no choice but to take suitable action so as to try to prevent further attacks and more casualties. Israel has the moral and the legal right to take action in self-defence and to take appropriate steps to make further terror attacks against it not worth while either for the terror organizations or for Lebanon which so generously extends its patronage to them.

83. Israel’s action was directed exclusively at the terrorists, at their positions and at their bases. The houses that were hit or blown up were, each and all of them, connected with the terror actions, as living quarters, offices, store-rooms for arms and ammunition and the like.

84. It is imperative that the Government of Lebanon itself take all the necessary steps to prevent any further acts of terrorism, murder and sabotage. The Government of Lebanon cannot shed its responsibility. It is a sovereign Government and has to shoulder the responsibility for actions against Israel which originate from its soil.

85. Neither Israel nor the international community requires Lebanon to favour Israel’s interests or support Israel’s views. Lebanon is obliged, however, as a Member of the United Nations to prevent the use of its territory by

irregular forces or any other forces for aggression against another Member State. No pretext can weaken this obligation. No excuse can diminish the responsibility incurred for flouting it. This has always been a tenet of international law and a United Nations principle repeatedly vindicated by United Nations jurisdiction. It cannot be modified to suit Lebanon's internal politics or inter-Arab problems. If Lebanon chooses to violate it, it takes a stand along with those who have opted for war, with all its dangers and repercussions. If Lebanon chooses to open its frontiers to aggression against Israel, it cannot claim them to be shut to Israel's defence against aggression. If the Lebanese Government forfeits its territory to war, it cannot expect it to be immune from actions taken against war. If the Lebanese Government declares that it is unwilling or unable to suppress crimes against Israel or shows itself indifferent to this problem, it must be ready for Israel to try to act so as to protect itself. Israel wishes for peace and quiet; but this does not depend on Israel alone.

86. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Security Council, which has met today urgently at the request of the representative of Lebanon, has to consider unprecedentedly outrageous actions on the part of the Israeli aggressors. The day before yesterday, on 25 February, Israeli forces, tanks and aircraft invaded the territory of a neighbouring Arab State—Lebanon. Yesterday, on 26 February, Israel committed new acts of invasion against Lebanon. As was correctly pointed out by the distinguished representative of Lebanon, Ambassador Kabbani, in his statement to the Security Council, the invasion of Lebanese territory by Israeli forces was the most serious aggressive and warlike act undertaken by Israel against a neighbouring Arab State over the entire period since its aggression in June 1967.

87. The representative of Israel, speaking yesterday in the Security Council, tried as usual to confuse the Security Council and world public opinion and indulged in extremely crude distortion of the facts and direct deception. He assured the Security Council that the Israeli aggressors are so good and humane that they did not attack populated areas and refrained from armed action against the civilian population.

88. Such assurances were even used by our distinguished colleague, the representative of the United Kingdom, as a basis for stating that, if that was the case, the Security Council's meeting should be adjourned to allow for consultations. In that way the representative of Israel completely deceived the Security Council, and as a result the Council did not take the necessary action yesterday, and the matter was not brought to a close.

89. In view of the seriousness of the present situation, the Soviet delegation in its statement yesterday proposed that the Security Council should strongly condemn the new aggressive acts on the part of Israel and require an immediate cessation of the aggression, the withdrawal of the aggressor's forces from Lebanese territory and condemnation of the aggressor. A similar proposal was also made by other delegations. The Soviet delegation also warned that, if Israel repeated the aggressive acts, it would be necessary to consider the expulsion of Israel from the

United Nations as a hardened aggressor and an incorrigible violator of the Charter.

90. The notion of Israel's right to reprisals, set forward by Israel yesterday, did not receive the support of any members of the Council in their statements. Yesterday nine members of the Council spoke, including four permanent members of the Security Council. And they all rejected that notion, a notion worthy of brigands or gangsters. Israel claims for itself the right to attack any State at any time, on the pretext of reprisals or preventive measures. The theory of preventive measures was invented in the gloomiest days of the "cold war". Some people tried to use that theory to conceal their aggressive plans and intentions directed against the Soviet Union. Israel, in blindly following those theories, is committing international crimes and aggressive acts against its neighbours.

91. Two more members of the Security Council have spoken today, and neither of them has supported the notion of Israel's alleged right to reprisals. Who gave Israel that right? Consequently, the overwhelming majority of members of the Security Council, having taken up such a position, have essentially condemned Israel for its new international crimes, its act of large-scale aggression against a neighbouring State, Lebanon, the fourth Arab State it has attacked. One of the five permanent members of the Security Council did not speak yesterday. We are waiting to see what he will say today on this matter.

92. In its insistence that the most effective measures should be taken immediately against the high-handed Israeli aggressors, the Soviet delegation bases its position on the sad lessons of the past, when delay in condemning an aggressor or in taking effective measures to thwart aggression has inevitably harmed the victim of aggression and encouraged the Tel Aviv adventurers to undertake new aggressive onslaughts. Unfortunately, our warning has been confirmed very quickly, within 24 hours.

93. Yesterday, the manoeuvrings of certain delegations behind the scenes prevented us from bringing matters to an end. Today, according to reliable data, the defenders and protectors of the Israeli aggressors are already trying to weaken the Security Council's just retribution against the aggressors. Those who yesterday were trying, by means of pressure and blackmail, to delay the taking of a decision by the Council are today trying to weaken it.

94. It is not difficult to see that such an approach, such a position plays into Israel's hands. It encourages Israel to commit new acts of aggression with impunity. We should not want to be witnesses to a situation where someone on the one hand signed on 26 February or on 27 or 25 February—at all events, during those days—an international document acknowledging the principle of peaceful existence, and on the other hand tried to prevent the adoption of a strong resolution condemning the aggressor and requiring the cessation of the aggression and the immediate withdrawal of forces from the territory of the victim of that aggression.

95. At the same time as the Security Council was considering the aggressive acts of Israel against a fourth

Arab State, Lebanon, and when the majority of members of the Council had already in their statements condemned Israel for this new act of aggression, the unbridled clique of aggressors were undertaking new, major operations against that Arab State. More than that—according to information provided by news agencies and the radio, Israeli forces both invaded Lebanese territory and fired on the territory of another country, Syria. This is a UPI report from Beirut, dated today:

“In Tel Aviv, a military spokesman”—an official—“said the Israeli guns blazed away into Syria three times early Sunday.”¹

96. Consequently, Israel not only invaded foreign territory, and is spreading death and destruction on Lebanese territory, but is also firing on the territory of another Arab country. What name shall we give this? Self-defence? The Israeli representatives will never in any circumstances succeed in convincing anyone that this is self-defence. It is blatant international brigandage, international gangsterism, elevated by a small group of Israeli lunatics to become a doctrine of State policy. From that only one conclusion can be drawn: Israel has seized so much foreign territory that it is not in a position to ensure its defence and protection. Nobody can answer for what is happening in Israel's own territory and in the foreign lands which it has seized. And if you have seized them, and if people are fighting you there, then you deserve it. The best solution is for you to give up the seized territories, withdraw your forces from foreign territory, liberate it, give that territory back to its rightful owners, and the problem will be solved, and your security will be ensured.

97. But the Israeli aggressors have no such plans or intentions. On the contrary, they have a different kind of plan: with each year they try harder to seize foreign territory. But it is time for the madmen in Tel Aviv to understand that such a policy will come to no good, and that the first to answer for it will be the Israeli people itself. We are dealing here at the moment with new armed aggressive acts by Israel, the scale of which, as many representatives have already noted, exceeds all previous acts of aggression against Lebanon committed since the 1967 war. It is not difficult to see that this intensifies the threat not only to peace in the Middle East but to international peace as a whole, and the Security Council cannot fail to consider this. What we are dealing with, therefore, is a direct challenge by Israel to world opinion, to the United Nations and to the Security Council, the principal United Nations organ responsible for ensuring the maintenance of international peace.

98. The threat to peace in the present situation demands that the Security Council should take the most urgent and decisive measures. The Israeli representative blatantly confused the Security Council by claiming that the Israeli aggression did not constitute a threat to the peaceful population. Today we have heard the statement of the distinguished representative of Lebanon, Ambassador Ghorra, which contained concrete facts. There is also the following information given by news agencies and on the

radio: an attack took place on a Palestine refugee camp in the village of Al-Nabatiya, in which 11 persons were killed, including 6 children who were burned to death, and 30 people were wounded. These are the modern barbarians of the second half of the twentieth century—the Israeli aggressors. What would you call this? A friendly visit to Lebanon by the Israeli aggressors or bandit-like highway robbery? Obviously, the second description would be more correct. As many have already pointed out here, the Security Council has three times in the past three years firmly warned Israel in connexion with armed attacks on Lebanon that such armed attacks will not be tolerated, and almost all the members of the Council who spoke at yesterday's meeting repeated this. In view of that fact, and since Israel has committed new crimes of aggression on a large scale against a peace-loving Arab country, the Security Council is obliged to take the most serious and effective decisions to curb the unrestrained, high-handed Israeli aggressors. The Security Council must strongly condemn Israel for its premeditated military actions, and its violations of United Nations decisions and of its own obligations under the Charter. And no references to the right of reprisals will be of any help. The distinguished representative of Guinea drew a striking parallel with the aggressive acts of the Portuguese imperialist colonialists committed against the Republic of Guinea under the pretext of reprisals; but those acts, as is well known, have been strongly and severely condemned by the Security Council. The Council should also take a stand with regard to the Israeli aggressors: as the representative of Guinea correctly stressed, there is no difference between the two cases. Obviously, both the Portuguese and the Israelis are ruled by the ancient NATO doctrine, dating from the time of the cold war, of the preventive strike, which was once cherished by the late Dulles and certain Pentagon generals. It is true that one of those Pentagon generals who thought well of that idea told me in a conversation in 1968 that he now rejects it, and that his only dream now is that his seven grandchildren should remain alive and that not one of them should perish in the flames of a thermo-nuclear war. Once that general, the head of a very important establishment in the United States, threatened in every speech to annihilate Leningrad, Moscow, Kiev, Kharkov—my native town—and other places. Now he has changed his mind, has renounced that idea and prays to God that none of his grandchildren should perish in the flames of a thermo-nuclear war. I was pleased to learn this and replied: “I am very glad that at last you have come to that conclusion. I have two grandchildren, but I fully share your view and hope that neither of my grandchildren will perish in the flames of a thermo-nuclear war.” But the Israeli aggressors are taking matters so far that there is a threat not only to peace in the Middle East but to international peace. Consequently, Israel's policy diverges from the view of those intelligent politicians in our host country who have come to their senses, who face reality and who pray to God that their grandchildren shall not perish in the flames of a thermo-nuclear war.

99. Israel must be told to withdraw its armed forces immediately and completely from Lebanese territory and to cease all aggressive actions against neighbouring Arab States. The Security Council must also firmly demand that Israel should cease all such aggressive acts in the future

¹ Quoted in English by the speaker.

under the bandit-like pretext of a non-existent right to reprisals.

100. Circumstances demand that, once the Security Council has promptly taken such a decision, it should continue to consider this matter and go much further in taking measures to curb the aggressor. It is late; we may continue at the next meeting. The time has come for the Security Council to implement its previous decisions and, in accordance with resolutions 262 (1968), 270 (1969) and 280 (1970), to apply against Israel the sanctions provided for in the relevant Articles and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations: it should require Members of the United Nations to break off completely economic relations and all other contacts with Israel, and also to break off diplomatic relations with the Israeli aggressor. The Council should also consider the question of expelling Israel from the United Nations, since it is a State which persistently violates the principles contained in the Charter, and consequently its obligations under the Charter, not to mention its numerous violations of Security Council and General Assembly decisions.

101. The delegation of the Soviet Union favours such strong and effective measures against this violator of peace and aggressor in the Middle East, which is threatening peace not only in that region, but throughout the world.

102. In conclusion, the Soviet delegation believes that the Security Council should give serious thought to implementing the latest resolution [2799 (XXVI)] adopted in December 1971 during the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly. That resolution was adopted by an overwhelming majority of votes, despite the opposition of Israel and its protectors. In that resolution the United Nations and the overwhelming majority in the General Assembly expressed support for the Jarring initiative and his attempts to promote a settlement in the Middle East. Ambassador Jarring has renewed his efforts, but he needs assistance. He mentioned this to the members of the Security Council, including myself and, if I am not mistaken, my friend Ambassador Kosciuszko-Morizet. He needs help. Once upon a time the permanent members of the Security Council, with the agreement of the Council, gave such help. However, one of the participants in those consultations insisted, in September 1971, that the date of the next consultative meeting should not be set, and should not be agreed upon. Of course, once that was so, it became possible to oppose the holding of a consultative meeting. And since that time, right up to the present, there have been no consultations between the permanent members of the Security Council on the question of granting help and assistance to Ambassador Jarring in carrying out the lofty and noble mission entrusted to him with the agreement of the overwhelming majority of Members of the United Nations.

103. In its statement yesterday, the Soviet delegation addressed itself to those permanent members whose policy has prevented a resumption of consultations. We remind them of that once again, and wait for their replies.

104. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia): Yesterday's warning at the Security Council's meeting that any concessive or

tolerant attitude towards the Israeli aggressive actions against Lebanon could only serve as an encouragement and inspiration for further brutal attacks against the people living in the border areas have, regrettably, proved to be correct. We cannot but state on this occasion also that all the arguments advanced by the representative of Israel to justify these attacks have failed to stand up to serious criticism, both from the legalistic standpoint and even more so from the standpoint of respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter and the implementation of resolutions already adopted by the Security Council on this question.

105. The Israeli attacks against Lebanese territory and against the lives of the people and property in the border areas, and the brutal reprisals in the name of so-called "defence and punishment", have been repeated for years now. It would be tragic, in fact it would be fraught with the gravest possible consequences, if Israel were to infer from this repetition that the world has reconciled itself to these aggressive and reprehensible actions. In no circumstances should the Security Council become an accomplice in having Israel's neighbours become accustomed to reprisals and brutal acts against their territories.

106. Yesterday, the representative of Israel stated—after all the futile attempts to justify these aggressive acts—that the attacks against Lebanese territory had actually ceased and that the Israeli army units had withdrawn to Israeli territory. Those statements have been proved today to be false and incorrect.

107. The persistence of Israel in continuing with the attacks, resulting, in addition to everything else, in punishing and destroying the innocent lives of children, only proves the extent to which these actions are deliberate. Therefore, we must ask ourselves: What are the true intentions of Israel? How long will it continue to demonstrate—at the cost of innocent lives of those who are the victims of its aggressive attacks against the territory of a neighbouring country—not only its superiority and arrogance as an aggressor, but also both its contempt and defiance of Security Council decisions and its total disregard for the role of the United Nations and of the Council in safeguarding peace and security in the Middle East?

108. The Yugoslav delegation is of the opinion that the Security Council can no longer remain deaf and tolerate these repeated aggressions but should clearly and unequivocally take a stand and condemn Israel, demanding that Israeli troops immediately desist from further attacks, not only at present but also in the future, and that Israel withdraw its forces from the territory of Lebanon, with full respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon.

109. Mr. VINCI (Italy): I am taking the floor very briefly in order to introduce on behalf of the co-sponsors—Belgium, France, the United Kingdom and Italy—a draft resolution contained in document S/10552, which I believe will be circulated shortly. The co-sponsors of this text, as I think appears very clearly from the statements they made yesterday, were already willing then to take the initiative they are taking today.

110. The reasons for which action was postponed are known to most, if not all, members of the Council who heard the statements made by the main parties concerned and took part in the consultations between various delegations. We lost some useful time perhaps since the serious events which were related to the Council today reveal that more serious clashes have taken place only a few hours ago, and that the situation on Lebanese territory is rapidly deteriorating. We should, therefore, not delay our deliberations any longer but should proceed at once to take some action. This is exactly the purpose of the co-sponsors.

111. The text we are submitting to the Council is quite clear and hardly needs any explanation. It consists of two short paragraphs which I shall read to my colleagues around the table:

"The Security Council,

"Deploring all actions which have resulted in the loss of innocent lives,

"Demands that Israel immediately desist and refrain from any ground and air military action against Lebanon and forthwith withdraw all its military forces from Lebanese territory."

112. The sponsors believe this is the minimum action the Council must take at this stage. We know that this text does not and cannot satisfy all members of the Council, but we are at the same time fully aware of the fact that if we attempted to do more than what is contained in these simple paragraphs of the draft resolution we would get involved in long discussions delaying further any action, and perhaps we should even find ourselves unable to act. And it is, rather, action—and swift, prompt action—which is required once again of the Council, an action which will stop the military clashes, the loss of life and greater ruin and tragedy for innocent, peaceful people.

113. In this connexion may I recall what I said yesterday—that while 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 may come, and all the more so when they involve the loss of the lives of innocent civilians, bringing tragedy into peaceful homes.

114. For the reasons I have just indicated the sponsors of this short draft resolution sincerely hope that other members of the Council will refrain from introducing amendments, even minor amendments, so that we may proceed forthwith to the vote, which we trust will be unanimous.

115. Mr. SEN (India): The present serious complaint by Lebanon is fully justified, yet it cannot be properly considered except in the context of what has been happening in West Asia. The broad facts are well known, and several speakers have already referred to them. I shall therefore not repeat them but should like to make some general comments and go a little into the basic cause we have been asked to look into.

116. For the last three years or more, whenever the Council has discussed the problems of West Asia, the starting point has always been resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. That resolution gave an indication of how the problem was to be solved. While the Arabs have done all that was required of them, unfortunately the Israelis have given the firm impression that they do not wish to abide by that resolution and, particularly, by its vital provision concerning withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories. This has created tension and frustration, and what we have been witnessing today on the frontiers of Lebanon and Israel is entirely due to that frustration and to Israel's determination to retain by force what does not belong to it.

117. That is the moral issue we must face today, and whenever the Security Council or any other forum of the United Nations ignores or deviates from moral issues and tends to confuse them with legal technicalities or political expediences the problems become more complicated.

118. The facts of the present instance have been amply established. No one will object to Israel taking action within its own territory by sealing its legal borders to the Arab States if necessary, but when it claims the right to take action, and sometimes the most ferocious and cruel action, against Lebanon or any other State in order to maintain its hold on lands which do not by any standards belong to it, it is clearly in the wrong and cannot expect either this Council or any impartial Government not to find it completely at fault.

119. On the one hand, Israel will not co-operate with the Jarring mission, and on the other, it must decide how to deprive and punish the Arabs without any respect for their rights. This is an intolerable situation, and the Security Council must not only take immediate action on the present complaint of Lebanon but must decide how to give effect to Council resolution 242 (1967).

120. We of the Indian delegation cannot accept that it is ever unworthy to resist the wrong that has been done the Arabs by the Israelis. We should, of course, like all others, prefer to see those wrongs removed by peaceful means. But if Israel will not permit it or co-operate with Ambassador Jarring in achieving it, then Israel must be held fully responsible for all the consequences.

121. We can only hope that Israel will realize the futility of the course it is following and will reverse it. If it does not, all the great Powers must immediately exert joint and private efforts to make Israel see reason. And if they too fail, the Council will have no option but to take the strongest possible action.

122. We cannot and should not be partners in perpetuating a wrong. Meanwhile, of course, Israel must desist from all violent acts against Lebanon and must withdraw its forces inside its established border—a border established by the United Nations a long time ago.

123. We believe Israel will be extremely shortsighted to ignore the clear denunciation by the Council on the ground of the imagined or fancied grievance that the Council has

been one-sided. In fact, the Council has taken everything Israel has said into the fullest consideration and has found the Israeli position entirely untenable. It is part of the untenability of the Israeli position that, whenever complaints are received by the Security Council, we are told that that particular incident is over and all is peace and quiet, while in fact only some time is gained, perhaps to inhibit action by the Council until fresh violence is planned and executed—again to the detriment of the Arabs not merely in terms of the destruction of lives and property but in order to continue to deny the rights of the Arabs. We should like to think that none of the members of the Council will encourage Israel in this senseless and futile policy, with all its grave consequences to world peace.

124. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): I do not want to divert the attention of the Council, but I could not help but notice that Ambassador Malik seemed most anxious to hear what the United States Government had to say. He chastised me for not speaking, I suspect however, that there is a delicate balance between talking far too much and saying nothing at all, so maybe we can both do better. I shall endeavour to speak up, but I shall try not to be repetitive, and I shall try not to conduct a filibuster or give a completely one-sided view of very complicated events.

125. Let me start, however, by rejecting *in toto* those unflattering comments about my Government made by our distinguished colleague and my friend Ambassador Malik both yesterday and today. I am unimpressed by those diatribes against the United States Government. Let us all try to be helpful in the solution of this problem before us without resorting to this repetitive, broken record of propaganda.

126. The United States Government views with deep concern the recurrence of incidents along the Lebanese border and the continuing incursions into Lebanon by Israeli defence forces. Yesterday we understood that the military action had ended. We are distressed and very concerned to learn that there have been new incidents along the frontier and even more extensive measures by Israel. We must express deep regret and concern that Israel has prolonged and intensified its attacks on the territory of Lebanon. We cannot condone such action. As we have repeatedly made clear, the United States fully supports the territorial integrity and political independence of Lebanon, and we therefore believe that the Security Council should call upon the Government of Israel to withdraw its forces immediately from Lebanese territory.

127. The United States deeply regrets the loss of life that has occurred on both sides. We also sympathize fully with Israel's distress at the loss of life at the hands of guerrilla infiltrators which apparently precipitated this latest row. The continuation of such acts—these terroristic acts—is not in the interests of any of the people of the area, for it can only delay the achievement of a just and lasting peace which all of us support here in the Security Council and in the United Nations. At the same time, we know that the Government of Lebanon has made strenuous efforts over past months to maintain quiet along the border. We recognize the difficulty of sealing a border completely, but, unless more effective measures can be taken to do so, a

situation is perpetuated in which Israel is exposed to terrorist attacks and, as its Ambassador said here today, feels compelled to retaliate in self-defence. However, the United States believes that the way to solve the problem lies not in hortatory declarations or in further recourse to armed force. It lies, rather, in direct liaison and co-operation between the parties to provide the most reliable assurance possible regarding the security of each. It is the parties that must redouble their efforts to avoid a repetition of the cycle of attacks and counter-attacks.

128. The United States, therefore, urges that both Israel and Lebanon have more frequent recourse to the international facilities that exist for the exchange of information and consultation on border matters. Above all, we ask for an end to cross-border attacks and terrorism, without which the cycle of action and reaction cannot be broken. These events serve to underline the urgency of moving ahead on negotiations for a peaceful settlement, for until peace is achieved the failure to satisfy the fundamental and legitimate concerns of all the people of the area will certainly perpetuate tension.

129. I turn now to the draft resolution before us. In our statement we have expressed our concern over loss of life on both sides. Several others around this table have addressed themselves to the events that led to the situation existing today—the cause, one might say. The draft resolution is brief and to the point, but it would better reflect the genuine concern that many of us feel for the loss of life—the loss of innocent civilian lives—if it were changed to include the words “on both sides” after the word “lives”. The preambular paragraph would then read: “*Deploring* all actions which have resulted in the loss of innocent lives on both sides”. It can be maintained that, as now drafted, the sentence does imply that we deplore actions on both sides, but it would be clearer if the Council would accept this one very brief amendment. This amendment is in keeping, as I indicated, with the views expressed here by several countries, and I strongly hope that the Council will accept it. As one of the sponsors, the very able Ambassador of Italy has stated, the present text is not entirely satisfactory to all members of the Council. For our part, we strongly believe that the thought implied in the preambular paragraph should be made explicit by this amendment adding the words “on both sides”. I am most sympathetic to Ambassador Vinci's plea but I would ask that the Council consider the addition of those three words, for they seem to us to express more fairly the humanitarian concern that we all feel. Certainly we want to try to be able to support fully the Ambassador's plea for unanimity on the resolution.

130. Mr. JAMIESON (United Kingdom): I had intended to explain briefly my delegation's co-sponsorship of the draft resolution. However, on behalf of my own delegation and on behalf of the other sponsors, I should like to appeal to the representative of the United States not to insist on tabling the amendment which he has just suggested. I believe that the draft as it stands can command the unanimous support of all 15 members of the Council. That is what I believe the present situation requires, and I therefore join the representative of Italy in appealing strongly to all delegations not to propose amendments, of whatever nature. It may be that some delegations feel that

the text could be improved in one way or another, but as it stands, and in the light of consultations which have been going on, it represents what I believe to be common ground among us. It seems the least that we can do in the light of the situation which has caused the Security Council to be summoned twice in successive days—and indeed has tonight brought the representative of Lebanon here in defiance of doctor's orders.

131. My delegation, for its part, has had no hesitation in co-sponsoring the draft, since it follows closely the line of thought I expressed in my intervention yesterday. And as the representative of Italy made clear when introducing the draft, the preambular paragraph deplores all—I repeat, all—activity which causes the loss of innocent life. Therefore I hope that the representative of the United States will agree that his suggested amendment is not necessary.

132. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (*interpretation from French*): We were among those who yesterday said that we regretted that the work of the Security Council did not conclude with a resolution. We felt that in any circumstances a resolution was desirable, and, unfortunately, I believe that events have borne us out.

133. Today we do have a draft resolution before us, which we have co-sponsored. To be truthful, I must tell the Council that when we agreed to co-sponsor this draft resolution it did not have the preambular part deploring all actions which have resulted in the loss of innocent lives. We do not actually believe that this preamble adds very much. To be perfectly frank about it, we think it is somewhat platitudinous. Does the Security Council really need to meet in order to deplore the loss of innocent lives? Of course we all deplore the loss of innocent lives, and if the United Nations did not do so it would be failing in its duty, its most elementary ideal. In any case, what do we call “innocent lives”? Women and children certainly, but, after all, a patriot who fights to defend or liberate his country is also innocent. We consider, therefore, that this preamble does not make this text stronger, but at the same time we do not believe that this would justify withdrawing our sponsorship and, as the representative of the United Kingdom has emphasized, we hope that no amendment will alter this text, which, quite frankly, seems to us to be a bare minimum. Apart from that, the text does not prejudice the substance of the problem, and, on this point, I should like to recall what we said yesterday—and it is a point that has been taken up by a number of other speakers—that this problem of the attack on Lebanon cannot be judged outside the general context of the Middle East, and we come back to resolution 242 (1967), to its implementation, to the necessary responsibility of the Security Council and to the need for concerted action and cooperation among the permanent members of the Security Council to see to it that this resolution is finally implemented. That is the substance of the problem.

134. But for the time being urgent action is needed. Reprisal operations have taken place—and here I should like to say that the outstanding submission by our colleague, the representative of Argentina was enlightening indeed: reprisals must not be confused with the right of legitimate self-defence. The representative of Argentina very cogently

explained the conditions for the exercise of the right of legitimate self-defence. Reprisals have absolutely nothing to do with that.

135. Thus something must be done, regardless of the substantive issues involved. These military actions must be stopped, this invasion of a territory must be ended, the troops must be withdrawn. That is what the draft resolution says. That is why we decided to co-sponsor it. It is a bare minimum, and we do hope that the Security Council unanimously accept this minimum.

136. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

137. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): Given the apparent desire of the co-sponsors that there be no amendments at all and the strong appeal by the representative of Italy to that effect, and in view of the statements by the representatives of the United Kingdom and France, we will not press this amendment, in accordance with their wishes.

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

139. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): When I asked for the floor I wished to exercise my right of reply with regard to the statement made by the representative of Israel. I see that the Council is now engaged in the very serious and important business of considering a draft resolution which will terminate the occupation of parts of my country. That is the most overriding element for my delegation at this particular stage. Out of deference to the members of the Council and the business in which they are now engaged, I shall refrain from saying anything further at this stage.

140. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel.

141. Mr. DORON (Israel): On 19 August 1948, the then President of the Security Council stated:

“... each party”—referring obviously to States—“should be responsible for the actions of the individuals or groups on its territory or under its authority to ensure that their actions do not violate the truce or lead to a situation that would result in resumption of military operations. . . .

“... the Security Council should adopt a suitable resolution or issue a warning to the parties involved . . . so that the Governments and authorities concerned may establish the necessary supervision over individuals or groups whose actions might contribute to a violation of the truce and a resumption of military operations. . . .

“The States which have undertaken to fulfil the Security Council's decision on the cessation of military operations . . . will certainly be able to find ways and means to punish and call to order or bring to justice the individuals or groups whose actions might contribute to violate the obligations imposed upon the various States involved. . . .”²

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, 354th meeting*, pp. 45 and 46.

142. The President of the Security Council whom I have just quoted was Ambassador Malik. That of course was 23 years ago, or a little more. He may have forgotten what he said then.

143. As recently, however, as 31 December 1968, the representative of the Soviet Union declared in the Security Council [1462nd meeting] in a debate concerning Israel's actions against terror warfare from Lebanon: "... support given by a State to armed bands . . . entering the territory of another State, must be regarded as an act of aggression. . . . However, no convincing arguments were adduced by Israel to show the responsibility of the Lebanese Government. . . . The Lebanese Government disclaims all part in that action." Will the representative of the Soviet Union be able to claim again tonight, as he did on 31 December 1968, that there is no evidence of Lebanon's responsibility for the terror organizations operating from its territory? I submit that the maintenance of terror organization headquarters, training bases, recruitment offices and other installations on the territory of Lebanon, and all their activities as clearly shown by me by quotations from the Lebanese press, surely and definitely fall within the Soviet Union representative's definition of helping armed bands to enter another State. That is the situation in the case before the Council now, and Lebanon cannot be absolved of responsibility for its aggression against Israel.

144. The representative of the Soviet Union has again tonight—in accordance with his habit, and using language which I as a newcomer to this forum find very strange—accused Israel of aggression and repeated himself over and over again on this point. I believe that, on the basis of the facts and the circumstances with which we are dealing and bearing in mind the record of the Soviet Union in so far as real aggression is concerned, it ill behoves the representative of that country to wrap himself in the cloak of this holier-than-thou attitude and make the pronouncements that he made tonight.

145. The representative of Yugoslavia has alleged that my statements yesterday about the cessation of action by the Israeli forces were, if I rightly quote him, "false and incorrect". However, the representative of Lebanon himself has admitted that my statements were correct when made. Subsequent attacks by terrorists on our forces this morning, as I explained tonight, have made it necessary for us to take further action against the terrorist positions.

146. Listening to the representative of India and well remembering the recent debate on the India-Pakistan question, one can only wonder—to say nothing more—whether the representative of India really thinks that all those present and the world at large have no memory at all.

147. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): We have just read the draft resolution co-sponsored by Belgium, France, Italy and the United Kingdom. We have also heard the explanations given by the co-sponsors. In our opinion, the United Kingdom representative's explanation of the preambular part of the draft is a complete reversal of the right and wrong and a confusion of aggression and the

victim of aggression, and thus places the responsibility equally on both sides.

148. This runs entirely counter to the facts. The fundamental truth is that the Israeli Zionists have launched aggression against Lebanon. This is the continuation and expansion of Israel's 1967 war of aggression against the Arabs. This is not only a violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon, but also an attempt to exterminate the resistance movement of the Palestinian people with threats and blackmail. In order to defend their right to national existence and to recover their lost territories, the Palestinian and other Arab peoples are fully entitled to take up arms to deal blows at the Israeli aggressors.

149. The Palestinian people's armed struggle is perfectly just. This is their sacred right, which is in complete conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

150. The Israeli representative has said that Israeli inhabitants have suffered sacrifices and losses. The responsibility for this rests squarely with the Israeli Zionists. It is their aggressive atrocities that have compelled the Palestinian and other Arab peoples to take up arms for counter-attack. The Israeli representative is in fact propagating a sort of gangster's logic.

151. The Chinese delegation considers the present draft resolution as highly unsatisfactory. We hold that the Security Council should sternly condemn Israel's aggressive acts against Lebanon. Therefore, we propose that the preambular paragraph be changed to: "*Condemning Israel's aggression against Lebanon*".

152. I hope that the sponsor nations can give serious consideration to this amendment in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter and the prevailing facts. If this is not acceptable to the sponsor nations, I propose that the preambular paragraph be completely deleted and only the operative paragraph be retained.

153. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I have a few observations to make in connexion with the remarks addressed to the Soviet delegation by the United States representative, Mr. Bush. He used the well known Anglo-Saxon term "filibuster". I believe that yesterday there was no filibustering, when statements were made by nine members of the Security Council who did not support the Israeli notion of reprisals and who condemned Israel for its large-scale aggression against Lebanon. Possibly, from the point of view of the United States representative, that is filibustering. From the point of view of justice, of the Charter of the United Nations and of previous Security Council decisions, it was the expression of rightful indignation and condemnation of a new act of aggression.

154. Yesterday, adoption of a resolution condemning Israel was prevented not by the statements of those nine members of the Security Council, and not by the fact that this question was discussed, but by the silent fussing behind the scenes which, it must be said openly, is often resorted to in the Security Council.

155. As far as references to propaganda are concerned, the Soviet delegation is ready to bear full and official responsibility for every word spoken yesterday and today. Its statements were based only on the facts and on the truth. We know, over the 26 years during which the United Nations has existed, that what the United States representatives do not like they call propaganda. But that will remain on their conscience.

156. Yesterday's speech by the Soviet delegation contained the statement that, among the States Members of the United Nations, the only friend, supporter and the protector of Israel is the United States of America. Is that propaganda? The whole world knows it. What sort of propaganda is that? Who would deny that amongst the Members of the United Nations the United States is the only friend, protector and supporter of Israeli aggression? That is a fact. Where is the propaganda in that? I wish there were more such propaganda in meetings of the Security Council.

157. Today we have not referred to the United States, and in my speech today the words "United States of America" did not occur. But if certain observations which I made were taken by the United States representative to refer to himself, I can do nothing about it. That means the observations were correct. By his amendment of today submitted to the already weak and unsatisfactory draft resolution introduced by the four sponsors, the United States representative has once again shown that in this case, as it has done over a long period of time, the United States delegation is keeping to one and the same line—it is placing on the same footing both the aggressor and the victim of aggression. We cannot agree with that. Even a weak formula of condemnation and regret must refer entirely to the actions of the aggressor, and not those of the victim of aggression. No aggressive crimes by the aggressor should or can be justified, either directly or indirectly. They must be condemned. The Soviet delegation, which introduced yesterday this proposal for condemning the aggressor, today reaffirms it and supports those who favour such a proposal. On this matter there cannot be two points of view.

158. I should like to make a brief observation with regard to the quotation from my speech at a Security Council meeting more than 20 years ago, to which the Israeli representative referred. The Israeli representative did me a great honour in quoting my utterances of 20 years ago. But he did so in vain. Try as he may, he cannot squeeze from that quotation any justification for the aggressive act committed by Israel against Lebanon. That quotation in no way justifies his country or his Government. The Israeli representative has once again used Himmler's vocabulary, equating partisans with bandits. Yesterday I said that this was the vocabulary of the German Fascists. Yesterday it was proved where the Israeli aggressors derive their inspiration for aggression against their neighbours, their experience and vocabulary of aggression. They derive that experience from the Hitlerite Fascist aggressors. And today the Israeli representative has reconfirmed that yet again.

159. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): Yesterday, during the course of the statement of my delegation, I indicated that the Council should at the first stage try to arrive at a decision

which would call upon Israel to respect fully the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon. I remarked that it is the armed forces of Israel that are continuing to violate the territorial integrity of that country and that no Lebanese armed forces have crossed the frontier into the territory of Israel.

160. I also expressed the hope that perhaps the Council would also demand that Israel immediately desist from any military action against Lebanon and cease forthwith any incursions by its land, sea or air forces into Lebanese territory.

161. It is a matter of great regret to my delegation that no action was taken by the Council yesterday, although the circumstances certainly warranted it. Perhaps now I am speaking from hindsight, but had a call gone out from this Council yesterday perhaps Israel might not have continued the armed attacks against Lebanon. It would have taken notice of the fact that the Council was earnest in its determination to see that these attacks stopped. Unfortunately, certain Council members were not disposed towards agreeing upon such a resolution.

162. So, what has happened? Many people have lost their lives, hundreds have suffered injury, many homes have been destroyed, a great deal of destruction has been caused to property, and whole village communities have been turned into refugees.

163. The draft resolution [S/10552] which has just been brought to the attention of my delegation does not meet the demands of the situation. Unfortunately, my delegation was not consulted during its formulation. The draft resolution speaks about "*Deploring* all actions which have resulted in the loss of innocent lives". I think it is important at this stage that we take into account the situation prevailing in the area. Naturally, one is not happy with the fact that lives have been lost. When we speak of "innocent lives", whom do we mean? We know that there are now three armed forces involved in the activities that are taking place in the area: the forces of Israel, the forces of Lebanon and the forces of the Palestinian liberation movement. Members of these forces, naturally, by the nature of their duty and their loyalty to their respective countries and flags, are expected to lay down their lives in the defence of their cause. But when we speak of "innocent lives" now, we should speak of innocent civilian lives, and I would ask the four members that have submitted this draft resolution to amend it so as to read: "*Deploring* all actions which have resulted in the loss of innocent civilian lives."

164. My delegation would have hoped that it would be possible in the preamble to make reference to a most important principle of the Charter, and to include a paragraph which would read:

"Taking note that all members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State".

One would have thought that this was a prerequisite to any kind of resolution which involved violations of a country's

sovereignty. Yet, we find that the draft resolution does not address itself at all to this important aspect, although it is these repeated violations of the territory of a sovereign country that are causing all the concern and all the tension.

165. It is the view of my Government that Lebanon is being held to ransom. This is quite clear from the statements which were made yesterday by the representative of Israel and also by the communication, or the warning, which was hand-delivered to the Lebanese authorities by Israel through the Mixed Armistice Commission. Interestingly enough, that document has not been denied by Israel. What does that document say? It says:

"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." [1643rd meeting, para. 8]

166. As the representative of France quite rightly stated yesterday, if this information is correct, "what Government worthy of the name could agree to such a demand, which is contrary both to law and to political realities?" [*Ibid.*, para. 19]

167. The representative of Israel has stated that the action Israel has taken is purely because of acts of violence committed on its territory, not by Lebanese armed units, not with the assistance of Lebanese armed units, but purely—and they admit this—by members of the Palestinian liberation movement which Israel prefers to call "terrorists".

168. The Israeli complaint is that a couple were killed as the result of an attack by a bazooka or a mortar. What is the reaction, the retaliation, the reprisal? The representative of Lebanon said yesterday that a battalion of Israeli armed forces composed of 60 tanks and armoured cars entered the region under heavy air force cover. This was on 25 February. Since then these attacks have continued over a wide front, raining death and terror upon the whole civilian population of eastern and southern Lebanon. This Council must learn from its past mistakes and it must not allow situations to drift towards war when with effort and determination it can chart the course towards peace.

169. The very first requirement is that Israel must be asked to respect the territorial integrity of Lebanon. The second is that, as the draft resolution points out, it should be demanded that Israel immediately desist and refrain from any ground and air military action against Lebanon and forthwith withdraw all its military forces from Lebanese territory. In addition Israel must also be warned that the Council will not countenance any further armed incursions into that territory.

170. Of course, such statements have been made in the past, and the whole history of the Israel-Lebanon relationship is replete with violations by Israel of Lebanese territory committed with impunity and with complete indifference to international opinion and to Israel's obligations under international law and in accordance with the Charter.

171. My delegation believes that Israel should be subject to the penalties the Charter allows.

172. The representative of Lebanon has asked that action be taken against Israel under Chapter VII of the Charter. After all, that would appear to be the only kind of pressure Israel might take notice of in its relationship with Arab countries. The same request has been urged by the Soviet Union representative. Of course, one anticipates all kinds of arguments as to why sanctions should not be imposed, and in this respect I should like to quote from the statement the representative of Syria made in the Security Council at its 1542nd meeting on 19 May 1970. He said:

"We have been told . . . that if action was demanded which could never be implemented it would lead to a weakening of the authority of the Security Council. It is alleged, furthermore, that if such a clause were adopted, the Council would never be able to implement its decision.

"The fallacy of that argument is too obvious. It condemns the Security Council to live for ever in a vicious circle of incapacity which it can never break. It paralyses its authority for ever. . . . Such an argument will continue to be invoked whenever it does not suit the interests of some particular Power." [1542nd meeting, paras. 83 and 84]

173. My delegation does not call for sanctions at this stage. But the imposition of sanctions should not be ruled out as a form of action which this Council should take if Israel continues its violations of the territory of its neighbours.

174. Mr. SEN (India): I wish to say a few words on a diversionary remark made by the representative of Israel. Some invocation has been made to my memory, which is, or at least should be, both detailed and vivid on any matters of immediate and grave concern to my country. However, we do not have to depend on memory on important political problems. Rather, we consult records and documents before, during and after the occurrence of these problems.

175. I wonder if the innuendo we heard a few minutes ago will bring any comfort even to those in the subcontinent who might once have disagreed with us.

176. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel.

177. Mr. DORON (Israel): Just to get a matter of semantics right for the representative of the Soviet Union, the expression I used for members of the Arab terror organizations was "terrorists". Whatever word was used in the Russian interpretation, I am sure the representative of the Soviet Union would have made use of much stronger language in the same circumstances.

178. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia): I have already expressed the opinion of the Yugoslav delegation. We now have before us a draft resolution sponsored by four delegations. Allow me to make just a few comments on this draft.

179. We all know that we are considering an urgent situation, and there is no time for long speeches and for delaying our decision. But I must say that the draft resolution presented by four sponsors is very weak and unsatisfactory. Many arguments have already been put forward by several speakers exposing the basic weaknesses and defects of this resolution. The defects are mainly centred around the preambular paragraph. Although this preambular paragraph looks very innocent, it entails many difficulties and it could create many precedents which could cause us to be confronted in the future with very grave consequences. It places on an equal footing the victims of aggression and the aggressors. It does not condemn the Israeli aggressive acts against the territory of Lebanon. It does not say a word about respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon. That is why this preambular paragraph very much weakens the draft resolution, and although I am very sympathetic to the appeal of our colleague, the permanent representative of Italy, that we should avoid any amendments and have a unanimous vote, I must say that with such a preambular paragraph this cannot be achieved.

180. To avoid amendments and to avoid further discussions which will go into the substance of the matter, the simplest possibility of solving the problem before us would be to delete the preambular paragraph and to have a draft resolution consisting only of the operative paragraph demanding that Israel immediately desist and refrain from any ground and air military action against Lebanon and forthwith withdraw all its military forces from Lebanese territory.

181. I should like to appeal to the sponsors of this draft resolution to consider my suggestion that the preambular paragraph be deleted.

182. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (*interpretation from French*): A number of proposals and requests have been put forward by our colleagues around this table. I think it might be a good thing if the sponsors could get together very briefly—perhaps for only ten minutes—to consider how best to meet the various proposals that have been made.

183. I suggest, then, that the Council suspend its meeting for perhaps no longer than ten minutes.

184. The PRESIDENT: Would the members of the Council agree to the suggestion put forward by the representative of France that we should adjourn for a period of 10 minutes and resume our meeting after the sponsors have had a chance to consider the suggestions that have been made?

185. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I had wished to ask for the floor before the French representative made his proposal but, since he has now made it, I shall refer to that proposal. I consider that it would be appropriate to take a short break, but before that break I should like to remind members of the Security Council that in its resolution 248 (1968), dated 24 March 1968, the Council took a decision in connexion with Israel's attack on Jordan, in

which appear the words: "actions of military reprisal . . . cannot be tolerated". I consider that the Security Council, having adopted such an approach in 1968, must follow that line of principle in 1972 also.

186. And from that point of view, if the Chinese delegation formally introduces a proposal concerning condemnation of the Israeli aggression and of Israel as an aggressor, then the Soviet delegation will support such a proposal. Both in yesterday's speech and in today's, we have stressed firstly that it is essential to condemn the aggressor and, secondly, that we are firmly opposed to any attempt to place on the same footing the aggressor and the victim of aggression and to allow in Security Council resolutions a wording which would enable the aggressor to consider that his actions were justified.

187. Taking into account previous Security Council resolutions, our basic premise must be that the aggressor must once again be condemned, and that the resolution should contain the demands which were included in the operative part of the above-mentioned draft.

188. The PRESIDENT: Do the members of the Council agree that we should suspend the meeting for 10 minutes?

189. I call on the representative of Lebanon.

190. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): I should like to make a short remark before the suspension of the meeting. In our statements both yesterday and today we have emphasized very clearly that what is most important for us at this stage is to liberate our occupied territories from the invaders, from the aggressors. We have called on the Security Council to take immediate action to that effect.

191. As regards the draft resolution before the Council now, we leave it to the wisdom of the Council to decide what it wishes to do. Our main concern is with the operative paragraph at this particular stage. The draft resolution falls far short of our demands. Our demands were very clear yesterday and they are very clear today, and by adopting this draft resolution the Council will not give us full satisfaction. At this stage we are mainly concerned with the invasion of our territory, the termination of that invasion, the relieving of the anxiety of the people of the area, the stopping of the exodus of the civilian population which is fleeing from the area and the stopping of the murder and destruction. I hope that we shall have an opportunity at a later stage to discuss with the Council further aspects of this problem, because our requests were very clear yesterday and they are very clear today. We shall not be satisfied with this resolution alone.

192. Mr. VINCI (Italy): I did not intend to speak, but, since the representative of Lebanon has made this statement, I think it should be clear to all members of the Council what has been requested by him; indeed it was on that basis that we insisted as co-sponsors that the Council take prompt action. Several views have been expressed, and we expected that; indeed we said in introducing our text that we knew that the text would not be completely satisfactory to several delegations. However, we thought that at this stage what was needed was to take action—

action at once and without delay. The views that have been expressed have been put to us in the form of suggestions, and we hope that they will remain only suggestions. I would add that these suggestions are on record and show clearly the position of each delegation.

193. Now, in an effort to enable the Council to act unanimously, the representative of the United States, who had put forward an amendment, has shown a spirit of conciliation and the desire to enable the Council to act as one man and united, by withdrawing his amendment.

194. We have the greatest respect for the Chinese representative and the greatest consideration for the views he has expressed in requesting the deletion of the preambular paragraph of the draft resolution—the same respect and consideration as we have for the representative of Yugoslavia, Mr. Mojsov. The representative of Somalia, with his usual knowledge and skill, has also expressed some views and put forward some suggestions. I should like to explain to all these representatives that what we have tried to do is use language which is open also to interpretation. I think this is our usual practice—that is, to use words that can be interpreted. I have not heard from any of my colleagues who have spoken that they have any quarrel with the words “loss of innocent lives”. Mr. Farah has suggested the wording “civilian lives”, but we have heard different views. Even one of the co-sponsors explained that “innocent lives” can be interpreted in different ways. Why should we become involved in these semantics when we are requested—as again a few minutes ago we were requested—to take action at once?

195. It is an interim resolution. We want to see what the result will be. We want to see the consequences. So let us act and not try to display merits. We do not claim any special merits. We only want to enable the Council to act, to take a decision. We have already said that we should have liked to see this action taken yesterday. Let us not delay any longer. Let us take this decision today, at once, without waiting any longer. We shall continue to have this subject under consideration. We have had it for so many years and we shall still have to deal with this subject and other subjects relating to the Middle East. So my final appeal to all delegations would be to enable the Council to take action and to adopt this draft resolution unanimously. It is open to each delegation to give its explanation of vote and to reiterate the views it has expressed previously or at this meeting.

196. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Yesterday and today the Chinese delegation has clearly stated its views. As an interim draft, the resolution can be very simple and concise. However, the preambular paragraph of the draft resolution in its present form cannot but give the impression of partiality towards the Israeli Zionists. Therefore, in order to enable the Security Council to proceed with actions, we have just proposed two alternatives: first, to condemn Israeli aggression against Lebanon. If this is not acceptable, then we propose that the preambular paragraph be deleted completely. In so doing, we can avoid delay and immediately proceed to actions. And this is precisely what the Lebanese representative has asked the Security Council to do. We are not engaged in

argument. We demand action. We hope the sponsors will take a sensible attitude so as to enable the Security Council to take action, and will not insist on retaining the preambular paragraph in the draft.

197. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): I listened with interest to what the representative of Italy had to say about the draft resolution before the Council. Since a number of delegations have taken issue with the preambular paragraph and since there is general agreement on the operative paragraph, would the co-sponsors take this into account and perhaps produce a revised draft resolution so that we could proceed forthwith with our work?

198. Secondly, I see that there is a United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Lebanon. I was wondering whether a report has been received by the Secretary-General on the military activities that have taken place in Lebanon over the past three days.

199. The PRESIDENT: In regard to the remarks that have just been made, I think that we are all keenly aware of the need for quick action, but I also consider that a short suspension, of 10 minutes, would not delay the Council unduly.

200. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): In view of the statement we have just heard from the representative of Lebanon, and taking into account the wishes which a number of delegations have expressed that the sponsors should agree to delete the preamble, perhaps we do not need to suspend our meeting, since the problem we are discussing is an urgent one and since it is essential for the Security Council to take a correspondingly urgent decision. If the sponsors have a serious approach to the question under discussion, if they really wish to provide assistance to the victim of aggression, then the most sensible thing for them to do would be to withdraw the preamble and to put the operative part to a vote; obviously, all members of the Security Council would vote in favour. In that case, a suspension would not be required.

201. The PRESIDENT: I shall then ask the sponsors whether they are prepared to delete the preamble. If they are, there would be no need for a suspension. If they are not, then we shall have a 10-minute suspension to consider what to do.

202. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (*interpretation from French*): I believe that after all the sponsors need to meet, if only for a few minutes, to consult with each other. I think that the recess would be a very short one and matters might be considerably simplified. I also think that my proposal for a suspension had priority, and that we should have decided on it at once. However, I do not insist, we have had some clarifications which might facilitate a solution, but I would maintain my proposal for a suspension, which I repeat, will be very brief.

203. The PRESIDENT: I regret that the discussion has dragged on. I now put it to the Council that with its agreement we should suspend the meeting for 10 minutes.

204. Since there is no objection, I take it that we shall suspend the meeting for 10 minutes.

The meeting was suspended at 11.55 p.m. on 27 February and resumed at 12.10 a.m. on 28 February 1972.

205. The PRESIDENT: Before we proceed to the consideration of the draft resolution before us I should like, with the indulgence of the members of the Council, to make a short statement as the representative of the SUDAN.

206. Members of the Council have often had occasion to witness the representatives of Israel decrying the use of violence, or what they consider incitement to violence, against Israeli territory or Israeli citizens on the part of the Arab people of Palestine. They have often deplored the fact that the neighbouring Arab countries have continued to give refuge to the Palestinian *fedayeen* and maintained that the Governments of those countries are to be held responsible for acts undertaken by the *fedayeen*. We heard this today and yesterday from the representative of Israel. Because of this, they have sought to justify before the Council their punitive action against the countries that have given refuge to the *fedayeen*.

207. They have done this in spite of the fact that their action has been repeatedly rejected and repudiated by the Council. It is an indisputable fact, however, that as a result of its so-called preventive and punitive action Israel is now in occupation of an area that is far in excess of the territory assigned to it by the original United Nations resolution on the partition of Palestine [*General Assembly resolution 181 (II)*].

208. The representatives of Israel have deplored the fact that Arab States did not accord to it the respect for its security and territorial integrity that is due to it as a Member of the United Nations. Yet the Government of Israel does not seem to consider itself bound by the principles and precepts that it would have all other States follow without deviation. One might ask: What is the territory of Israel that the Arab countries have to respect? Does it include Jerusalem? Does it include Gaza? Does it include Sinai? These are areas that Israel occupies in violation of all the principles that its representatives are so importunate about observing. These areas are now claimed by Israel as part of its territory, and being part of its territory are therefore inviolate.

209. The Palestinians do not accept this logic. They do not accept it since their claim to the land that Israel now occupies is undeniable. Indeed, the United Nations has repeatedly asserted the right of the Palestinians to their lands; but the United Nations has been unable to enforce its resolutions because Israel has continued to deny every right to the people of Palestine.

210. Now Israel is holding Lebanon responsible for the action of a people that is asserting its rights to its homeland. Israel claims that the punitive action undertaken in Lebanon was undertaken in self-defence. But such actions by Israel have always been unequal and disproportionate. They have always been condemned by the international community. Members of the Council would recall

the attack on the civilian airport of Beirut on 28 December 1968. That action, which was condemned by the Security Council [*resolution 262 (1968)*], was defended by Israel. The Israeli attack against southern Lebanon in May 1970 was also deplored by the Council [*resolution 280 (1970)*]. The Security Council regarded that action by Israel as a violation of the Charter of the United Nations, and therefore it was condemned by the Council.

211. The action that Israel has engaged in during the last two days is again in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and should be just as vehemently condemned as the last action. The Security Council must indeed be decisive against Israel if it is to maintain any respect or authority. The Charter of the United Nations provides for such action against transgressors. Members of the Council might consider that the time has come for the international community to take punitive action against Israel.

212. Speaking as the representative of the Sudan, I would say that the draft resolution introduced by the representative of Italy on behalf of the four sponsors falls far short of the action that the Council is duty bound to undertake. Israel has been condemned in countless resolutions of the Council and asked to desist from its wilful and self-seeking ways. It has not been deterred. The adoption of this draft by the Council, even if it were unanimous, would not change the Israeli attitude. The need for more decisive and drastic action still remains.

213. Speaking as PRESIDENT, I understand that the representative of Italy has a statement to make on the draft resolution before the Council.

214. Mr. VINCI (Italy): I have asked to be allowed to speak in order to inform the Council of the results of the consultations which took place between the sponsors during the short break that was requested by the representative of France on their behalf.

215. I should like first of all to assure the members of the Council that the four sponsors have considered very carefully and seriously the suggestions which have been submitted to them by the representatives of China, Yugoslavia and, if I am not mistaken, Somalia.

216. We have come to the conclusion that in order to be consistent with the position that we had taken when we made an appeal to all members not to put forward amendments it would be difficult for us to accede to a request to delete the preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. Nevertheless, we believe that we can give full satisfaction to the suggestion which was put to us by having the two paragraphs put to separate votes. This, I think, would satisfy the request which was put to us, and through the consultations we had I think we can draw that conclusion.

217. Finally, my suggestion would be that you, Mr. President, take separate votes on the two paragraphs of the draft resolution: first a vote on the preambular paragraph, and second a vote on the operative paragraph.

218. The PRESIDENT: I believe that suggestion is acceptable to the Council. I shall therefore put to the vote . . .

219. I call on the representative of Israel.

220. Mr. DORON (Israel): Mr. President, with all due respect, in the statement you made in your capacity as representative of your country you went far beyond the scope of the subject before the Council. Had your observations been made before an objective President and not under your own Presidency they would have been ruled out of order.

221. Defending the activities of the terrorists against Israel from the soil of another Member State of the United Nations . . .

222. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

223. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): Mr. President, when the Council is proceeding to a vote, statements are not permitted. Why is that privilege being granted to the Israeli representative?

224. Mr. DORON (Israel): I asked for the floor before anything was put to the vote.

225. The PRESIDENT: Since I did not quite grasp the interpretation, may I ask the representative of the Soviet Union to repeat his remarks?

226. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): If I understood you correctly, you stated that you were putting the draft resolution to a vote after the statement of the representative of Italy. Consequently, the Council was proceeding to a vote. In accordance with the provisional rules of procedure, when the Council is proceeding to a vote on a draft resolution, no debate is permissible.

227. The PRESIDENT: I think we can consider that, while I was on the point of starting the voting procedure, the representative of Israel asked for the floor before the voting procedure actually started. Consequently, I call upon the representative of Israel to resume his statement.

228. Mr. DORON (Israel): Defending, as you did, Sir, the activities of the terrorists against Israel from the soil of another Member State of the United Nations, you carried your remarks into the realm of extreme partisanship. They are most emphatically rejected by my delegation.

229. The PRESIDENT: I think I do not need to defend the statement I made as representative of the Sudan because it was not in my estimation a partisan statement. It took account of the facts as I saw them, and it took account of the pronouncements of the United Nations on the Palestinians and their rights as acknowledged by the United Nations.

230. If we may revert to consideration of the draft resolution before us [S/10552], the Council will now proceed to vote. Separate votes on the preambular and operative paragraphs have been requested.

231. I shall first put to the vote the preambular paragraph.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Argentina, Belgium, France, Italy, Japan, Panama, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: China, Guinea, Sudan, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining: India, Somalia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The result of the vote was 8 in favour and 4 against, with 3 abstentions.

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

232. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution as modified by the vote on the preambular paragraph, which was not carried.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Argentina, Belgium, China, France, Guinea, India, Italy, Japan, Panama, Somalia, Suda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia.

The draft resolution, as modified, was adopted.³

233. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call upon representatives who wish to speak in explanation of their votes after the vote.

234. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): I shall try to be very brief; the hour is late. We find it incomprehensible that people around this table could have failed to support the inclusion in the resolution of a statement which read: "Deploring all actions which have resulted in the loss of innocent lives". How this Council could object to such fair and humane language leaves us completely baffled.

235. Yes, we voted in favour of the draft resolution without the preambular paragraph, for, as we said in our statement, the Security Council should call upon the Government of Israel to withdraw its forces immediately from Lebanese territory. That the Council has done. But it is our strongly held view that the Council even at this stage knows enough and should have cared enough to deplore, among other things, the actions which resulted in the loss of innocent lives.

236. We shall in the future carefully note those who raise this question in other incidents.

237. Let me be clear. Our vote on the final passage of the resolution was in no way a condonation of the events that led up to the actions taken by the Government of Israel.

238. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of the preambular paragraph for two reasons. First, my delegation had no alternative on language which deplored the loss of innocent lives. Secondly, the preambular paragraph was

³ See resolution 313 (1972).

interpreted by my delegation as being closely linked to the operative paragraph which was subsequently unanimously adopted.

239. As the representative of Italy very correctly pointed out, the language in which this resolution is couched has lent itself to various interpretations. Having said that, however, we should like to add that we find much merit in the proposal of the representatives of China and Yugoslavia, because we do not believe we can put on an equal footing action by the *fedayeen* and excessive action in the name of the so-called right of legitimate self-defence taken by Israel. I hope I made that point very clear in the course of my statement. In the opinion of the delegation of Argentina, Israel has far exceeded the exercise of that right to self-defence.

240. Therefore, in casting our affirmative vote, we in no way interpret it as meaning that we put both forms of action on an equal footing.

241. Mr. OGISO (Japan): My delegation voted in favour of the preambular paragraph since it believes that it is very deplorable that, as a result of excessive acts of so-called self-defence by Israel, loss of life occurred and, in particular, the loss of children's lives.

242. My delegation voted in favour of the resolution as a whole, for two main reasons. Firstly, my delegation wished to respond to the appeal made by the representative of Lebanon that the occupied part of the territory of Lebanon should be liberated as soon as possible. Secondly, my delegation took note of the explanation given by the representative of Italy that this resolution is intended to be an interim measure.

243. As I recall, the Security Council has adopted a number of resolutions with respect to the question between Lebanon and Israel, and the Council had issued a similar request, or appeal, or demand, a number of times. But we are still facing a recurrence of the unhappy incidents in the border area between Lebanon and Israel. As some representatives mentioned before, the lack of a report from UNTSO seems to handicap the Council when it wishes to act effectively, because of lack of correct information. Therefore my delegation would have hoped that any resolution adopted by the Council would have some provision for some concrete peace observation machinery. However, in view of the appeal by the representative of Lebanon and in view of the urgency of the situation, my delegation has agreed to the present resolution. I feel that the sponsors of this resolution submitted it in the conviction, or at least in the strong hope, that it would, if adopted, be fully respected by the parties concerned and in particular by Israel. I strongly hope that this resolution will be fully respected by Israel and that Israel will not violate it on the grounds of self-defence.

244. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): During discussion of this urgent question, the delegation of the Soviet Union has firmly spoken out against the adoption of an identical attitude towards Israel and Lebanon, the aggressor and the victim of aggression. For that reason, during consultations we firmly

insisted that the sponsors should relinquish the preamble of their draft and withdraw it. However, since at the time of the vote the preamble was rejected, not having received a sufficient number of votes, the Soviet Union delegation held back, considering it inadvisable, as they say, to flog a head horse. Basically, there was nothing to vote for, since the preamble had already been rejected.

245. In connexion with the adoption of that resolution, I would like to point out one more fact. The representative of Italy, who introduced the draft resolution on behalf of the four sponsors, explained that he regarded the resolution as a provisional one, in view of the urgency of the question and the need for the Security Council to take urgent measures. In view of that statement by the sponsors, and taking into account the general mood of all but one of the representatives in the Council who have set out their position, I believe that it would be advisable to continue discussion of this question in order to take into account the statements of delegations with regard to the adoption by the Security Council of more serious and strict measures against Israel. The USSR delegation has set out those measures in its statements. They include condemnation of Israel and implementation of sanctions against it in accordance with the relevant Articles and provisions of the Charter, and also consideration of the application of an extreme measure to Israel—as a violator of the Charter and of Security Council decisions—consideration of the question of Israel's remaining in the United Nations, as well as a number of other questions. For that reason, the Soviet Union delegation formally proposes that consideration of this question should be continued after adoption of the resolution.

246. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): No one rejoices over the loss of life, and my delegation indicated that, had this preambular paragraph been qualified by the inclusion of the term "civilian", it would have had no difficulty in accepting it as it stood. Unfortunately, the sponsors seemed in a particular hurry to get through with the paragraph and to disregard the suggestions which were made for its deletion. The paragraph as it stood was ambiguous, having regard to the circumstances which exist, and it did not address itself specifically to the central question before us, which is the murderous attacks by land and aerial bombardment against the civilian population of Lebanon. It is my hope that when we resume consideration of the complaint by Lebanon we shall have an opportunity to give further consideration to a paragraph which would concentrate perhaps on expressing our regret at the loss of innocent civilian lives and also at the wanton destruction that is being inflicted upon the people of Lebanon by foreign armed forces.

247. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): We are very grateful to the sponsors, who have enabled us to have a separate vote on the preamble and the operative part of the resolution. We should not like there to be any ambiguity about our position in the Council. We would have supported the resolution as submitted by the sponsors if the preambular paragraph had not been worded so equivocally. My delegation in no way wishes to have the victims placed on the same footing as the aggressors, so as to be able to feel satisfaction later with an easy conscience, with a job well done. While demonstrating our solidarity

248. Mr. MOJISOV (Yugoslavia): It was not because we do not deplore the loss of innocent lives that the Yugoslav delegation voted against the preambular paragraph. On the contrary, it was precisely because we deplore the loss of innocent lives, caused by the aggressive actions of Israel, that we could not support the preambular paragraph which equated the victims with the aggressors. In previous resolutions of the Security Council on the same matter we had such phrases deploring the loss of civilian lives but they were accompanied by the condemnation of the aggressive Israeli acts. Voting for the preambular paragraph would have meant that the larger and more powerful the action of the aggressor, the weaker the resolution adopted by the Security Council. My delegation voted for the resolution as a whole, having in mind that it was an urgent interim resolution and that urgent action by the Security Council was required. We believe it necessary that the substantive issues which are involved in the entire problem of the aggression by Israel against Lebanon should continue to be considered by the Council.

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

250. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): Mr. President, I wish to thank you personally for the able and objective manner in which you have conducted this meeting. I also wish to express the thanks of my delegation and my Government to the sponsors of the draft resolution which has been adopted by the Council. I also wish to express my thanks to all the members of the Council for their unanimous vote as well as for the statements made in the Council which expressed deep feelings of sympathy, support and friendship for and solidarity with my country and my people.

251. I do not wish to indulge in rhetoric at this hour in rebutting the statement made by the representative of Israel earlier in this debate. However, I should like to make a few points for the sake of the record.

252. He may have misunderstood me when I said that at the very moment when he made his statement here in the Council, Israeli soldiers were perhaps technically not on Lebanese soil. But the facts, as I said, were that Israeli forces were still opening roads in southern Lebanon and Israeli planes were flying over the air space of my country. The Israeli representative claimed that after the withdrawal of the Israeli troops some mortar fire took place from somewhere on the slopes of Mount Herman against the soldiers retreating from Lebanon. I am wondering what Al-Nabatiya, far to the south-west of that area, had to do with such mortar fire—if mortar fire did indeed take place. I wonder what a Palestinian refugee camp had to do with such actions in which women, children and other innocent people were murdered and wounded.

253. He went on to quote from the Lebanese press. We pride ourselves on having a free press where all the facts and all the opinions are given. We do not have to make any excuses for that; indeed we are very proud of it. But if he needs more quotations, I can give him tons of Lebanese papers to quote from.

254. We in Lebanon are wholeheartedly with the Palestinian people, with the Arab people who have been the victims of Israel's aggression and usurpation.

255. He claimed that Lebanon is a sanctuary for terrorists. Lebanon has for 23 years been a haven for 300,000 refugees out of 1.5 million who have been expelled by Israeli terrorist action in Palestine; they are there because of Israel's actions. They are living, as you all know, in camps and you have discussed on many occasions here the ways and means of coming to their support and helping them to subsist.

256. This is the sanctuary Lebanon has made of itself for our brethren, the Palestinian people. Lebanon is not Israel—an aggressor, an occupier—where over 1.5 million of our Arab brethren are suffering under Israeli military occupation.

257. I am not going to cite the dozens of resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly condemning Israel for its many aggressions and acts of violence and wars against the Arab States, against the Palestinian people and against my country.

258. The record is very heavy and the hour is very late, and I am not going to recite all these things. May I be permitted only to make one final remark. On 19 May 1970, in its resolution 280 (1970), and on 5 September 1970, in its resolution 285 (1970), the Security Council adopted resolutions similar to the one that has just been adopted. What did Israel do with these resolutions? Exactly what it has done to the scores of other resolutions adopted by the United Nations. Our hope is not only that the resolution just adopted will be respected but also that it will be enforced by the Security Council if it is not respected by Israel.

259. We understood from the various representatives around this table that this was a provisional, an interim resolution, adopted upon our request, to deal with an urgent emergency matter. We thank you for that action. But we cannot stop here. The past is very clear. We know the record of Israel and, as we heard from some members of the Council, we will have, I hope soon, opportunities to go deeper into this matter in order to satisfy the demands, the requests, that the Lebanese delegation has put before the Council.

260. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Israel.

261. Mr. DORON (Israel): I have asked for the floor to express the deep regret of my delegation that the resolution just adopted by the Security Council fails again to make mention of the root cause of the situation discussed in the last two meetings here: namely, the failure of the Government of Lebanon to take any action against the terrorist organizations established on its soil, with a view to putting a stop to their activities against Israel, activities which are nothing but criminal, murderous acts that cannot be glorified or exalted by any other name.

262. Now the original draft resolution contained a preambular paragraph which on the face of it expressed regret for all actions that have resulted in the loss of innocent lives. Apparently some delegations feared lest this preambular paragraph could have been interpreted as deploring the loss of Israeli lives as well, innocent as they may be. Therefore, they asked for the deletion of the paragraph.

263. It is a matter of sorrow for my delegation that the preambular paragraph, perfunctory as it was, has been deleted for procedural reasons, although an absolute major-

ity voted for its retention. What remains is a completely one-sided resolution.

264. The PRESIDENT: I have no more speakers. I therefore propose that we now adjourn, and I shall maintain close consultations with the members of the Council in order to determine when we shall next meet to resume consideration of this question.

*The meeting rose on Monday, 28 February 1972,
at 1.00 a.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 الى : 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.
