



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

1499th MEETING: 14 AUGUST 1969

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1499)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 12 August 1969 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of Lebanon addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9385)	
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 12 August 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9387)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND NINETY-NINTH MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 14 August 1969, at 10.30 a.m.

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

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1499)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. The situation in the Middle East:

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

3. The situation in the Middle East:

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

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

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

The situation in the Middle East

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

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): In accordance with the Council's previous decision I shall invite the representatives of Lebanon and Israel to take places at the Council table.

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

2. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the question on the agenda.

3. Mr. AZZOUT (Algeria) (*translated from French*): The Security Council is meeting today at the request of the

Government of Lebanon to consider the Israeli aggression against Lebanese territory. The flagrant violation of Lebanon's sovereignty by Israeli aircraft is part of the daily military escalation in which the Tel Aviv authorities are engaging. By their own admission, it is no longer a matter of reacting to any kind of activity by the Palestinian resistance, but of really putting into practice a doctrine, one of reprisals.

4. This attitude of Israel can be explained, on one hand, by the Zionist State's conviction that it is possible to impose a solution by force on the countries of the Middle East and, on the other, by the manifest impotence of the international organizations, and of the Security Council in particular.

5. When we realize that the Tel Aviv authorities publicly announce their intention to effect a pure and simple annexation of territories belonging to countries which are sovereign Members of this Organization, and that at the same time Israel is receiving the most modern weapons to strengthen its aggressive potential and the funds necessary for accelerated settlement of the conquered territories from its great ally, the United States, such an attitude can hardly surprise us.

6. The so-called objective and impartial policy statements setting the occupier and the occupied on the same footing can no longer disguise an active external complicity aimed at consolidating and perpetuating the Zionist civil and military occupation.

7. The pretexts invoked by the Tel Aviv authorities in their aggression against the Arab countries of the region do not withstand objective analysis. They have already been put forward in the past, and the Council duly rejected them.

8. The aggression perpetrated against Lebanon last 11 August was expected. The Zionist designs on that region of Hasbani had been proclaimed, one of the main objectives being the occupation of that region in order to control all the tributaries of the Jordan River. Did not Mr. Ben-Gurion tell Mr. Eric Rouleau, a French journalist for *Le Monde* on 16 April 1969: "No, the State of Israel we dreamed of has not yet been born"?

9. The war machine which Israel has been since its origin has not yet carried out its plans. Other regions are still threatened, and the southern part of Lebanon is one of the most coveted. Faithful to a tried and true tactic, the Zionists are now preparing world public opinion for an

imminent occupation of Lebanese territory on the everlasting pretext of security needs.

10. Nevertheless, here as elsewhere Israel, before occupying this area, wants to eliminate all economic activity from this area by generalized destruction, so that when the time comes it will no longer be necessary to drive out the inhabitants who, deprived of their means of livelihood, will already have left the region.

11. Then, with the region deserted of inhabitants, the hour of colonization will have rung. Only recently, in Jordan, Israeli aircraft were destroying the Ghor Canal, thanks to which 10,000 hectares of land were being cultivated. This deliberate determination by Israel to deprive thousands of farmers of their sole means of livelihood, this destruction of purely economic objectives, has become the favourite weapon of the Zionists, whose avowed aim is to block any economic development of the countries of the region.

12. To keep those countries in a state of permanent under-development, and therefore of dependence, was and still is the basis of Israel's existence.

13. However, the war imposed by Israel on the sovereign countries of the region, and its occupation of part of their territory should not conceal from us the underlying cause of a conflict which derives from the original depredation inflicted on the Palestinian people with the active support of the Western world. All the subsequent aggressions, destructions and repressions are only the immediate or remote consequences of this denial of justice to the Palestinian people.

14. After the long night of colonialism, a people conscious of its destiny is being reborn from its ashes and is making its entrance on to the international scene, and any attempt to silence it can only fail. Today, the Palestinian people has taken its fate into its own hands. Its glorious struggle against the occupiers is an established fact which no one has a right to ignore. Several days ago a curfew was imposed by the Zionist authorities at Gaza; in Jerusalem, at Ramallah, Haifa and Tel Aviv, heroic men and women have resolved to fight for Palestine, their homeland. All they want is to be Palestinians without any discrimination, either racial or religious.

15. The Palestinians are not alone in their noble combat. All the free peoples of the entire world support their cause. The United Nations, which bears a special responsibility in the tragedy of the Palestinian people, cannot evade its duty.

16. Because of the refusal of certain Powers to take into account the realities of the Palestinian situation, the Middle East crisis has lasted for twenty years, and it threatens to place international peace and security in grave danger.

17. When, then, will this Organization decide to assume its responsibilities? For years the Security Council has been adopting resolutions condemning the doings of the Tel Aviv authorities; for years it has asked them to abide by the resolutions already adopted. What has been the practical result of all those resolutions? Perhaps the present meeting

of the Security Council itself answers this question. Thus, on 31 December 1968, after considering the Israeli aggression against Lebanon, the Security Council adopted resolution 262 (1968). Operative paragraph 3 of that resolution stated that the Council:

"Issues a solemn warning to Israel that if such acts were to be repeated, the Council would have to consider further steps to give effect to its decisions".

18. The situation is clear. The time has now come either to consider the "further steps" mentioned in the resolution, or to proclaim clearly that, because of the opposition of certain Western Powers, the Council is more than ever unable to achieve the objectives laid down for it at the time of its establishment, and that it will now be the responsibility of the Palestinian people alone, and the other Arab peoples, to liberate their own territories.

19. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): For the second time within a comparatively short period, the Security Council is considering the question of Israel's aggressive acts against Lebanon. As is known, in December of last year the Security Council already condemned Israel for its aggressive attack on the undefended civil airport of Beirut, terming that act by the armed forces of Israel as a threat to peace in the Middle East. In the resolution [262 (1968)] unanimously adopted at that time [1462nd meeting], the Security Council clearly and definitely stated that it:

"Condemns Israel for its premeditated military action in violation of its obligations under the Charter and the cease-fire resolutions".

20. The Security Council also warned Israel:

"... that if such acts were to be repeated, the Council would have to consider further steps to give effect to its decisions".

21. Now Israel has committed a new premeditated and unprovoked act of aggression against Lebanon, in the form of an attack by the Israeli air force on civilian villages in the southern part of Lebanon. During this air raid against the civilian population, napalm bombs were used. There were dead and wounded, including women.

22. In his statement [1498th meeting] Mr. Ghorra gave the facts concerning this attack by Israel against Lebanon. These facts speak for themselves and we shall not repeat them.

23. We cannot fail to note that this new act of aggression by Israel against Lebanon is not an isolated event. It reflects Israel's general aggressive policy against the neighbouring Arab States, a policy of obstinate rejection of a political settlement in the Middle East on the basis of the Security Council resolution [242 (1967)] of 22 November 1967, a policy of undermining international efforts to restore peace in that area.

24. The new air raid by the Israeli air force on Lebanon is one link in the chain of this policy of the Israeli extremists.

This act confirms once more that the entire responsibility for the tense situation in the Middle East rests with Israel, and with Israel alone.

25. What were the objectives of this new military action by Israel against Lebanon? In sending its military jet planes to bomb defenceless Arab villages, the Israeli adventurers were trying to intimidate a small Arab country which firmly maintains its position in favour of peace and a political settlement, respects its international commitments and strictly abides by the terms of the Armistice Agreement. They obviously wished to sow confusion among the Arabs, to weaken their will to fight for a political settlement.

26. But that is not all. This action by the Israeli extremists was also deliberately aimed at a general complication of the situation in the Middle East. In pursuing a policy aimed at further inflaming the conflict in the Middle East and thwarting a political settlement, the Israeli aggressors obviously entertain the illusion of impunity. The moral and political condemnation which has been repeatedly passed on Israel by the Security Council and world public opinion makes no impression on them.

27. Is this by accident? Far from it: the facts of the political realities in the Middle East and in the surrounding areas show otherwise. Israel commits a routine act of aggression against one or another Arab State—and it receives a certain quantity of weapons, including bombers, from its wealthy friends abroad. It commits a further act of aggression—and calls on its friends abroad for a further quantity of weapons, clearly counting on a favourable reply. But does not such a situation constitute a direct encouragement to Israel's aggressive designs?

28. A letter from the representative of another Arab country, Jordan, dated 12 August 1969 [S/9388] also reports the bombing by Israeli military aircraft of vital irrigation installations in Jordan for the purpose of undermining the agricultural economy of that Arab country.

29. However, the Israeli Government should remember that in our time aggression cannot go unpunished, no matter on whose support—direct or indirect—the aggressor relies. The Soviet Government has already repeatedly warned the Israeli Government of that. Israel's continuing aggression against the Arab countries constitutes a constantly increasing threat to all the peoples of the Middle East, including the people of Israel itself. The growing Arab resistance movement on the lands seized by Israel, the firm verdict of world public opinion against Israel's expansionist course, the broad support of the States of the world for the just cause of the Arab countries which demand the elimination of the consequences of the Israeli aggression—do not all these facts indicate that it is time the Government of Israel seriously reflected on where its policy is leading its country and its people? The aggressor will have to pay for his misdeeds. The experience of history makes that abundantly clear.

30. The Security Council has once again met with a false device of the aggressor, who is trying to mislead public opinion and shift the responsibility to the victim of

aggression by maintaining that the air raid on Lebanon was nothing but an "act of self-defence".

31. But, first of all, the Security Council has already repeatedly, and in the strongest terms, condemned Israel's policy of committing so-called acts of retaliation and has warned it that, if they were repeated, the Council would take more effective measures against the aggressor.

32. The Israeli representative has complained here that it seems Arab partisans are carrying out operations against Israel from Lebanese territory. But it should be recalled that it was precisely Israel, and not Lebanon, which violated the Armistice Agreement with Lebanon, and broke off the work of the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission set up by that Agreement. It was Israel which, instead of making use of the machinery created by the Armistice Agreement, chose to resort to gross acts of aggression against Lebanon, in violation of the United Nations' Charter and the decisions of the Security Council on the cease-fire. Israel has never made use of that machinery nor permitted it to conduct investigations on the territories it occupies.

33. Secondly, the Israeli representative's arguments concerning the actions of Arab partisans from Lebanese territory not only cannot justify Israel's actions against Lebanon, but still further unmask the failure of the adventurist policy of the ruling circles of Tel Aviv which launched the aggressive war against the Arab countries and are now reaping the fruits of the legitimate anger and hatred of the whole Arab world. Indeed, it is not a question of some sort of allegedly subversive acts against Israel, as the Israeli representative is trying to represent them here; it is a question of the legitimate struggle of the peoples of the Arab countries against Israeli aggression and the occupation of age-old Arab lands. That struggle is taking place under the principle of justice, and because of the people's conviction of their righteous cause. Only the day before yesterday, the Security Council in its resolution [269 (1969)] on Namibia again reaffirmed the right of peoples to wage a struggle against foreign invaders and occupiers.

34. Let the Israeli occupiers not calculate that, by military repressions and terror, they will succeed in breaking the will of the Arab peoples to resist. It is perfectly obvious that, as long as Israel continues its occupation of Arab lands, the liberation struggle of the Arab population will also continue, and not only continue but be intensified. The aggressor will get neither peace nor rest as long as he treads on foreign soil.

35. The struggle of the Arab population is a just struggle, directed against the expansionist pretensions of the ruling circles of Israel, particularly the pretensions just recently reaffirmed at the congress of the Israeli ruling party, which adopted a programme for territorial seizures based on the results of the 1967 aggression. The Israeli leaders talk a lot about peace. However, their desire to reach a peaceful settlement by annexations has nothing whatever in common with genuine peace in the Middle East. To pursue a policy of annexation is not only to violate the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, but to undermine peace in the Near East, and to sow the seeds of a new war in the future.

36. The Arab stand against the policy of assimilation of the occupied territories being carried out by Israel, against the attempts of the Israeli armed forces to build long-term fortifications on the usurped territories and to dig themselves in there, is fully justified. The aggressor can hardly fail to know that as long as his troops are on the territory of Arab countries, the flames of the Arab people's national war of liberation will continue to spread, and no force on earth can put them out.

37. If Israel, as its representative states, wants not war, but peace in the Middle East, the way is open. That way lies in the implementation of all the provisions of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. Withdrawal of Israeli troops from the territories occupied during the 1967 conflict is the fundamental condition, the key to a settlement. But it is precisely this course, the only realistic one, that Israel does not want to take, and the attack on Lebanon is still another proof of this.

38. The Israeli leaders often say that they want a settlement which would ensure Israel's existence under conditions of peace. However, their words do not match their deeds, since they themselves block and reject just such a solution, preferring to have Israel exist under conditions of war. But that is a slippery and risky path fraught with danger for the fate of Israel's own people.

39. The position of the Soviet Union with regard to the situation in the Middle East has been and remains firm and consistent. It is steadfastly directed towards support of the struggle of the Arab peoples for the elimination of the consequences of the Israeli aggression, and towards the achievement of a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

40. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Gromyko, stated on 10 July of this year in his speech before the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"The Soviet Union is in favour of the use of all possible means for a settlement of the situation in the Middle East. Delay is dangerous and detrimental to everyone . . . All countries, both large and small, can only be interested in the settlement of the situation in the Middle East. The solution of this problem would also have a positive influence on the international situation and tip the scales in favour of peace."

41. The Soviet Union fully supports Lebanon and its appeal to the Security Council in connexion with Israel's attack on peaceful populated areas in Lebanon. The Soviet delegation considers that the Security Council must strongly condemn Israel for its new act of aggression against Lebanon, committed in violation of Israel's obligations under the United Nations Charter, the Armistice Agreement with Lebanon, and United Nations decisions on the cease-fire. The Soviet Union is prepared, in conformity with the United Nations Charter, to support any effective measures of the Security Council aimed at curbing the aggressor.

42. Mr. CHAYET (France) (*translated from French*): Here we are once again, meeting to consider the complaint

submitted by the Lebanese Government following the bombing by Israeli aircraft of a number of villages in Southern Lebanon on Monday, 11 August. According to the information provided so far by the Beirut authorities, this attack caused four deaths, and left three seriously wounded. Napalm bombs were used during this operation.

43. The Israeli authorities try to justify this action by the presence of *fedayeen* in this part of Lebanon, which is located close to the common border.

44. On behalf of my Government, I wish to stress from the outset of this debate how clearly this affair illustrates the dangers inherent in the absence of a political settlement of the conflict: as there is no progress in that direction, we are witnessing an escalation of violence which today threatens the peace and security of a country which has always played a moderating role in the conflict.

45. There hardly seems to be any need for me to recall that acts of reprisal have always been condemned by our Organization. Such acts are contrary to all the resolutions adopted by the United Nations.

46. My Government is all the more concerned by the consequences which may arise from Israel's action on Monday, inasmuch as it has always taken a special interest in Lebanon, to which it is bound by very old and close ties of friendship. It understands that the situation which has developed on the Lebanon-Israel border is basically the result of the deterioration of the situation in the region as a whole. It realizes the efforts which the Lebanese Government has made to assert its full sovereignty and to avoid, by all means within its power, the creation on its part of a new source of disturbance. My Government therefore fears that the Israeli reprisal action will only aggravate the situation and hamper the contribution the Lebanese Government can make to the search for peace which, we are convinced, is one of its foremost concerns.

47. In this patient search for a true and lasting peace in that region we, as members of the Security Council, must exert all our energies. We ourselves spare no effort along those lines, and we are prepared to give our support to all measures which may be necessary to facilitate success. It is in this spirit, keeping in mind that the basic objective is the search for peace, that we cannot fail to deplore all acts of violence, whatever their nature and source.

48. The French delegation is ready to consider any measures in that direction, and will determine its attitude to the texts which will be submitted in the light of the considerations I have just set forth.

49. Mr. YUNUS (Pakistan): As the Security Council is considering Lebanon's complaint contained in documents S/9383 and S/9385 of 11 and 12 August 1969, it is natural that our minds should be filled with thoughts about the fearful situation in the entire Middle East. This situation has been cruelly dramatized during the last few days by the damage done to the East Ghor Canal in Jordan by the Israeli air force. That the backbone of the agricultural economy of a small country should be so allowed to be destroyed, that thousands of farmers should be robbed of

their sustenance, that, in another instance, the drinking water supply of the population of a large area of the United Arab Republic should be disrupted—these occurrences demonstrate the horror and the human poignancy of the conflict in the Middle East. They prove, if proof were still needed, that Israel admits of no principle of restraint on its conduct. All it does serves to deepen the sense of outrage, to perpetuate the indignation of the peoples of the Arab countries.

50. But while concern with the whole Arab-Israeli situation is natural, it would be a dereliction of the Security Council's duty, as much as disregard of the sovereign right of Lebanon, if we allowed that wider concern to make us lose sight of the precise issue placed before us today. In the present debate, the Council is confronted not with the situation between Israel and Jordan or Israel and Syria or Israel and the United Arab Republic: it is confronted with the situation resulting from an armed attack by Israel on Lebanese territory, an attack in which napalm was admittedly used and which resulted in civilian casualties. The facts that are most pertinent to a consideration of this event by the Security Council are: first, Lebanon is a country which was not involved in the hostilities of 1967; second, an Armistice Agreement which was concluded on 23 March 1949 exists between Lebanon and Israel; third, it is well known that the Government of Lebanon, a defenceless country, has made every endeavour to insulate its territory from the fighting which is an inevitable consequence of the continuance of Israeli occupation of Arab territories.

51. With those three facts in mind, and in view of the additional fact that the attack alleged by Lebanon is admitted by Israel, my delegation considers it incumbent on the Security Council to do whatever is possible to ensure that Israel desist from any attack on the territory of Lebanon. Let us not forget that the Council, when adopting resolution 262 (1968), issued a solemn warning to Israel that if its premeditated acts against Lebanon were to be repeated the Council would have to consider further steps to give effect to its decisions. The Council is now confronted with a repetition of such acts and is, therefore, morally bound to consider suitable further steps.

52. Of course, we have all heard the usual plea advanced by Israel that Lebanon—and I quote from the letter of the representative of Israel to the Security Council: "... harbours on its territory ... considerable concentrations of irregular forces ... engaged in ... terror warfare against Israel". [S/9387.] Two considerations arise here. The first is that if the allegation were true it would, on Israel's own valuation, constitute a breach of one of the provisions of the Armistice Agreement between Israel and Lebanon. If so, the responsibility would devolve on Israel not to take the law into its own hands but to report such a violation to the Security Council. Certainly the United Nations Charter does not allow Israel, any more than it allows any other Member State, to arrogate to itself the right of making a charge against another Government, pronouncing on the validity of that charge and then determining the sentence for it. A State's self-appointment at once as prosecutor, judge and executor of punishment is anathema to the Charter. Does the right of reprisal exist under the Charter

of the United Nations? Experts on international law have proclaimed, and I am sure members of this Council agree, that the provisions of the Charter pertaining to the avoidance of the use of force are, without the shadow of a doubt, to be regarded as prohibiting reprisals or retaliation of the kind that the Council is now considering. There is no question of Israel having any right whatsoever under the Charter to cross the international border and wantonly launch an attack against Lebanon.

53. I need hardly recapitulate the occasions on which this Council has condemned Israel for taking the law into its own hands. It is simply inconceivable that Israel could have drawn any right from the decisions of this Council to go into the territories of Lebanon and rain death and destruction upon the civilian population. On the contrary, this Council has explicitly, unequivocally and quite definitely condemned reprisals as incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

54. The second consideration is that there is no proof whatsoever of any truth in the Israeli charge. To say that Lebanon "harbours concentrations of irregular forces on its territory" is to allege active assistance on the part of the Government of Lebanon to those forces and a furtherance of their designs. Where do we have the slightest shred of proof of such assistance? The fact of the matter is no more than that Lebanon has given refuge to some Palestinians who have been forcibly evicted from their homes. Was it wrong to do so? These Palestinians have the inherent right to struggle to regain their homeland. Where can they wage that just struggle? Can they do so in the occupied areas from where they have been expelled, where large numbers of innocent people are rounded up every week, where their houses are demolished, where prisoners are tortured and where unspeakable brutalities are committed? If they wage their struggle from wherever they are, nothing in the law of the Charter, nothing in the principles of justice and humanity, requires that the Governments of the Arab States must suppress them and thus help Israel to consolidate its illegal possessions. The thesis advanced by Israel is not only that the Government of Lebanon must embark upon such suppression but also that its failure to do so exposes it to dire punishment from Israel. Can we countenance such an argument?

55. That is the moral and legal consideration which must weigh with the Security Council. Independently of it, however, there is a political consideration of almost equal importance. When Israel attacked the Beirut International Airport in December last, the representative of the United States said at the meeting of the Council on 29 December 1968: "This destructive operation has enlarged the ring of reprisal and widened the circle of terror to touch areas and peoples hitherto struggling to keep aloof from these measures" [1460th meeting, para. 75].

56. That is equally true of the attack which has brought about this meeting of the Council. That being so, the prerequisite for any effort towards the restoration of peace in the Middle East is that the enlargement by Israel of the area of belligerence must be checked effectively and promptly. The Pakistan delegation believes it is that prerequisite to which the Council resolution must address itself.

57. How do we proceed now? Having determined that Israel had no right to launch the attack in question and having condemned Israel for it, the Council should hold Israel responsible for the damage to civilian life and property, and proceed to take some action to protect Lebanon against a recurrence of such attacks. That is the least that the Council could do at this stage in relation to the Lebanese complaint.

58. We know it is said at times: what difference does it make if Israel is condemned again and again, for it pays no heed to the solemn pronouncements of this Council? Nevertheless, we remain convinced that for the discharge of its own duty and for the protection of the rights of weaker nations, this Council is required to leave no doubt about its judgement. The will of the international community must be clearly expressed. Whether Israel does or does not heed it at present must be regarded as a matter for Israel itself to ponder.

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

60. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): It may be superfluous to restate a basic principle of international law: that Governments are responsible for all acts of aggression committed from their territories against neighbouring States. That is a tenet embodied in all definitions of aggression; that is a precept specifically applied by the Security Council since 1948 to the Israel-Arab conflict. Despite that, however, the protagonists and supporters of Arab aggression have tried to shirk their responsibility by various spurious claims. The most baseless and odious has been the comparison between the *fedayeen*, Al-Fatah and similar terror organizations which have been pursuing terror warfare against Israel's civilian population since Israel's independence long before the 1967 hostilities, and resistance fighters against occupation. I do not know whether the representative of the USSR holds sacred anything at all. However, as one whose family has been among nazi victims, and as representative of a State which is the refuge of hundreds of thousands of human beings saved from nazi crematoria, I should like to protest and reject with contempt the Soviet representative's renewed insult to the memory of 6 million of our brethren victims of nazi barbarity, and of the valiant men who fought nazi domination, by making a comparison between those who wage terror warfare against us and resistance fighters, and declaring as legitimate the murder of Jewish men, women and children.

61. The associations of anti-nazi fighters have repeatedly repudiated with anger the loathsome comparison between the resistance movement and the Arab assassins of Jewish civilians. In proclamations and resolutions adopted in their international conferences, the anti-nazi fighters have pointed an accusing finger at these Arab assassins and declared them to be the heirs to Hitler's nefarious crimes. Similar declarations have been made by personalities of world renown, among them last year's Nobel Peace Prize winner, René Cassin, and the former Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, General Burns.

62. In previous debates I have brought before the Council a number of such documents; today I should like to draw

attention to the following proclamation of last March by the Vice-President of the Association of Resistance Fighters of Belgium, a country which was one of the first victims of nazi aggression:

"I denounce the Security Council before world opinion for its complicity in the murder of working people in Qiryat Shemona. By its unjust and partial condemnation, motivated by certain prejudices, the Security Council has encouraged and even incited the terrorist bands of Shoukeiri and of Amin el Hussein, the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem and a Nazi war criminal, in their murderous action against peaceful workers. The widows and orphans of the victims will take these gentlemen of the Security Council to task for the mourning and suffering they have caused.

"Are they to pay the price of the scraps of Beirut? According to Mr. Gromyko, the Security Council should pay no more attention to acts of terrorism perpetrated during twenty years by these disciples of former nazis, war criminals against the survivors of the death camps.

"What is it all about?

"I am talking about the odious attack on the Jerusalem market—twelve dead, among them women, old men, Jewish and Arab children—about plastic bombs planted at the Tel Aviv bus station which caused many casualties; about button-mines, made in China, strewn in schools with the intention of killing children; about the sky-jacking of an El Al airliner to Algiers with the subsequent detention of its Israeli passengers and crew, and, finally, about the bloody attack on a second Israeli airplane at the Athens airport which, by a miracle, caused only one dead and one wounded. Had this operation succeeded, it could have resulted in the loss of hundreds of human lives and could have destroyed the entire airport installation. However, when Israel administers a lesson limited in scope and resulting in material damage only, to an Arab country which supports terrorist hands, it faces condemnation by the highest international authority which, by definition, should be objective.

"In truth, Mr. Gromyko succeeded in executing a masterful sleight of hand, but I am sorry for the countries which went along with him, for the next time they may well be the victims of this procedure.

"The emissaries of certain communist countries, as well as a part of progressive opinion, attempt to reward the hired killers in the pay of Arab adventurers by endowing them with the aura of the Resistance against the Nazis.

"To this, we, the Resistance Fighters say: no. The Resistance Movement in occupied Europe has never been directed against the lives of women, of innocent men and of children."

63. In conclusion, I shall quote certain phrases from a resolution adopted by the Seventh Conference of the International Union of Resistance Fighters and Deported Persons, held in Brussels in April 1968:

"... No resistance fighter can accept so odious a perversion of the character and the aim of their struggle,

in which, moreover, participated thousands of men and women who have found a haven in Israel and desire nothing but to live in peace and tranquillity.

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

(Signed) M. A. Deneweth
National Vice-President"

64. The records of the Security Council are replete with wanton Soviet abuse of Israel, delivered in the spirit of the anti-Semitic writings of Trofim Kichko, once condemned and now exalted again in the Soviet Union.

65. I shall not engage the Council in an extensive rebuttal of the Soviet representative's malevolent statement. By now the entire world knows what value can be attached to Soviet views on aggression, the law of nations and human rights. I shall say only one thing. The Jewish people's millennial history has endowed it with a long memory, and the day will come when the Jewish people will submit to the Soviet Union an account for the role which the USSR continues to play in denying to the remnant of the Jewish people its rights and in contributing to aggression against the Jewish State. On the tears of our oppressed brethren in the Soviet Union, on the blood of the innocent Israelis murdered with Soviet weapons and Soviet encouragement, on the support lent by Moscow to those who strive to ravage Israel, on Soviet opposition to real peace between the Arab States and Israel, there will be no oblivion and no silence.

66. Mr. AZZOUT (Algeria) (*translated from French*): I think all the members of the Council are familiar with this type of exercise. But, for the record, I should merely like to say that we have realized a long time ago that the Zionists,

true to their racist doctrine, challenge the right of non-white, non-European peoples to resistance. I should only like to say that today the Palestinian people no longer await anybody's authorization, least of all that of semi-official Zionist organizations established in Europe or elsewhere.

67. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I asked for the floor in exercise of my right of reply in connexion with Mr. Tekoah's statement.

68. The Israeli representative has expressed his dissatisfaction with many of the statements made here but, as always, he has expressed dissatisfaction in particular with the statement of the Soviet delegation.

69. But his dissatisfaction only serves further to unmask Israel's aggressive intentions towards the Arab States. The Israeli representative has resorted to the usual tactic, familiar to all of us by now, used when the Israeli representative runs out of arguments or has no arguments: he takes the floor and comes out with slander and fabrications about the Soviet Union. But no justification, no slanderous twaddle of the Israeli delegate, no diversionary manoeuvres can help Israel to obscure the plain fact, which is clear to everybody, that the Israeli armed forces are making aggressive attacks on the Arab States which respect their international obligations and that it is Israel which continues to resort to the illegal practice of repression, thereby defying the United Nations Charter and the repeated resolutions of the Security Council; that it is Israel which is impeding a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East by refusing to withdraw its troops from the occupied Arab territories, and that Israel therefore bears the full weight of the responsibility for the continuing tense situation in the Middle East.

70. That Mr. President, is why the Security Council must reject the Israeli delegate's demagogic arguments and in all seriousness consider and adopt an appropriate decision.

71. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): As no other representative wishes to speak at present, if I hear no objections I shall adjourn the meeting and reconvene the Council for this afternoon at 4 p.m.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Получите справки об изданиях в нашем 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.
