

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FIFTH YEAR

**1539<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 13 MAY 1970

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1539) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 12 May 1970 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9794) .....	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 12 May 1970 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9795) .....	1

## NOTE

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

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

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

## FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINTH MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 13 May 1970, at 10.30 a.m.

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

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

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1539)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. The situation in the Middle East:

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

3. The situation in the Middle East:

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

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

#### The situation in the Middle East

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

#### The situation in the Middle East

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

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

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

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

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the item on its agenda.

3. The Secretary-General has sent word to me that he has had unexpectedly to undergo medical treatment this morning and will therefore be delayed in arriving at the Council's meeting. In view of the assurance he gave to the Council toward the close of yesterday afternoon's meeting he has given me the following message to transmit to the Council at the beginning of this meeting:

"Because of the lack of adequate means of observation on both sides in the Israel-Lebanese sector, as mentioned in my statement to the Council at its meeting yesterday morning, it has been possible for the Acting Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) to provide only limited information about military activities in the Israel-Lebanese sector. With specific reference to the implementation of the resolution adopted by the Council at its meeting yesterday morning [resolution 279 (1970)], I regret to say that I have as yet received no information from the Acting Chief of Staff. This, I realize, is due to the fact that he has had no verified information because of the absence of direct means of observation. I will, of course, convey to the Council immediately any information on the situation I may receive from the Acting Chief of Staff of UNTSO in the course of the day."

4. I have just received from the Secretary-General a message which, through Mr. Tekoah, he has received from Mrs. Golda Meir. The document will be distributed,<sup>1</sup> but I think it would be informative for the Council if we had an immediate reading of it, and I would ask the Secretary of the Council to read it out.

5. I call on the Secretary of the Council.

<sup>1</sup> Subsequently circulated as document S/9801.

6. Mr. CHACKO (Deputy to the Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs): The communication, dated 13 May 1970, from the Permanent Representative of Israel, transmitting a message from Prime Minister Mrs. Golda Meir, reads as follows:

"I have the honour to transmit to you the following message from the Prime Minister and Acting Foreign Minister Mrs. Golda Meir:

"Excellency,

"I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your cable of 12 May, addressed to Foreign Minister Eban and transmitting the text of the resolution adopted by the Security Council on the same day.

"I would recall that at the outset of the operation, our army spokesman stated that it was a combing action, and that our forces would leave the area immediately on its completion.

"The army spokesman added yesterday that the operation had been carried out according to plan and had been concluded, and that our forces were deploying to leave the area.

"The Israel representative, Ambassador Tekoah, informed the Council to this effect, before the resolution to which your cable refers was proposed. Mr. Tekoah later explained to the Council that the return of our forces was being delayed during the hours of darkness in order to avoid the risk of firing which might injure civilians. I wish now to inform you that all our forces that were involved in this action have returned to their bases.

"The circumstances which necessitated this defensive action were placed before the Council in the statement made by Ambassador Tekoah at the meeting yesterday morning, and in a series of prior letters to the President of the Security Council.

"My Government continues to hold the Government of Lebanon fully responsible for all acts of violence perpetrated from Lebanese territory against the population, territory and armed forces of Israel.

"Our policy remains one of seeking a just and lasting Israel-Arab peace, and until then, of maintaining scrupulous observance of the cease-fire on a reciprocal basis. If Israel is subjected to armed attack, it has the same inherent right of self defense as any other State.

“(Signed) Golda Meir”

"Please accept, etc.

“(Signed) Yosef TEKOAH

“Permanent Representative of Israel  
“to the United Nations”

7. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The first speaker on my list is the representative of the United Kingdom, on whom I now call.

8. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I have no intention of going over what we did yesterday. I was surprised that the Council was not prepared to call for a cessation of all military activity in the area. I can still see no justification for that failure. But I did not hesitate to agree with the demand for withdrawal of Israeli troops from an action which we could not possibly condone. Today we welcome the report which has just been read to us, and we look forward to the confirmation which we may expect to receive from the Secretary-General in due course.

9. After the furious debate of yesterday and in spite of the intense feelings which naturally persist, I wish, with your permission, to reflect this morning on the obligations of this Council and the main duty with which we in this Council are charged. I ask the indulgence of the Council to speak of our overriding obligation not to inflame and divide but always to search for common ground and, even in times of bitter controversy, to neglect no means of promoting agreement and assisting efforts to achieve peaceful and accepted settlement.

10. It might be said that after the violent events of the past twenty-four hours this is no time to talk peace. On the contrary, I submit that the perpetuation and intensification of conflict surely makes it all the more necessary and all the more urgent to find a way out of the bloody deadlock which causes so much suffering and so much misery and so much hopelessness. This is not the time to give up. It is the time to redouble our efforts to carry out what must be our primary aim: to bring justice and peace in the place of force and conflict.

11. Yesterday the Soviet representative made a very grave accusation. He did so in the heat of reply, and I have little doubt that he has thought better of it, but nevertheless it was an accusation that cannot be allowed to pass. He said that my Government had sought to impede the implementation of resolution 242 (1967). With due restraint, I must tell him what indeed he well knows: that what he said is the exact opposite of the truth. He and the others who have participated in our discussions since the June war of 1967 know very well that at every opportunity, at every meeting, my delegation has put forward positive, practical proposals. Whether it was in the discussions immediately after the war or in the consultations leading up to the unanimous adoption of resolution 242 (1967), or in the subsequent meetings of the Four, or those of the deputies, always, at every meeting, the United Kingdom has advocated urgency and has pointed the way to practical progress in carrying out the principles set out in the resolution.

12. May I remind the Soviet representative that that resolution was not put forward by the Soviet Union but by the United Kingdom. I should add that I have repeatedly paid tribute to the Soviet Union for supporting it.

13. No one can suggest that we have not wished to see our own resolution put into effect. For two and a half years we have sought at every opportunity to persuade the others to proceed with us on the common ground of agreement without further delay or dispute. The record shows what we have repeatedly advocated. Whenever I have spoken in this Council or in the Four I have said that delay was the principal enemy, and I have also consistently maintained that a measure of common ground of agreement in fact exists.

14. The damage done by delay is very plain to us today. Some now despair of progress towards agreement, but I wish most earnestly to put it to you today that there is a way to go forward, that we should choose that way and that we should insist that we must not be deflected from it.

15. Where is the common ground? Let me point to it with every effort to avoid disagreement, and let me say now that the remarkable, the undeniable fact is that there is so much on which we have agreed.

16. None of us, I am sure, would wish to detract from the joint statement of the four Foreign Ministers made last September,<sup>2</sup> when they reaffirmed that all States in the Middle East have an inalienable right to exist as independent and sovereign States. None of us would question the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war. None of us would question that without withdrawal there can be no peace. No one can doubt that in order to secure withdrawal there must be assurance of a just and lasting peace with the right of every State in the area to live in peace with secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force. No one can doubt that without a just settlement of the refugee problem with full respect for the rights of the refugees there can never be a final settlement. None of us doubt in fact that the provisions of resolution 242 (1967) must be carried out fully and completely in every respect.

17. In the Four we have examined and elaborated all these principles. On priorities and methods we still have some differences, but on the declared principles we are in full agreement.

18. So what should be done now?

19. I trust that we of the Four will be able to report to the Secretary-General before the end of this month. Thereafter I hope that the Secretary-General will agree that Ambassador Jarring should resume his consultations with both sides, and I trust that he will soon be able to report to the Secretary-General on his up-to-date discussions with the parties. Then and only then can we hope to make new progress towards the settlement we wish to see. Then the way will be open to make final initiatives—to use the words of the resolution “to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement”.

<sup>2</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fourth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1969, document S/9485.*

20. This is the programme of progress which I advocate. No one who has been associated with the problems of the Middle East could be easily optimistic, still less complacent. Passions run too high, suspicions are too deep, injustices have been too long endured, hopes of peace have been too long deferred.

21. But we must see a way forward. We must believe in the possibility of peace. We must never forget that our duty in this Council is to resist every temptation to embitter disputes, and never to give up the search for agreement.

22. Violence, bloodshed, death and destruction are not reasons for abandoning our duty in this Council: they are a terrible reproach to us for our delays; they are overwhelming arguments for pressing on with our endeavours with renewed determination and with a compelling sense of urgency. I trust that in that duty we shall not fail.

23. Mr. NICOL (Sierra Leone): My delegation is most gratified to hear the good news of the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from Lebanon. Lebanon is a country which has striven with dignity and wisdom to solve the problems of religion, race and social class. Its position in the Middle East has always been a difficult one. We ourselves have in our country, Sierra Leone, many distinguished residents and citizens of Lebanese origin who have contributed to our country's development. We have thus been deeply concerned that, because of circumstances which do not originate from the Lebanese Government, their country has twice been savagely attacked within a year—at Beirut airport and now in the south-west area of Mount Hermon. We do hope that reparations will be made to civilians on both sides who have suffered as a result of that battle.

24. My delegation would urge that, as soon as we receive from the Secretary-General words of his satisfaction that the resolution that we unanimously adopted yesterday [*resolution 279 (1970)*] has been implemented, the Security Council should continue its work towards peaceful conciliation.

25. The Big Four of this Council have a great responsibility at their meetings to work more speedily towards a solution of this problem. I would urge that at this stage we should not continue an exercise which will exacerbate the feelings of all concerned. The plight of the Palestinian refugees is great. Development and progress are a matter of urgency for both Arabs and Jews. Every fighter plane purchased, whether it be a Mirage or a Phantom—the very names of those weapons of war show their transitoriness and impermanence—represents both retrogression and regression and money which could have been spent on schools and hospitals for the development of that area.

26. Surely it is in the interest of mankind that we should all seek passionately and persistently a way towards peace in a region which has produced the Koran, the Torah and the Bible—documents weighty enough to have brought comfort and reassurance to millions over hundreds of years.

27. I do hope that at the conclusion of this debate and with the implementation of the resolution we shall allow the processes of conciliation and reconciliation to continue.

28. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): At the urgent request of the Government of Lebanon, the Security Council is again discussing a fresh act of aggression against that Arab country. Troops of the Israeli aggressors have invaded the territory of Lebanon. Large contingents of Israeli infantry units, tanks, artillery and aircraft were used to carry out this large-scale aggressive operation. The aggressor is barbarously destroying peaceful Lebanese centres of population. The unleashed military machine of Israel, in committing this further act of international banditry against a neighbouring Arab State, has used brutal scorched earth tactics, that is, the tactics used by the Hitlerites in those dark days of the Second World War which cannot be effaced from the memory of mankind, when stealthily, by night, they attacked other countries. With United States aircraft, the aerial pirates of Israel subjected Lebanese centres of population to brutal bombardment, committing the criminal murder of peaceful inhabitants like that recently committed by them in the United Arab Republic when they killed peaceful inhabitants, including workers and children.

29. The invasion of Lebanese territory by Israeli troops is evidence that Israel is flouting all the rules of international law, is flagrantly violating the Charter of the United Nations and its decisions, is making international banditry the basic doctrine of its foreign policy and its relations with the neighbouring Arab countries, is continuing to follow a course of expanding aggression in the Middle East, is undermining a peaceful political settlement in that region and is trying to achieve its imperialist, annexationist purposes by means of open, insolent military brigandage.

30. As world public opinion well knows, the Security Council has already twice—in December 1968 and subsequently in August 1969—decisively condemned Israel for aggressive attacks on Lebanon and described those acts of Israeli aggression as a threat to peace in the Middle East and a violation by Israel of its obligations under the United Nations Charter.

31. In December 1968 the Security Council stated that it "Condemns Israel for its premeditated military action in violation of its obligations under the Charter and the cease-fire resolutions" [*resolution 262 (1968)*]. In August 1969 the Security Council declared in its resolution that it "Condemns the premeditated air attack by Israel on villages in southern Lebanon in violation of its obligations under the Charter and Security Council resolutions" [*resolution 270 (1969)*].

32. Thus the Security Council, the principal organ of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security, has already twice condemned Israel in the most categorical fashion for the international crimes it has committed and its policy of armed brigandage and international gangsterism.

33. On both those occasions the Security Council warned Israel that if such acts were repeated, the Council would have to consider further steps for the implementation of its decisions. Israel has now, impudently defying the clearly expressed will of the United Nations and world public opinion, committed a further premeditated act of aggression against Lebanon, the most serious attack against that peace-loving country since the aggression committed by Israel in June 1967 against three Arab countries—the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan.

34. The distinguished representative of Lebanon, Ambassador Ghorra, in his statement at yesterday's meetings of the Council, advanced cogent facts and arguments concerning this new monstrous crime on the part of Israel. These facts speak for themselves, and we shall not repeat them. Confirmation of the fact of Israel's aggression against Lebanon is also to be found in the statement made by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant. Even the representative of Israel did not deny the fact of the armed aggression and invasion of Lebanese territory by Israeli troops, although he tried to justify this new aggression by all kinds of fabricated, false pretexts.

35. It is quite clear that the fresh act of aggression by Israel is merely one of the links in the chain of the policy of international banditry, lawlessness and seizure of territory which the Government of Israel has been pursuing for many years now against its Arab neighbours.

36. Encouraged by the support of its main protectors and allies—the United States and American Zionism—for almost three years the ruling circles in Israel have stubbornly, cynically and arrogantly been continually sabotaging a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East and refusing to implement the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, the main provision of which is the inadmissibility of acquiring foreign territory through the use of force.

37. Instead of complying with that Security Council resolution, withdrawing its troops from all the Arab territories and helping to establish a durable peace in the Middle East, Israel has been carrying out one military provocation after another against the Arab States, calculating that, by escalating the use of force, it will succeed in achieving its unlawful aims.

38. That is precisely the intent of the new Israeli attack on Lebanon. The Israeli extremists are trying to intimidate that peaceful Arab country, which stands firmly for the peaceful political settlement of disputes, respects its international obligations and the United Nations Charter and enjoys incomparably higher authority and prestige in the United Nations than Israel with its policy of aggression.

39. The contention of Israel that it has some kind of "right" to invade Lebanese territory in order to combat Arab patriots is nothing but a false pretext which has absolutely no basis or justification in international law. You, the Israeli extremists, end your policy

of aggression, withdraw your troops from the occupied Arab territories, and then the problem of fighting the Arab patriots will disappear of its own accord. It will disappear just as did the problem of the struggle of the Soviet patriots, our glorious partisans, during the years of the Second World War, when they fought the Hitlerite invaders and occupiers so bravely and devotedly and unsparing of their own lives. It will disappear as did the problem of the struggle of the Maquis in France, which fought equally bravely and devotedly against the Hitlerite occupants of French territory. This is the reality, and no attempts by the Israeli extremists and their representatives here to justify this marauding intrusion into Lebanese territory can be condoned from any point of view. In this connexion it should be recalled that the Security Council has many times in the past emphatically condemned similar actions by Israel carried out under the pretext that they were "retaliation" or "reprisals". These condemnations of the aggressor's fabricated pretext of "reprisals" are recorded in a number of Security Council resolutions where the Israeli position is found to conflict with the United Nations Charter and international law. This "concept" not of international law but of international brigandage and lawlessness must now again be condemned most emphatically.

40. The Israeli extremists are clearly committing their crimes against the peace and security of peoples on the assumption that those crimes will go unpunished and that they will continue to enjoy political, diplomatic and military support from outside.

41. The Government of Israel and those who are so generously financing Israeli aggression, putting weapons into the hands of the Israeli militarists and supplying Phantom aircraft for death-dealing air raids on the territory of Arab States, obviously calculate that, through threats, blackmail and the escalation of aggression, they will be able to make the Arab States and their peoples capitulate and accept imperialist conditions for a "settlement".

42. As was shown yesterday in the Council by the statements and actions of the United States representative and by those of his British colleague and friend, the United States and the United Kingdom—as witness also today's statement by Lord Caradon—again failed to find strong words that would adequately and decisively condemn the piratical acts of their Israeli protégés and exert a sobering influence and effect on the Government of Israel. Lord Caradon made a long speech, but there were no words in it to condemn Israel's aggression against Lebanon. All the acrimony in his speech was directed at the Soviet representative; but the Soviet representative in his statement simply told the Council what corresponded to the facts, and no attempts by Lord Caradon to distort the facts will succeed.

43. The representatives of Arab States who spoke yesterday in the Council quite justifiably made serious accusations against the United States and attributed to it the blame and the responsibility for the aggressive policy of Tel Aviv. The whole world, the States Mem-

bers of the United Nations and world public opinion refuse to believe that the United States is powerless to exert any influence on the Israeli extremists. The Arab representatives with equal justification drew a parallel between the United States aggression in Cambodia and the Israeli aggression against Lebanon.

44. It cannot be overlooked, in this connexion, that the intensified aggression of Tel Aviv was synchronized with the United States' freezing of its position on a Middle East settlement, supported by the United Kingdom, with the blocking by the United States delegation of the possibility of attaining agreement on a peaceful settlement in the four-Power consultations on the Middle East, with the stubborn reluctance of the United States—with United Kingdom support—to agree to the withdrawal of all Israeli troops from all the occupied Arab territories behind the line existing before 5 June 1967, and with its stubborn insistence not to recognize that line as the frontier between Israel and the Arab States and thereby prevent Israel from annexing the Arab territories seized by it. Various formulas are being put forward for leaving the Arab territories in the hands of the aggressor. Specific areas have been named which should be left to Israel. And all this is supported by Mr. Yost and Lord Caradon. In his statement today, Lord Caradon tried to present the matter as if the Soviet representative had incorrectly stated the substance of the issue. If this is so, then I would urge Lord Caradon to state before all the members of the Security Council that the United Kingdom is in favour of the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli troops from all the occupied Arab territories behind the line prior to 5 June 1967. If he makes this declaration in the Security Council, then I will state that I was mistaken in my assessment of the United Kingdom position. I put this direct question to Lord Caradon, and I ask him to give a direct answer without the usual evasions and reservations of British diplomacy, which are also attributes of Lord Caradon himself.

45. From a financial standpoint the fresh act of aggression by Israel has been aided by a large new loan of \$100 million recently granted to Israel by the United States. The new act of aggression has also been reinforced by the continued supply to the aggressor of United States weapons of the most advanced types and by official promises to continue arming the aggressor in the future.

46. The representatives of the Arab countries, Lebanon, Syria, Morocco and Saudi Arabia, have quite rightly drawn the Council's attention to the fact that the Israeli aggression against Lebanon was committed at a time when, in another part of the world, in South-East Asia, the United States aggression against the peoples of Viet-Nam and Laos is proceeding on an ever-widening scale, and soon after there had been a military invasion of the territory of a neutral State, Cambodia. In both places we have the same policy of military adventure and the escalation of aggression for the purpose of stifling the national liberation struggle of the peoples, of eliminating progressive régimes, of suppressing the struggle of patriots for the

freedom and independence of their countries and peoples, and of imposing imperialist conditions of bondage on the peoples through the use of military force.

47. At the present historical juncture, in the second half of the twentieth century, there is but one correct and scientifically justified name for this: modern imperialism.

48. At the International Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow from 5 to 17 June 1969, a document was adopted which gave the following description of the tactics and actions of modern imperialism:

"Using military-political blocs and bases on foreign territories, economic pressure and commercial blockade, imperialism is maintaining a state of tension in a number of parts of the world. It is providing financial and political support to reactionary organizations and intensifying political pressure. Armed intervention, brutal repression—particularly where the struggle takes on the most acute forms and where the revolutionary forces are fighting with weapons in their hands—counter-revolutionary conspiracies, reactionary and fascist coups, provocations and blackmail, are all set in motion by imperialism."

49. This description of the policy and actions of modern imperialism is extremely apt as regards the instigators of international aggression both in the Middle East area and in the countries of Indo-China.

50. In both places the same logic is applied: the aggressor, having first invaded one country, declares that someone is disturbing and threatening him and that this, from the standpoint and to the way of thinking of the aggressor, is sufficient pretext for invading the territory of another country, and then that of a third, and so on, sowing death and destruction and creating a threat to world peace. In both places, frontiers and State sovereignty, the inviolability of territory and compliance with international obligations and the generally accepted rules and provisions of international law have ceased to have any meaning for the aggressor. The boots of the United States military are treading the earth of Cambodia. The boots of the Israeli military are treading the earth of Lebanon and other Arab countries. Towns and villages are going up in flames; peaceful inhabitants—children, women and the aged—are perishing in Cambodia, in Lebanon and in other countries of the Arab East. United States soldiers, having performed the bloody prelude at Songmy and other places in South Viet-Nam, are now marauding on Cambodian soil. The Israeli cutthroats, having become skilled hands at murder and violence against the Arab population in the occupied territories, are now doing the same in Lebanon. At the same time, United States air pirates have again begun their brutal bombings of the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, while their Israeli colleagues in international aggression are continuing their brutal bombings of the territories of Arab countries. Moreover, in both cases the same terminology is being used for purposes

of justification and camouflage: as we know, President Nixon stated, when he announced the invasion of Cambodia by United States troops, that these troops would be withdrawn after they had completed their mission in that country. Yesterday the members of the Security Council heard almost the same words from the Israeli representative: he repeated, like a lesson learned by heart, that Israeli troops would be withdrawn from Lebanon on completion of their mission. That is no coincidence. The pupils are blindly and bloodily copying their teachers.

51. This imperialist policy is an example of the most blatant high-handedness in international relations. It is a policy of international high-handedness and brigandage, the savage practice of the law of the jungle, and it must be condemned and stopped in the most decisive fashion by all peace-loving States and peoples.

52. The Security Council must not underestimate the danger of the extreme tension at present existing in the Middle East through the fault of Israel and those who protect it. It is merely a matter of ensuring the right of every State in the Middle East to security, peace would long ago have been restored in that area. But it is now perfectly clear to everyone that the aim of the present leaders of Israel, with their imperialist designs and expansionist ambitions, is not peace but tension in the Middle East, it is to have a free hand and any excuse for further piratical attacks on Arab States. It is difficult to avoid the impression that tension in this area is, alas, the aim of Israel's protectors, who are providing it with full military and material support in its aggression against the Arab States.

53. It is only because they are blinded by a racist kind of pathological chauvinism and are fraudulently speculating on biblical myths and legends that the Israeli leaders fail to see that, by their disregard of the United Nations and of world public opinion which condemns them—and yesterday's vote in the Security Council once again clearly demonstrated this to Israel—and by their blatantly aggressive policy against the neighbouring Arab countries, they—these new, raving warmongers—are threatening the security of the Israeli people itself, whose future can lie only in good-neighbourly relations and not in strife with the Arabs. This policy arouses disgust and indignation in all peace-loving peoples of the world; the actions of the Israeli aggressors offend the conscience of mankind.

54. The Soviet Union is firmly in favour of a lasting peace being established in the Middle East area so that the national strife, hostility and war inflamed by imperialism may be a thing of the past. The Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 provides a sound and universally acknowledged basis for this. We shall not slacken our efforts towards the implementation of that resolution in all its paragraphs and provisions. But, in circumstances where Israel is disregarding that resolution and is extending its aggression against the Arab States, the struggle for peace in the Middle East, like the struggle for peace in the world as a whole, should above all take the form of a decisive



rebuff to the aggressors in all the parts of the world where they have unleashed aggression.

55. There is only one road to a peaceful settlement in the Middle East: the withdrawal of the aggressor's troops from all the territories occupied by it. Israel must be made to comply with the decisions of so important an international organ as the United Nations Security Council. The sooner the United States and the United Kingdom understand the full senselessness, hopelessness and danger of their connivance with the Israeli aggressors, the sooner that will be achieved. No one should have any doubt that the Arab peoples will never capitulate or acquiesce in the perpetual occupation of their territory.

56. The Soviet Union fully supports Lebanon in its appeal to the Security Council in connexion with Israel's attack. The Soviet delegation cannot fail to express satisfaction at the fact that the Security Council—for the first time, it seems, in its twenty-five-year history—has reacted so swiftly, decisively and definitely to an aggression, and adopted at its very first meeting a resolution aimed at restraining the aggressor. Those who tried to impede the adoption of this just resolution once again assumed before the Security Council and the whole world the ignoble role of defender and protector of the Israeli aggressors, and consequently the role of opponent of a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East, the role of opponent of the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the occupied Arab territories, the role of opponent of their withdrawal behind the line prior to 5 June 1967, the role of opponent of the implementation of the major principle of resolution 242 (1967) concerning the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by the use of force. The Security Council must decisively condemn Israel for this new aggressive act against Lebanon, committed in violation of Israel's obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and the resolutions of this Organization. The Security Council must take further, more effective measures to halt the aggression.

57. The Soviet Union is prepared, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, to support effective measures by the Security Council designed to check the aggressor.

58. In conclusion, I should like to draw attention to the statement by Mrs. Golda Meir which was read out by the Deputy to the Under-Secretary-General. It is full of hypocrisy and is intended to mislead the Security Council and world public opinion. The Israeli logic is strange: you can attack a neighbouring State at night, but you cannot withdraw your troops at night from the foreign territory occupied. That is truly the logic of the aggressor. Moreover, a news dispatch just received says that Israel sent a further large detachment of tanks and armoured vehicles to the areas of military activity in Lebanon at 3.15 a.m.; that is to say, additional troops were sent at dead of night on 12/13 May, many hours after the adoption by the Council of the resolution on the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from Lebanon. Once again we have a violation by Israel

of a Security Council resolution. It is quite obvious that Mrs. Golda Meir's statement is designed to mislead both the Council and world public opinion.

59. To revert to Lord Caradon's statement today, I can say candidly to the Security Council: yes, Lord Caradon is indeed the author of resolution 242 (1967). Nobody denies that. He boasted of it today; I acknowledge that he has a right to be proud of it and even to boast of it. It is true that he put forward the draft resolution. But since then, for almost three years since the time of the Israeli aggression, he has been taking a stand that obstructs the practical implementation of that resolution. That is what makes his position so unusual. You, Lord Caradon, in fact refuse to support the unconditional principle of resolution 242 (1967) on the withdrawal of all the Israeli troops from all the Arab territories occupied in June 1967. You refuse to support the practical implementation of the principle of the non-acquisition of territory by war and the principle that the frontiers between Israel and the Arab States must exactly correspond to the line prior to 5 June 1967. You are actively supporting the United States approach and formula for the alteration of frontiers in favour of the aggressor and at the expense of the territory belonging to the victims of aggression. Where is the logic of this? We are grateful to you for presenting the resolution, but we cannot be grateful for your subsequent actions in hindering the putting into effect, the implementation, of the resolution. We say this forthrightly, honestly and openly before the Security Council and world public opinion.

60. Yesterday, even in the course of a procedural discussion, which in fact turned into a sharp political debate, you and Ambassador Yost in effect came to the defence of the aggressor, and tried by various procedural manoeuvres to prevent, or at least delay, the speedy adoption by the Security Council of the resolution which it did adopt. It was only because those attempts failed that you were forced to vote for that resolution together with the rest of the Council. Therefore, the sooner you abandon the policy and position of defending the aggressor and attempting to justify his aggressive misdeeds, the sooner we shall be able to resolve the problem of a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East.

61. Mr. JAKOBSON (Finland): Eight months have passed since the Security Council last considered the situation in the Middle East. The reason for the Council's inaction is not, as we all know, that tranquillity has reigned in the region. The reason is that the Security Council has virtually lost control over the situation in the Middle East. Violent incidents occur daily. They are being recorded and filed away.

62. Now the Security Council has been convened in response to an exceptionally large-scale incursion by Israeli armed forces into Lebanese territory. We have been told by the representative of Israel that the purpose of the attack was to destroy bases used by Palestinian guerrillas for their activities against Israel. But, as I have had occasion to state before, my delegation cannot accept any arguments designed to justify a pol-

icy of military retaliation. Accordingly we welcomed the prompt and unanimous action taken by the Council at yesterday's meeting in demanding the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli forces from Lebanese territory.

63. I am aware that condemnation of this or any other act of violence in itself solves nothing. Once again the Council is dealing with symptoms rather than the core of the problem. The latest Israeli raid illustrates the almost total breakdown of the structure of international arrangements erected in the aftermath of the war of June 1967 for the purpose of putting an end to the fighting and creating the necessary prerequisites for making peace in the Middle East.

64. At the base of that structure was the cease-fire. A cease-fire by its very nature is a temporary device, a first step in the process of making peace. The next stage in that process was outlined in the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, a resolution which envisaged a comprehensive political settlement between the parties to the conflict, and which also provided for the use of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to promote agreement between the parties.

65. However, the passage of time has so eroded the cease-fire that it has become virtually meaningless. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Jarring, has been reduced to inactivity. The impact of the Security Council resolution of November 1967 is itself in danger of fading. The talks between the four permanent members of the Security Council are continuing, but, judging by what the other members of the Council have been told, no substantive progress has been made. As Lord Caradon pointed out this morning, delay is the principal enemy of peace. The absence of any advance towards a peaceful settlement is bound to strengthen those on both sides who do not believe in the possibility of peace or perhaps do not even want peace. As a result our discussions here are becoming more and more divorced from the violent realities of the Middle Eastern conflict, which is acquiring new and frightening dimensions.

66. My delegation has from the very beginning strongly supported the efforts of the four Powers. We continue to support them, because we realize that no genuine settlement of the Middle Eastern conflict is possible unless it is backed by some measure of agreement between the permanent members of the Security Council, and also because we see in these talks an acknowledgement on their part of their special responsibility for preventing the conflict in the Middle East from endangering world peace. Yet the fact that the four-Power talks continue cannot absolve the Security Council as a whole from ultimate responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security in the Middle East.

67. The only effective way to put an end to the kind of attacks that we have been dealing with today and all acts of violence in the Middle East is to work for a comprehensive political settlement of the conflict between the Arab States and Israel. The blueprint

for such a settlement is contained in Security Council resolution 242 (1967). We believe that the four Powers engaged in negotiations and the parties themselves must now make a new and supreme effort to reverse the trend towards increasing violence and danger and at last set in motion a process that can lead to the establishment, in accordance with the resolution, of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

68. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I have no further speakers on my list for the general debate, but the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States have asked to be allowed to exercise the right of reply.

69. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I am sorry that Mr. Malik should have thought fit to repeat a charge which I believe he knows to be untrue—the charge that my Government has not sought to carry out and put into effect our own resolution. I was glad to hear, however, that he confirmed his support for the resolution in all its parts.

70. On the question of withdrawal and on the question of peace—and they must go together—Mr. Malik knows very well that we of course set out our proposals in the resolution. We stand four-square by the proposals set out in that resolution. Mr. Malik knows also that in the discussions among the Four on the question of withdrawal and on the question of peace my delegation has put forward detailed and comprehensive formulations on both subjects. I do not propose to enter here and now into a discussion of texts which are still under confidential discussion within the Four, but I am very happy to be able to assure the Council that, as Mr. Malik knows very well, the formulations that we have put forward on those essential subjects of withdrawal and peace were, first, positive, second, definite, third, fair and, fourth, fully in accordance with resolution 242 (1967). Therefore I am in a position to say that the accusations made by Mr. Malik were false, and I am glad to reject them.

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

72. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Unfortunately I did not obtain a straight answer to my question from Lord Caradon's statement. I put a direct question: are the United Kingdom and Lord Caradon in favour of the withdrawal of all Israeli troops from all of the occupied Arab territories, or not? That is the question, and I ask Lord Caradon to answer yes or no, and not to indulge in the turgidity and evasions which are usual in British diplomacy.

73. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I shall merely repeat what I have said to the Ambassador: that our proposals on withdrawal and peace were set out in the resolution. Our formulations on withdrawal and peace have been put forward within the Four, as he very well knows. I have given him a straight answer to his question, and he knows very well what proposals

we have put forward, both in the Council and within the Four. I have nothing more to say.

74. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I think it is now clear to everyone whose statements contain falsehoods and whose the truth.

75. Mr. YOST (United States of America): I shall address myself at an early meeting to the situation that has called us together and is on our agenda for today. At the moment I wish merely to make two comments on the irrelevancies in the characteristic statement by Mr. Malik that we have just heard.

76. The Soviet representative has raised the question of South-East Asia. Some of my colleagues will no doubt remember that the United States in 1965 and 1966 made repeated efforts to obtain action by the United Nations on the subject of Viet-Nam. Among others, we brought the question to this Council. All those efforts were thwarted by the Soviet Union. In the intervening years the ally of the Soviet Union, North Viet-Nam, has steadily and substantially expanded its military occupation of two neighbouring States, two neutral and independent States, Laos and Cambodia, both guaranteed by the international agreements of 1954 and 1962, and North Viet-Nam has expanded the war from Viet-Nam into their territories against the will and against the neutrality of their Governments. That is imperialism pure and simple, and it is connived at and supported by the Soviet Union. This is, of course, the reason, and the only reason, for the limited military operation that the United States is conducting against the North Viet-Nameese forces in Cambodia. Yet the Soviet Union rejects steadily and consistently all proposals for the reactivation of the International Control Commission in Cambodia, for the convening of a conference on the problems of Indo-China, for any United Nations action in the area and, indeed, for any negotiations for a political settlement. Permit me to ask whether this is the action of a Government genuinely interested in a restoration and maintenance of peace.

77. My second point is to invite the attention of the Council to an interesting aspect of Ambassador Malik's negotiating technique which I have had the opportunity to observe at some length during recent months. When he wishes to negotiate seriously, when he has authority from his Government to engage in the normal give-and-take of diplomatic negotiation and political settlement, he speaks in a quiet, business-like manner. When, however, his Government has decided not to make any accommodation whatsoever, to dig its heels in and insist that the Soviet position be adopted a hundred per cent and hence to bring effective negotiations to a halt, then he endeavours to conceal this fact by throwing up a smoke-screen and indulging in a torrent of bombast and invective such as we have just heard. This is, I may say, a very bad sign for peace in the Middle East..

78. I can only hope that after they have squeezed all the propaganda advantage they can out of this

posture, he and his Government will again join their colleagues in a sincere and genuine effort in which we are, I hope, all engaged to bring about the full and rapid implementation of resolution 242 (1967).

79. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I give the floor to the representative of the Soviet Union who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

80. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The accusation of the United States representative that my position is inconsistent is without any foundation. From the very first days of the United States aggression in Viet-Nam, the Soviet Union has firmly and unwaveringly demanded the cessation of that aggression and the withdrawal of the United States troops from Viet-Nam and from the whole of Indo-China. Only after that will it be possible to conduct any negotiations anywhere. To discuss the issue in the United Nations would be to cover up the aggression and give the aggressor the opportunity of continuing what he is doing, and I think the United States representative knows this. If he does not, I am informing him of it, and I should like him to understand this position. If he understands it, he will not allow the responsibility to be shifted on to someone else's shoulders. The fresh act of aggression by the United States is censured not only by the world as a whole, but by your own people, particularly the young. We have all become aware of that during the last two or three weeks. So this cannot be justified; it is not justifiable from any point of view.

81. With regard to the Middle East issue, you know perfectly well, Mr. Yost, that what I said here I have been telling you for more than a year now in our four-Power meetings.

82. As the Soviet representative, I emphatically insist on the following: that resolution 242 (1967) be implemented in all its paragraphs and provisions, that the aggressor should not be rewarded for his aggression—that not an inch of the soil of the victim of aggression pass to the aggressor—and that the troops of the aggressor, down to the very last soldier and officer, be withdrawn from all territories occupied by the aggressor. This is in accordance with the spirit of the resolution.

83. I wish to stress that the Arab States have made enormous concessions and have agreed to regard the line of 5 June 1967 as the frontier of Israel. They are making a major concession to Israel. Israel seized a vast area of Arab territory as a result of the aggression of 1948-1949. For twenty years it has refused to settle that problem and return the territory. Now the Arab States are making a huge concession. They are not insisting on the return of that territory; they are simply demanding the establishment of the frontier on the line of 5 June 1967.

84. You, Mr. Yost, are always putting forward the idea of an adjustment. What does an adjustment mean? It means rewarding the aggressor at the expense of the victim of aggression, transferring to Israel some

part of the Arab territory seized by the aggressor. On what grounds? Do you think this is in accordance with resolution 242 (1967)? Certainly not. I reject that approach and that interpretation. At the basis of resolution 242 (1967) are its main provisions on the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by the use of force, and we firmly abide by that position.

85. If you and Lord Caradon will take that same position, we shall solve the problem tomorrow. We will call an urgent meeting of the Four including the Ambassador of France—the President of the Security Council—Ambassador Yost and Lord Caradon; and tomorrow we will work out a generally agreed formulation on the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by the use of force, the withdrawal of all Israeli troops from all the occupied territories behind the line prior to 5 June 1967, and the recognition of the 5 June line as the boundary. We shall quickly settle all the remaining questions—including peace and whatever else you like. That is how the matter stands.

86. I should like today to obtain a definite answer from Ambassador Yost and Lord Caradon. Will they answer “yes” or “no” to the question whether all Israeli troops should be withdrawn from all the occupied territories?

87. That is the quintessence, the substance, the crux of the matter. Until we reach agreement on this matter, there can be no progress. Without a withdrawal there can be no peace in the Middle East. That is the reality. And the sooner our colleagues, the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom, understand this, the better it will be for the affairs of, and peace in, the Middle East.

88. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): As the representative of FRANCE, I would merely point out that if, from this debate, a strengthening of resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council in all its provisions and its means of implementation were to emerge, we would then have made serious progress towards a peaceful settlement.

89. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): In the context of the complaint of which the Security Council is seized, specifically, the complaint made by Lebanon against the attack on Lebanese territory and inside Lebanese territory, and to come back to the actuality of this complaint, it is in this spirit that I shall make my statement today. In doing so, I propose to deal with the question first in its world dimensions with such appropriate and valid analogies as obtain in the world today, and second, within the context of the Middle East crisis. The two, certainly, are not separable, put emphasis will be laid on one or the other as the logical order of the situation obtains.

90. In this moment of anxiety and concern for the Arab peoples—and indeed for the peoples of the world at large—I am sure it will be understood if we plead, and continue to plead, for usurped Arab rights, and if we protest against the trespassing of our sovereignties and at being the victims of aggression. The representa-

tive of Finland, in his intervention today, spoke about our discussion here becoming more and more divorced from the violent realities of the Middle East conflict. Humbly I would say that we have this feeling of reality, because we are the victim of the tragedy. There is a difference between speaking of villages being destroyed and of children being killed in school, and reading letters and looking at photographs—there is a difference between that and seeing one's own children, one's own civilians, one's own villages being razed to the ground and one's people killed and massacred in a cynical manner.

91. That, therefore, is the sense of reality with which our deliberations should be imbued. Of course, there is a difference of approach between someone who is the victim of such a situation and someone who is looking at it in a rather detached way, somewhat in the manner of Nero watching Rome burn and playing his fiddle meanwhile.

92. When the representative of Morocco intervened yesterday and reflected the sense of tragedy among the Arabs and in the Arab capitals, he drew a parallel between the Israeli action against Lebanon and the American action in Cambodia. The same pattern is repeating itself; the same arguments are being echoed by one party after the other in a parrot-like way. However, I would not say that the speech of the representative of Morocco has influenced the editorial writers of the American newspapers of this morning, because hardly an Arab voice can be found reflected in the American press. However, I shall give them the benefit of the doubt; and starting with today's *New York Times* editorial, this is what it says:

#### “The More Perilous Crisis

“Israel's large-scale raid against guerrilla sanctuaries in Lebanon calls attention once more to a continuing crisis in the Middle East that is even more perilous than the escalating Indochina conflict on which national and international concern has focused in recent weeks.”

The only thing is that the author of this editorial did not give due credit to the Ambassador of Morocco.

93. The second editorial appears also today in the *New York Daily News*, under the title “Israel's Cambodia”, with a photograph of Moshe Dayan, the henchman of Israel. This is what the editorial says:

“The situation”—says the writer—“is a dead ringer for our Cambodian problem in Southeast Asia—a problem the USA is trying to solve with troops dedicated to knocking out Red sanctuaries inside Cambodia's borders, then returning promptly to South Vietnam.

“Yesterday, Israel mounted an ambitious ‘Cambodia’ operation of its own. Twin spearheads of 100 Israeli tanks and 1,000 troops stabbed into southern Lebanon in an effort to clean out Arafat's guerrillas or a considerable fraction of them.

"We're for Israel in this set-to, frankly. And"—the writer goes on to say—"we are waiting with breathless interest for comments on Israel's Cambodia-like stab into Lebanon from such haters of the US Cambodia moves as Senator J. K. Javits.

"('Would it not be wonderful' muses a *News* operative out loud, 'if we could trade Javits for Dayan?')".

94. Surely, the only comment that could relevantly be made here is that Senator Javits, who is opposed to the Cambodia operation but supports giving Phantoms and Skyhawks and missiles to Israel to perpetuate its occupation of Arab territory, suffers—as some American intellectuals who write about the security of nations suffer—from a case of schizophrenia.

95. That the situations are analogous and follow the same pattern is not indeed brought out by the Arabs. First of all, here we have what the American editorials of today have written; but there is more than that: there are Zionists and leaders of the Jewish faith who themselves have drawn the analogy. May I just take the liberty of showing you a very unique book, published in the United States after the six-day Israeli *Blitzkrieg* against the Arabs. It is called *The Jewish Stake in Viet-Nam*. It has three authors—Meir Kahane, Joseph Churba and Michael King—and, on the cover, the flag of Israel and the star of David.

96. Now, this whole book argues that if the Viet Cong and the North Viet-Nameese and the forces working for liberation in South Viet-Nam reach their goal it will mean a setback for Israel; and it explains how General Dayan, before the war, went to South Viet-Nam and actually took part as a paratrooper with the American aggressive troops there. The analogy is accepted even by leaders from Israel itself.

97. Here is the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, the most authoritative source of news about Israel and Zionism, put out in New York itself by the Jewish Agency for Israel. This is part and parcel of the Israeli Government, in accordance with the Status Law of 1951 and is recognized as such by the American Government—a situation unique of its kind in the whole world: a Government, half of which exists in Israel and the other half at 515 Park Avenue, New York City, New York.

98. Here is what the Jewish Telegraphic Agency says, under the title "Israel reported concerned fall of Cambodian régime will encourage Russians in Mideast". Everything is always in terms of Russians and in terms of Americans—as though the Arab peoples do not have an existence. But we do exist. Here is what is reported in the 5 May 1970 issue of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency:

"New York, May 4. *Time* magazine, in a release to the news media, reported today that an unnamed 'high Israeli diplomat' has 'hinted' in a statement to the magazine that the government of Israel is

gravely concerned about the outcome in Cambodia fearing that the fall of the new Cambodian régime would encourage the Russians to increase their activity in the Middle East. *Time* quoted the diplomat as saying: 'If the United States lets (Cambodian Premier) Lon Nol down, the Russians will conclude that the Americans have gone soft.' "

And then what is the conclusion? That the CIA must continue its brave and courageous work.

99. Then the same Jewish Telegraphic Agency, on 5 May 1970, reports the views of a sound rabbi of the Jewish faith criticizing the Jewish stand on Viet-Nam. This is what is reported:

"Rabbi Brickner says the Jewish community should join others in condemning the Viet-Nam war . . . An American rabbi castigated the organized Jewish community today for 'failure to join with others of the greater society' in condemning the Viet-Nam war and its recent expansion by the United States into Cambodia. Rabbi Brickner, Director of inter-faith activities . . . said that the failure of organized Jewry to participate in the anti-war movement jeopardizes the credentials of the Jewish community with its own youth who reject a parochial approach to the issues of war and peace in the world."

He goes on to say:

"Jews have a tendency to view the world situation in a myopic way, through the prism of the Israeli glass."

100. This is related, because unfortunately that rabbi was put in jail in the land which we were told yesterday was the land of the freedom of speech and the right of dissent. Needless to say, we deeply regret and deplore the killing of four American students at Kent State University.

101. I cannot add anything to the analogy that was given by the Ambassador of Morocco [1538th meeting] in his brilliant intervention yesterday, except to carry it to its logical end. There are similarities. For instance, the President of the United States tells us that "We will stay in Cambodia for only thirty days and will go only thirty miles". But we know that the flotilla that went up the Mekong River reached Pnom Penh, which is sixty miles inside Cambodia, and that American advisers were killed. On the other hand, when President Thieu of South Viet-Nam was asked about the operation in Cambodia, he said: "There is no time-limit and no limit to the number of times when we can attack Cambodia and penetrate into Cambodia. We will do that as we deem it necessary." The letter which you read out today, Mr. President, from Mrs. Golda Meir, also said the same thing.

102. I would not enter here into an argument with the representative of a State that has committed and is committing international brigandry. But to the representative of the United States, who is the author of

a remarkable book, *The Insecurity of Nations*, I would put the views expressed on the responsibility of the United States as one of the two greatest Powers in the world only last Sunday, 10 May, by Arnold Toynbee. We may agree or disagree with Arnold Toynbee. We may say that he is or is not one of the greatest living thinkers in the world. But we cannot disagree with the fact that Arnold Toynbee is undoubtedly one of the leading thinkers of the West, and by no means a pro-communist writer. This is what was reported last 10 May. *The New York Times* put the question last week to the eminent British historian: "How does the United States look to the rest of the world these days?" The following is Arnold Toynbee's reply—I cannot read it all, but I shall read some paragraphs:

"To most Europeans, I guess, America now looks like the most dangerous country in the world. Since America is unquestionably the most powerful country, the transformation of America's image within the last thirty years is very frightening for Europeans. It is probably still more frightening for the great majority of the human race who are neither Europeans nor North Americans, but are Latin Americans, Asians and Africans. They, I imagine, feel even more insecure than we feel. They feel that, at any moment, America may intervene in their internal affairs with the same appalling consequences as have followed from American intervention in South-East Asia.

"For the world as a whole, the CIA has now become the bogey that communism has been for America."

And he goes on to say: "Today America has become the world's nightmare."

103. In his ceremonial and sermon-like manner, for which I have the greatest admiration, Lord Caradon today lectured us once more about international morality and expressed his regret about the failure of the Council yesterday to adopt the United States and United Kingdom amendment for the cessation of all military activities. I would put the following question to the sense of fairness of Lord Caradon: Exactly what is meant by that amendment? If it means that the Arabs should cease to resist Israeli occupation of Syria, for instance, then I cannot interpret the words of Lord Caradon to mean anything other than that the Security Council should decide that Israel should continue to occupy the Golan Heights militarily. It also means giving Israel the opportunity not only to occupy Syria, as it did in 1967, but to attack Lebanon whenever it deems it necessary.

104. My second point is that Israel interprets the cease-fire as giving legality to Israeli occupation of Arab territories in Jordan, the United Arab Republic and Syria. But the time has come when we have the right to ask Lord Caradon whether he believes that the cease-fire does in fact mean the continuation of Israeli occupation of Arab territories, of three Member States of the United Nations, and whether that occupa-

tion should continue as Israel decides and deems fit, or whether the time will come for Israel to withdraw after it has imposed its conditions on the Arab States, of course, with the help primarily of the United States and the United Kingdom.

105. Now, should Lord Caradon refrain from giving a direct answer, then I will give the answer. And the answer is not mine. The statements made by the Prime Ministers of Israel after the 1967 war, by Deputy Prime Minister Allon, by Dayan, by Eban and others have become legend. But directly related to my questions to Lord Caradon is this latest statement by General Weizmann, again reported by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency:

" 'There must be no territorial concessions whatever to the Arabs,' General Ezer Weizmann, Israel's Minister of Transport, declared at a United Jewish Appeal fund-raising dinner here last night. General Weizmann, former commander of the Israel Air Force, was named to the Cabinet by the Heirut faction."

I will stop here to explain that Heirut is the party of Menachem Beigin, the hero of Der Yassin. The article goes on to say:

"He is not a member of the Knesset. He told his audience: 'We must be suffering from some psychosis to think that we have to give back territory.' He maintained that 'Once the ancestral Israel is in our hands, any talks with the Arabs must be centered on Israel's rights with no territorial concessions.' General Weizmann, a nephew of the late Dr. Chaim Weizmann, Israel's first President, did not specify what he meant by 'ancestral Israel'."

106. So we are faced with a concept of a State that has no limits, that knows no boundaries. And this has been again explained in clearer terms by General Dayan himself in *Le Monde* of 9 July 1969:

"People abroad ought to realize that quite apart from their strategic importance to Israel, Sinai, the Golan Heights, the Tiran Straits and the hills west of the Jordan lie at the heart of Jewish history. Nor has the restoration of historical Israel ended yet. Since their return to Zion a hundred years ago, a double process of colonization and expansion of frontiers has been going on. We have not yet reached the end of that road. It is the people of Israel who will determine the frontiers of their own State."

107. To Lord Caradon I humbly submit that here is a very clear-cut statement by the Minister of War of Israel in which he acknowledges that Israel has begun a double process of colonization and expansion. And more ominous, not only for the Arabs but for the world community at large, is his statement: "We have not yet reached the end of that road. It is the people of Israel who will determine the frontiers of their own State."



108. Mr. President, you read to us this morning the text of a letter that was communicated to you by the Permanent Representative of Israel embodying a statement made by his Prime Minister, Mrs. Golda Meir. I think it needs no great elaboration to say that Israel and Israeli spokesmen do not speak with two tongues, or three or four. They have many tongues. *The New York Times*, which could safely be described as religiously Zionist and pro-Israel, commenting on the attack on Lebanon yesterday, had this to say on its third page today:

"Another purpose seems to be to warn the Lebanese Government that if it fails to act effectively against the guerrillas, it may be subject to the kind of razing carried out against the frontiers of Jordan and the United Arab Republic."

Indeed, Sir, if we read carefully we will find that this threat, which is spelled out so clearly here, is contained in the letter that was read to us and which has now been circulated as a document of the Council [S/19801].

109. It is now within the context of the obligations of the Security Council that I shall address myself. To speak about all the atrocities, the Nazi-like acts being continuously perpetrated by the Israeli occupying authorities, would take me a long time. They are described in the letter recently submitted by the representative of the United Arab Republic concerning the killing of school children, the letter of the representative of Jordan concerning the massacre of civilians by Phantoms and Skyhawks and the letter of the representative of Kuwait containing many photographs taken on the spot of the Arab civilian victims, including children and women.

110. The list is long and the spectacle of the world standing paralysed before this exercise in lawlessness, of arrogant defiance, of reliance upon sheer power, is to us Arabs both electrifying and tragic. For there is today, in all of our lands, the inevitable response to the Zionist occupation and to the Israeli stultification of world morality and law. Palestine has come full circle.

111. The Zionist apparatus, in the thirties and the forties, introduced organized terrorism into Palestine in an effort to thwart every attempt to install a political system which would safeguard Arab rights and succeeded in the geopolitical murder of the people and land of Palestine. Now, the descendants of that Zionism have impelled the descendants of those victims to the legitimate reaction of self-defence against annihilation and utter genocide. Let it not be forgotten that it is Israel which is in occupation of our territory. It is Israel which says unilaterally, as I have stated here and now, that it has no intention of withdrawing from it, in spite of all that we are going to hear from Mr. Tekoah. It is Israel which says that it wishes to negotiate directly for peace, but has withdrawn from the agenda all Arab rights and declared them non-negotiable.

112. Coming back to the responsibility of the Council, to the continued threats, to the attack on

Lebanon—which might be repeated and will be repeated—I wish to recall here two resolutions adopted by the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly. One is resolution 2546 (XXIV), adopted on 11 December 1969, which recalls all previous humanitarian resolutions and goes on to say that the General Assembly:

"*Gravely alarmed by fresh reports of collective punishments, mass imprisonment, indiscriminate destruction of homes and other acts of oppression against the civilian population in the Arab territories occupied by Israel,*

" . . .

"*Condemns such policies and practices as collective and area punishment, the destruction of homes and the deportation of the inhabitants of the territories occupied by Israel.*"

113. The General Assembly, in resolution 2535 B (XXIV), adopted on 10 December 1969, also placed a special responsibility on the Security Council with regard to the very grave situation in the Middle East. This resolution, in its very brief operative paragraphs,

"1. *Reaffirms* the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine;

"2. *Draws the attention of the Security Council to the grave situation resulting from Israeli policies and practices in the occupied territories and Israel's refusal to implement the above resolutions;*

"3. *Requests* the Security Council to take effective measures in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations to ensure the implementation of these resolutions."

114. I submit that this is an opportunity—a living, actual and real opportunity—for the Council to undertake the defence of law, to affirm the rule of law against the law of the jungle, because if Israel is to be permitted to continue its cynical behaviour and aggression and attacks and occupation there will be dire results, not only for the Arabs, not only for the Middle East but for the world at large.

115. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call now on the representative of Israel in exercise of the right of reply.

116. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I do not believe that the long list of quotations and misquotations submitted to the Council by the representative of Syria deserves any response.

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

118. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): The representative of Israel spoke of "misquotations" by the representative of Syria. I immediately challenge him to prove that

there were any misquotations in what I have said today. Otherwise, he is misleading the Council and, to say the least, lying.

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

120. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I would say that the only way to test Israel's intentions regarding State boundaries to be established for the first time between Israel and the Arab States is by talking peace to Israel, not by waging war against it. We are ready for that; we hope some day the Arab Governments will be as well.

121. As I listened to the Soviet representative's words in this meeting I was reminded of our experience in Israel with Soviet representatives in 1967. When the Soviet Union began at that time to spread false rumours about alleged Israeli troop concentrations on the Syrian border, the Ambassador of the Soviet Union to Israel was invited to visit the area and to ascertain for himself that those rumours were unfounded. He simply shrugged his shoulders and replied that he was not interested. When United Nations military observers investigated those rumours, checked the situation and reported to the Security Council that the Soviet allegations about concentrations of Israeli forces were a figment of the imagination, the Soviet Ambassador and his Government simply refused to give any heed to this. They continued to spread the falsehoods which, as the world knows, played a significant role in igniting the 1967 war. Thus it is today. The Soviet representative is not really interested in the purpose, nature and scope of Israel's defensive action against bases of aggression in Lebanese territory. He is not ready even to accept the fact of Israel's withdrawal. What he is obviously interested in is to heap slander on my Government, on other Governments, and to spur on the Middle East conflict.

122. I in fact agree with the Soviet representative on one point: that pupils frequently follow their teachers and mentors. In his unbridled abuse the representative of the Soviet Union has faithfully followed his Arab mentors—a pity, for Arab falsehoods and passions have never brought any good to their propagators. Yet the influence between the Soviet Union and the Arab States is a reciprocal one. Indeed, if the Security Council were in need of any further explanation why the Arab States still pursue war against Israel, why the Arab States trample the cease-fire into dust and refuse to make peace with Israel, the statement we heard today from the Soviet representative has undoubtedly disposed of that need. There, under the garb of a permanent member of the Security Council entrusted with the promotion of peace and international security, sits the principal culprit responsible for inflaming the Middle East conflict.

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

124. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I protest against the

outrageous statements of the representative of Israel. We are discussing Israel's aggression, and not the actions of members of the Security Council. The fact that we have allowed him to speak here does not give him any right to insult members of the Security Council. His cynicism oversteps the bounds.

125. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I would appeal to all members to allow this debate to continue with all the seriousness and gravity which the situation calls for. The Council should be able to form an opinion for itself upon the documents and on the statements made, and each will obviously draw the necessary conclusions therefrom.

126. The representative of Israel has the floor.

127. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): There would have been no Arab design in 1967 to launch the final onslaught against Israel without Soviet encouragement. There would have been Arab-Israeli peace after 1967 had it not been for Soviet support for the continuation of Arab warfare.

128. Today's intervention by the Soviet representative—the representative of a State which suppresses the rights of small nations and violates the independence and sovereignty of neighbouring States—is intellectually interesting but not surprising. Soviet intervention has become a permanent and grim factor in the Middle East conflict, a force for war and not peace, a force for the pursuance of the Arab war of attrition against Israel. It is with Soviet arms that the irregular forces operating from Lebanese territory have been attacking and murdering Israeli civilians. Soviet Katyusha rockets, Soviet Kalashnikov guns are now directed indiscriminately against Jews as Hitler's blood-stained weapons were in the past.

129. If the Soviet Union were concerned about the promotion of peace in the region it would silence the present expressions of its policy, whether in the Security Council or in the Middle East. It would put an end to Soviet identification with Arab aggression. It would arrest its growing military involvement in the regional conflict. It would begin to work to bring the parties to peace.

130. One cannot but wonder why members of the Security Council, and especially its permanent members, listen to Soviet warlike diatribes, know of Soviet aggressive activities and designs in the Middle East, and continue nevertheless to consort with the Soviet Union as if it were Red Riding Hood's grandmother and not the bloodthirsty wolf that it is.

131. Indeed, as things stand now, my delegation submits to the Security Council that if this organ wishes to address itself seriously and constructively to the Middle East situation, it would be well advised to summon the Soviet Union to take the seat where it belongs—the defendant's bench—and to account for its nefarious and dangerous behaviour in the Middle East.



132. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Lebanon to exercise his right of reply.

133. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): I promise to be brief. I wish only to refer to some points that were raised in the debate yesterday and today. Naturally, I do not have a crystal ball to enable me to know what is going on in the chambers of the Big Four in their consultations about the Middle East. Naturally, we were very interested to hear the statements made around this table today. Nevertheless, I will not deviate from the main purpose of the meeting we have called, which is our complaint against Israel regarding its aggression against Lebanon.

134. First of all, I owe it to Lord Caradon, whom I respect for his sense of fairness and legality, to draw his attention to one point he made this morning. I am sure in my heart that my doubts are probably misplaced, but for the record I should appreciate an explanation and perhaps a correction of my misapprehension.

135. Beginning his remarks, Lord Caradon welcomed the report that was read to us by the Secretary of the Security Council on your behalf, Mr. President. That report contained a message from the Prime Minister of Israel covering many points. I am inquiring only whether Lord Caradon really welcomes that report *in toto* or only some parts of it, as I assume he does. Perhaps he welcomes the fact that the resolution that was unanimously adopted by the Council yesterday was carried out today by Israel.

136. Another point is the fact that the representative of Israel yesterday accused me of debasing my arguments by pretending that I do not know the facts and saying that the Lebanese army was engaged with the Israeli army whereas the Lebanese army knows the facts better.

137. I am glad to tell you that I fully agree with Mr. Tekoah that the Lebanese army knows the facts better because the Lebanese army knows that seven of its valiant soldiers have met their death fighting against the aggressor. Eight soldiers were wounded. The Lebanese positions were shelled continuously from the beginning of the invasion until its termination.

138. I feel sorry for Mr. Tekoah, because he may have been led into the wilderness of distortion by his own military superiors, the hawks of Israel. On one point I should like to say that the military authorities of Israel certainly also know the facts better than Mr. Tekoah, for they even know exactly how many shells they have poured into the lines of the Lebanese army. Israel's intention was to drive a wedge between the Lebanese army and our Palestinian brothers. That has failed lamentably. Israel wanted to create turmoil, trouble and division in Lebanon. That design also has failed, because the people of Lebanon has never shown such unity and solidarity as during the last forty hours in the face of danger, in the face of Israeli aggression.

139. Mr. Tekoah said yesterday that the armed forces of his country could not withdraw in daytime. They were waiting for nightfall. The representative of Syria yesterday reminded us of the thief who comes at night and steals away at night. The actions of Israel are always concocted in darkness and carried out at night. This morning, in his brilliant speech, Ambassador Malik of the Soviet Union read to us one of the news dispatches that said that at 3.30 a.m.—at night—the Israelis were still bombing Lebanon.

140. I confirm to the Council that all night covering their withdrawal from Lebanon, the Israeli air force bombed and shelled our military and civilian positions. A lot of destruction has taken place. The justification by Israel was that its combing operation, as it was called today by Mrs. Meir, was directed against the commando positions in Lebanon, against the Palestinian freedom-fighters and against the members of the resistance movement of the Palestinian people who are fighting for their homeland.

141. Even the fabrications that Mr. Tekoah gave us yesterday showed how meagre and fallacious were his pretexts. He pretended—I have nothing to confirm this—that five fedayeen were killed and six taken prisoner, and that thirty-seven Lebanese houses were destroyed. A few cars also were destroyed. An invading army, with a whole armoured brigade comprising hundreds of tanks and armoured cars and thousands of soldiers—not one thousand—participated in that assault against Lebanon. What for? To destroy thirty-seven houses, kill five fedayeen and take six prisoners. What irony, what cynicism. But that is in line with the official policy of Israel.

142. Mr. Tekoah was just reminding us of Hitler. I should like to remind him that the Israeli racists and militarists appear very much to be aping the methods employed by the Nazis during the last world war. I should like to quote from a message that was sent by the late Lord Bertrand Russell on 31 January to a parliamentary conference in Cairo, just a few days before his death. It was in a way his testament. He said, among other things:

“We are frequently told that we must sympathize with Israel because of the suffering of the Jews in Europe at the hands of the Nazis. I see in this suggestion no reason to perpetuate any suffering. What Israel is doing today cannot be condoned, and to invoke the horrors of the past to justify those of the present is gross hypocrisy.”

143. That line, as I said, is the official policy of the Israeli military hawks. We all know—and today Ambassador Tomeh reminded us of them—of the General Assembly resolutions regarding the area and the mad neighbourhood destruction there, a policy followed by General Dayan. This policy was condemned by a resolution of the Security Council [270 (1969)]. It was most recently condemned by a resolution of the Commission on Human Rights.<sup>3</sup> The collective

<sup>3</sup> *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 5, resolution 10 (XXVI).*

punishment applied in the territories occupied by the Israel military in Palestine, in the Golan Heights, in Gaza and in Sinai has been carried a step further from the occupied territories to territories of sovereign neighbouring States. There are mass murders of the civilian population in chosen regions in order to make sure that nothing interferes with the Israeli sanctuaries in the occupied Arab territories. This line also involves the kidnapping of innocent civilians who are summarily accused, taken back to Israel and tortured or executed. It involves the destruction of houses and of innocent villages; it involves wanton air attacks on civilian centres, resulting in the killing, wounding and kidnapping of innocent people, in the destruction of civilian installations and the burning of crops. The Israelis have been shooting in all directions while cynically trying to convince the world that they are for peace.

144. We have just heard from Mr. Tekoah that he invites us to test Israel's desire for peace. Israel has been tested many times. It is occupying the territories of three Arab States. The Israeli concept of peace—better called *Pax Israel*—has now been extended into Lebanon by overt aggression and military conquest.

145. In a long series of letters to the President of the Security Council and to the Secretary-General, the Lebanese Government brought to their attention the wanton Israeli attacks against our towns and villages and all the victims and damages we have suffered. Prior to the last events, from the beginning of 1969 to the middle of March 1970, sixteen Lebanese civilians were killed, thirty-nine wounded and forty-three kidnapped as a result of these attacks and Israeli incursions into our territories, in flagrant violation of the Israel-Lebanese Armistice Agreement, the United Nations Charter and the principles of international morality and law.

146. Those are my comments.

147. I revert now to a point which is very important to us—I know it is dear to the heart of Lord Caradon—that is, the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations. Mr. Tekoah has proposed that Israel's desire for peace should be tested. I think the Security Council should take a measure to participate in the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations. It could adopt a very simple resolution whereby the Council rededicates itself to the principles and provisions of the Charter and declares that in commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, forthwith no territory of any Member State of the United Nations should be occupied by a foreign military Power.

148. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I have three speakers who have asked to be allowed to exercise their rights of reply: the representative of the Soviet Union, the representative of the United Kingdom and the representative of Israel. Obviously, I intend scrupulously to abide by the concept of the right of reply, but I would appeal to all our colleagues that these replies be limited as far as possible by per-

sonal self-discipline, in order to ensure the effective work of the Council.

149. Mr. MALIK (Union of Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I shall bear in mind your wish that we be as brief as possible and would lay special stress on that part of your comment.

150. My distinguished friend and colleague, the Ambassador of Syria, has called the representative of Israel a liar. He apparently knows him better than I do. But having heard his statement, I am inclined to agree with that assessment. The representative of Israel has piled up such an unimaginable heap of slander, insinuations and fictitious charges against the Soviet Union that I regard it as beneath my dignity to answer it all. This has become a habit of his, and I will not pay any attention to it, as I consider it beneath my dignity.

151. I will simply give some information to the Security Council. Firstly, the warning which the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government gave of the impending threat of Israeli aggression against Arab countries in 1967 was confirmed: the act of aggression was committed and to this day the aggressor has been hindering a peaceful settlement. This is a historical fact, and no inventions by the Israeli representative here will help him to escape that fact.

152. Israel has many times sat on the defendant's bench here in the Security Council. It has also been condemned many times. It is a criminal that has committed a crime against the peace and security of mankind. Israel has twice been condemned for attacking Lebanon alone. Therefore, when the convict tries to slander others, no trust can be placed in what he, the criminal, says.

153. Mention was made of the Soviet Union's assistance to Arab countries. Yes, we are helping. We are helping with arms, we are helping with appropriate facilities, we are helping with military advisers. We do not hide it. We are proud of it. We are helping the victim of aggression and not the aggressor. We are grateful to the people of the United States for the fact that, when we, the Soviet people, the Soviet Union, were the victims of aggression, they helped us, during the Second World War. We are grateful for that; international law permits the granting of assistance to the victim of aggression, not to the aggressor.

154. I quite understand that Israel and its representative here are very pleased when the United States gives them a \$100 million loan for continuing the aggression, modern weapons, Phantom jets and so on. But here is the logic of the aggressor: if the aggressor obtains a loan of \$100 million, an influx of arms and promises of an endless arms supply, that is for the cause of peace. If, on the other hand, help is given to the victim of aggression, that is against peace. If the Soviet Union insists that, in accordance with resolution 242 (1967), not one inch of Arab soil, not one inch of the territory of the victims of aggression, should be handed over to the aggressor, that is said to be against peace and obstructing a peaceful settlement.

155. If, on the other hand, the participants in the four-Power consultations support Israel's claims to Jerusalem, to Gaza, to Bethlehem, to the Golan Heights and to many other Arab territories, that is furthering a peaceful settlement. This is Israel's logic, the logic of the aggressor. But who here, in the Security Council, or in the entire world, can agree with this kind of logic? If the Soviet Union demands and insists on the basis of resolution 242 (1967) that all Israel's troops should be withdrawn from Lebanese territory, that is a hindrance to a peaceful settlement. If the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom, while speaking of troop withdrawals, have in fact insisted for more than a year that the borders should be altered to the aggressor's advantage, that is furthering a peaceful settlement. It is a blessing, from the aggressor's standpoint. It is a curse for the victims of the aggression.

156. In accordance with international law, we are in favour of assisting the victims of aggression and against assisting the aggressor. If the Soviet Union demands that Israeli troops should be withdrawn behind the line of 5 June, that means that the Soviet Union is standing in the way of a peaceful settlement. If others support the aggressor's territorial claims and desire to hold on to a considerable part of Arab territory, that is furthering a peaceful settlement. Such is the logic of aggression and the logic of the aggressor, and the logic of those who support and protect the aggressor.

157. Yesterday and today the Israeli representative has maintained that his country and his Government desire peace. If that is so, then let him state that Israel fully accepts resolution 242 (1967) and all its provisions and articles and is prepared to implement it, that Israel is prepared to withdraw all its occupation troops from all Arab territory behind the line which existed until 5 June and that Israel agrees to renounce all its claims to any part of occupied Arab territory. Then the whole world and the Security Council will believe that Israel wants peace and a peaceful settlement. To date, in the period of nearly three years following the Israeli aggression of June 1967, the world has heard no such statements. If the Israeli representative makes these statements, the world will believe that Israel wants peace. We are waiting for such statements.

158. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I wish to reply to two questions that were put to me—first to that put by the Ambassador of Lebanon.

159. I am glad to confirm that when I said we welcomed the news which we had received at the beginning of our meeting, I was welcoming the fact that the withdrawal of Israeli troops, in accordance with the demand of the Council unanimously made yesterday, had been completed. That was the welcome which I extended as we started our deliberations today.

160. I was also asked, by Ambassador Tomeh, about the position of my Government in regard to the question of withdrawal. The question of withdrawal and the goals we wish to achieve have been set out in the resolution, of which we all know the terms. In addition

to that, we have, as I have reported, put forward our amplification of those proposals in the meetings of the Four. That was the right place to do it; it was the right way to proceed. We have stated our position, and we stand by it. There is no question whatsoever of going back on the public efforts we have undertaken, and no question of going back on the proposals which we have set out. If the representative of the Soviet Union suggests that my country supports the acquisition of territory by war, then I can only say that that is a gross distortion.

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

162. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): The Soviet representative has just repeated the terms "aggression" and "aggressor" in almost each one of his sentences. I confess, I cannot claim as much expertise as he and his Government have on aggression. As for the application of those terms to others, the Security Council's categorical rejection yesterday of the Soviet attempt to attach the description of aggression to Israel's defensive action in Lebanon was a telling response to the Soviet representative's abuse, as indeed was the failure of a similar attempt in June 1967.

163. I fail to understand why the representative of Lebanon should insist on alleging that the Israeli action yesterday was directed not against the bases of the terror organizations but against the Lebanese army. We all recall that at the opening of yesterday morning's meeting the Secretary-General stated—and I quote from the verbatim record:

"The Acting Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission has also reported to the Acting Chief of Staff information given to him by a Lebanese representative to the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission who had gone to the border point of Rosh Hanikra for a telephone conversation with the senior Israeli representative. According to this information, the senior Israeli representative stated that the present action going on in the El Arkoub area, east of the Hasbani River, was aimed only at the destruction of fedayeen commandos, and that it was not the intention of Israeli troops to act against the Lebanese army or population provided that the Lebanese army and population did not support the fedayeen." [1537th meeting, para. 6.]

164. In the meantime, reports from Arab sources have confirmed that the Israeli defensive action was directed solely against irregular forces which have turned Lebanese soil into a springboard for armed attacks against Israeli towns and villages and their civilian population. In this morning's *Washington Post*, for instance, we read a report from Lebanon, from Beaufort Castle:

"A high ridge of Mount Hermon was repeatedly pounded by artillery. 'Those are Israeli guns trying to hit a guerrilla base,' said a Lebanese soldier at Beaufort Castle, which has the dual role of tourist site and army lookout post."

165. The same report goes on to quote an El-Fatah spokesman as having said that the commandos had engaged the Israelis in bitter hand-to-hand combat and recaptured a guerrilla defensive position that had been taken by the Israelis at noon.

166. Similar reports have been published by other information media. For instance, the Arab Middle East News Agency reported yesterday: "Lebanese sources are saying that the Israeli forces enveloped the fedayeen in the village of Rashiya El-Fahar."

167. The Middle East conflict is sufficiently complex without its being further complicated by distortions, exaggerations and fantasies.

168. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): I wish very briefly at this late hour to thank the representative of the United Kingdom, Lord Caradon, for the answers he has given to my questions. However, I consider that those answers are, if I may say so, incomplete and inadequate. In view of the lateness of the hour and of the grave legal implications contained in this question, I will refrain now from imposing on the Council by expounding any further to prove the inadequacy of the answers given me by Lord Caradon—answers for which I am grateful—and I would go on to say that during the last deliberations of the Security Council on the question of Southern Rhodesia I had occasion to quote a book of Lord Caradon's, entitled *A Start in Freedom*. For once in the five years that we had been together in this Council I drew praise from Lord Caradon—this is on record—for my fine taste in excellent literature.

169. The history of England is rich in lords who are at the same time poets, and only two days ago—on Monday afternoon—we heard a poem by Lord Caradon. While I praise his prose, unfortunately I cannot say that I have the same admiration for his verse. However, I would recall that in the tradition of England, there is another great lord who was a poet, Lord Byron, who indeed gave his life for the cause of the freedom of a people. I hope that this may give inspiration for some better poetry by Lord Caradon.

170. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I certainly would not wish the death of Lord Caradon, even in the cause of freedom.

171. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I am taking the floor again since Lord Caradon has made a serious charge against me. He said that I was incorrectly interpreting his position and the position of the country he represents concerning the inadmissibility of the acquisition of foreign territory by the use of force. Although he said he acknowledges this principle, he still did not answer my direct question: Are the United Kingdom and Lord Caradon in favour of the complete withdrawal of all Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories behind the line which existed before 5 June? He beat about the bush but gave no straight answer. From this I conclude that he supports the position of the United States and Mr. Yost that this line should be altered to the aggressor's advantage and that part of the Arab territory should be transferred to or left in the hands of the aggressor. If I am wrong, if I am misinterpreting the position of the United States and the United Kingdom, then I ask them to make it clear that they agree with the inadmissibility of the acquisition of foreign territory by the use of force, that they are in favour of the withdrawal of all Israeli troops from the occupied territory behind the line which existed before 5 June and that they wish that line to be recognized as the border of Israel. Only direct answers to these direct questions will show the Security Council that I am incorrectly interpreting the position of the United Kingdom and the United States. Thank you.

172. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I shall be very brief. I can only advise the Ambassador of the Soviet Union first of all to read Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and then to read his record of the discussions in the Four. From reading these two documents he will have an ample reply to his question.

*The meeting rose at 1.55 p.m.*