

UNITED NATIONS

INDEX LIST



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FIFTH YEAR

1551st MEETING: 5 SEPTEMBER 1970

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1551)	1
Expression of thanks to retiring Presidents and statement by the President	1
Adoption of the agenda	2
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 5 September 1970 from the Chargé d'Affaires, a.i. of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9925)	2

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 FIFTY-FIRST MEETING

Held in New York on Saturday, 5 September 1970, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. Davidson S. H. W. NICOL (Sierra Leone).

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/1551)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 5 September 1970 from the Chargé d'Affaires, a.i. of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9925).

Expression of thanks to retiring Presidents and statement by the President

1. The PRESIDENT: During this month, the twenty-fifth commemorative assembly of the United Nations will commence. We look forward, firstly, to a felicitous gathering which will crown the efforts of Ambassador Akwei of Ghana and his colleagues in the Committee for the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the United Nations. Secondly, we fervently hope that the numerous contacts which will take place among Foreign Ministers and Heads of State and Governments will bear fruit in the enhancement of peace and prosperity for all mankind.
2. Our Chairman for the month of July was Ambassador Sevilla Sacasa of Nicaragua. He embodies in himself the finest qualities of diplomacy in the great tradition of Hispanic culture. As one of those who actually signed the Charter at San Francisco, this twenty-fifth anniversary must bring back many memories of the hopes and ideals of the United Nations. The patience and understanding with which he presided over the major African resolutions that were adopted in July won him universal praise and admiration.
3. I regard myself as being fortunate in succeeding my good friend Ambassador Kulaga of Poland as President of the Council. His personal distinction, modesty and wisdom were clearly evident in his conduct of our affairs during the past month. This is not the first time that my delegation has encountered his profound

experience in diplomacy. He was for some years his country's Ambassador to my own country and helped to forge strong links between Poland and several African nations. My delegation congratulates him on his successful Presidency of the Council during the month of August.

4. The matter which we have before us is an important aspect of the situation in the Middle East. This situation is of cardinal importance to international peace and security. We are aware of the condition of cease-fire now existing, and we congratulate all concerned on the initiative and restraint which have been displayed. Our best wishes go to the Secretary-General and his representative for success in those talks. A great deal will depend on the high level of sincerity and the high degree of patience which, we are sure, will be forthcoming from both sides.

5. This meeting of the Security Council has been convened at the urgent request of the Chargé d'Affaires, a.i. of Lebanon.

6. Yesterday, it will be recalled, I received a letter from the Chargé d'Affaires, a.i. of Lebanon, transmitting the text of a letter addressed to me by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lebanon. That communication has been distributed as Security Council document S/9924. Early this morning I received a further letter from the Chargé d'Affaires, a.i. of Lebanon, transmitting the text of a letter addressed to me by the Minister body in order to consider the question brought by his Government. Copies of today's letter have been circulated in document S/9925. Upon receiving that letter I immediately undertook to contact all members of the Council in order to consult them as to the time when this meeting should be convened. I have endeavoured to meet the situation in accordance with the wishes of the Council's members. I might mention at this juncture that the delegation of Nicaragua has agreed to the present meeting of the Council and that the representative of Nicaragua is already on his way to join this meeting. Accordingly, the Council should not feel inhibited from proceeding with the question on its agenda.

7. I have little doubt that the wisdom of the Council and the good sense and humanity of those concerned will lead us to a speedy and harmonious solution of the matter now in hand.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 5 September 1970 from the Chargé d'Affaires, a.i. of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9925)

8. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Lebanon and Israel, pursuant to their requests, which I have received in writing today [S/9926 and S/9927], to participate without vote in the discussion of the item just inscribed on the agenda.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Y. Mahmassani (Lebanon) and Mr. S. Rosenne (Israel) took places at the Council table.

9. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the matter inscribed on its agenda this afternoon at the request of Lebanon.

10. Before calling on the representative of Lebanon, I call on the Secretary-General who wishes to make an announcement to the Council.

11. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: With regard to the matter before the Council at this meeting, it is my duty to inform the Council of the relevant information available to me. I have until now received from the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine (UNTSO) two cabled messages.

12. The first message which was sent from Jerusalem today, 5 September, at 1740 hours GMT—that is, 1940 hours local time—reads as follows:

“1. The following message was received by the Chairman of ILMAC”—that is, the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission—“from the Lebanese authorities on 5 September 1970:

“‘On 4 September 1970 Israeli aircraft attacked the Lebanese region of El Arkoub. At the same time the same area was subjected to artillery bombardment. The bombardment caused various material damage. When the bombardment ceased an Israeli mixed infantry and armoured force penetrated the region opening a way to our village of Kfar Chouba, approximate map reference 2150-3035, destroying our road networks in this region as they blew up several houses. Up to the present, 0930 GMT’”—that is, 1130 local time 5 September—“the Israeli unit continued to remain in our territory, on the outskirts of Kfar Chouba. For this reason we request:

“‘(1) The confirmation by a United Nations military observer (UNMO) on the spot.

“‘(2) The immediate withdrawal of the Israeli unit from our territory.’

“2. I have instructed Chairman ILMAC”—that is, the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission—“to provide two UNMOs for on-the-spot enquiries.”

As soon as I receive reports from these observers I shall promptly report to the Security Council.

“3. Up to 1500 GMT”—that is, 1700 local time today, 5 September—“assistant IDF liaison officer”—that is, the assistant Israel Defence Force liaison officer—“did not have any information on the alleged incident.

“4. I will await the report of UNMOs and will keep you informed.”

13. The second message sent at 1755 hours GMT on 5 September—that is, 1955 hours local time—is as follows:

“Assistant IDF liaison officer”—that is, the assistant Israel Defence Force liaison officer—“called at 1705 GMT 5 September”—that is, 1905 local time—“and informed that at this time all IDF forces had withdrawn from Lebanese territory.”

14. This is the information given by the assistant Israeli Defence Force liaison officer. I have received no other information from UNTSO thus far. In this regard, the Council will recall the statement I made before it on 12 May 1970 on a similar occasion. This statement was:

“As members of the Council will be aware, I have for long sought to increase substantially the number of United Nations observers on both sides in this area, but without success. This accounts for the fact, among other things, that I cannot have detailed information of actions such as that now in progress in this area.” [1537th meeting, para. 8.]

15. The PRESIDENT: I thank the Secretary-General for his statement and now give the floor to the representative of Lebanon.

16. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon): Mr. President, I wish to thank you for your prompt action in convening this urgent meeting of the Security Council at our request. My thanks go also to the other members of the Council for responding to your urgent call. It is an element of satisfaction to the Lebanese delegation to see you presiding over this august body in these extremely difficult circumstances, for it is needless to refer to the strong and cordial ties which link Sierra Leone and Lebanon.

17. Yesterday I communicated to Your Excellency and to His Excellency the Secretary General a letter from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Lebanon [S/9924], bringing to your attention that the Israeli aggression against Lebanon has been escalating at an alarming rate in the past few days, in flagrant violation of the pertinent resolutions of the United Nations and the Lebanon-Israel Armistice Agreement.

18. During the last two weeks, Israeli armed forces committed fifty-eight acts of aggression against Lebanon—air attacks, mortar bombing, incursions inside the territory of Lebanon, abduction of civilians, dynamiting civilian installations and construction of roads for military purposes.
19. A few hours after I had communicated the aforementioned letter to you, Israeli armed forces consisting of two companies of infantry, backed by its air force and tanks, launched a sneak attack inside Lebanese territory reaching the village of Kfar Chouba, which is four kilometres inside the Lebanese border, and then constructed a road to allow them further military expansion.
20. Today, Saturday, at 1300 hours local time, the Israelis have continued their aggression, backed by the Israeli air force, bombing Lebanese territory and civilian populations. They have penetrated an additional seven kilometres from the border. Our latest information is that the military operations are still continuing and the Lebanese Army is still resisting the aggressor. In fact, a few minutes before I came into this Chamber, about 4.15 p.m. New York local time, I received an official call from Beirut confirming that the Israeli forces are still engaging units of the Lebanese Army inside Lebanese territory. This flagrant violation of our frontier and territory has, so far, resulted in the death of two civilians and two others were wounded seriously. Considerable material damage has been inflicted on civilian installations. These acts of aggression take place at the same time when Israel is trying, by all means, to obstruct a just solution of a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. These acts further constitute a direct threat to regional and world security by the grave implications and the consequences that could result from the extension of the area of conflict.
21. Let me say now that the Israeli aggression has intensified because it is clearly apparent to the Israeli leaders that any just solution sought in the Middle East would expose Israel to serious difficulties and internal divisions.
22. Israeli aggression, which is taking the shape of ominous military hostilities directed against Lebanon, is undoubtedly a prelude to the resumption of hostilities on other fronts in the area. This aggression is directed not only against Lebanon but also against other Arab States, as well as against all efforts to preserve peace in the Middle East and in the world.
23. The daily bombardment of Lebanon by Israel and the latter's threats offer the world an example of the agonizing and sad circumstances created by Israeli military expansionists. The drama that Lebanon is living today at its southern border represents a challenge and a test of the ability of the Security Council to live up to its obligations under the Charter and to ensure the safety, the security and the independence of small and peaceful nations, which are constantly threatened by military and expansionist aggressors.
24. We have come to the Council on several occasions always seeking guarantees promised by the Charter. We are still confident and hopeful that this august body will not shy away from its responsibility to condemn the aggressor and the aggression and to take effective measures to stop them.
25. Lebanon asks nothing more from the Security Council than the following: immediate and complete withdrawal of all Israeli forces from all Lebanese territory; a strong condemnation of Israel for its repeated acts of aggression against Lebanon, in violation of the Charter and the pertinent resolutions of the Security Council—262 (1968) of 31 December 1968; 270 (1969) of 26 August 1969, 279 (1970) of 12 May 1970 and 280 (1970) of 19 May 1970; Lebanon demands further the application of Chapter VII of the Charter against Israel, in accordance with operative paragraph 3 of Security Council resolution 280 (1970), which states:
- “Declares that such armed attacks can no longer be tolerated and repeats its solemn warning to Israel that if they were to be repeated the Security Council would in accordance with resolution 262 (1968) and this resolution consider taking adequate and effective steps or measures in accordance with the relevant articles of the Charter to implement its resolutions”.*
26. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Israel.
27. Mr. ROSENNE (Israel): Mr. President, I should like first on behalf of my delegation to express to you, Sir, our best wishes that your term of office will be tranquil and constructive. I would also take this opportunity to pay our respects to the outgoing Presidents for July and August, the Ambassadors of Nicaragua and Poland. I would also pay my respects across this table to the Secretary-General and to his Special Representative.
28. The attempt of the Lebanese delegation to dramatize a minor patrolling incident, fully justified by the free hand given to the terrorists by the Lebanese Government, by suddenly asking for this urgent meeting of the Security Council, knowing full well that nothing justified this step at a time when many members of the Council were taking advantage of the public holiday to repose and gather strength for the forthcoming session of the General Assembly, will not have passed unnoticed. Perhaps it is the vocation of Lebanon, which has been mentioned before in this Chamber, to excuse its own evil intentions, that supplies the real justification for the panic evidenced in the letter addressed to you, Sir, yesterday by the Chargé d’Affaires at the request of the Foreign Minister of Lebanon, followed by the request for this meeting.
29. It was clear when the Security Council adopted the inequitable and one-sided text of resolution 280 (1970) on 19 May last, that the resolution would, as similar ones in the past, give encouragement to the

aggressor. Three days after the adoption of that resolution, attackers from Lebanese territory in a particularly dastardly operation, ambushed an Israeli school bus and murdered nine children and four adults. That gave rise to universal disgust from virtually every part of the world, with one ominous exception. My delegation has submitted written complaints about the Lebanon to the Security Council twice since then, on 22 May [S/9810] and 12 June [S/9834]. In all, since then, over 200 acts of aggression have been committed from Lebanese territory, and with the connivance of the Lebanese authorities, against Israel territory and civilians.

30. Since the Security Council adopted that resolution there have been in fact at least 204 terrorist aggressions from Lebanese territory; fifteen Israeli civilians have been killed; five Israeli soldiers have been killed; thirty-eight Israeli civilians have been wounded; fifty-five Israeli soldiers have been wounded.

31. To show the intensification of terrorist activity in this area between 12 May 1970, when the last debate on the Lebanese question began, until 31 May, twelve civilians and one soldier were killed, twenty civilians and five soldiers were wounded. This corresponds to the openly-proclaimed designs of the terrorist leaders to sabotage the major diplomatic efforts now being made to reach a peaceful and just solution of the Middle East crisis.

32. According to the Lebanese daily newspaper *El-Amal Kfar* of 31 December 1969, Chouba—which was mentioned in the report of the Secretary-General and again just now in the statement we have just heard by the representative of Lebanon who, I should have thought, should perhaps have not been too eager to have mentioned that name—serves as one of the main front posts of the terrorist organizations in the El Arkoub area, the area with which we are dealing.

33. I am now talking about the resolution of last May. That was not the first time that the Security Council had demonstrated its inability to address itself fairly and constructively to the situation in the Middle East. That was not the first time that it had set up a double standard, applying one measure for the Arab party and another for Israel, and failed to deal with the situation on its merits.

34. In these circumstances it is necessary for my delegation to make certain clarifications concerning its position in the deliberations in this organ.

35. The Charter of the United Nations states that the Organization is based on the sovereign equality of all Member States. That is a basic premise of our Organization. Israel, however, has consistently been deprived of this fundamental prerogative, particularly in the Security Council.

36. Although it is intended that the Security Council should be representative of the entire membership of the United Nations, Israel's right of representation has been brushed aside. While all of Israel's neighbours

have at one time or another served on the Council, Israel has been denied this position. More than this, not only has membership in the Security Council been withheld from Israel, but Israel has never been allowed to influence the choice of candidates representing, or purportedly representing, the geographic area to which Israel belongs.

37. Israel's rights in the Security Council have been further whittled away by the fact that in the last fifteen years the Council has become paralysed by the use of the veto in all instances concerning the situation in the Middle East in which consideration for and recognition of Israel's interests and rights was necessary.

38. Israel's exclusion from representation on the Council and the Council's inability, because of the veto, to accord due consideration to Israel's rights, are aggravated by the composition of this organ. One-third of its members maintain no diplomatic relations with Israel. Some of them even deny or question Israel's right to exist. Of the remaining members, several unreservedly identify themselves with the Arab position irrespective of its merits, which indeed they disdain to examine. What is more serious, some of the States represented on the Council follow a policy of unilateral measures against Israel which in fact constitute illegal sanctions contrary to Charter provisions on this matter. Their manifest lack of neutrality, their blatant partialities, deprive them of all claim to the status of impartial observers, let alone arbiters of the situation in the Middle East.

39. The most recent and flagrant deviation from Charter principles has been the seating as a member of the Council of Syria, which repudiates the United Nations Charter in relation to Israel, has rejected the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 [242 (1967)] on the establishment of a just and lasting peace and has even refused to accept the Secretary-General's Special Representative, and to explore with him the road to peace. Syria's membership in this organ has made a mockery of the Council's responsibility for international peace and security . . .

40. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of Syria on a point of order.

41. Mr. JOUEJATI (Syria): Mr. President, I think you will agree with me that it is high time for the representative of Israel to deal with the complaint brought by the delegation of the Lebanon, which is the question of the invasion of Lebanese territory. The candidature of Syria is not in question. If the delegation of Israel has a complaint about that, it can bring it before the Security Council at any time. I think that we are all faced with a very grave problem and we should adopt a resolution as soon as possible. Any delaying tactics would be interpreted, and rightly so, as allowing the aggression, the invasion, to continue. I hope that the Security Council will not be an accomplice to that.

42. I waive my right of consecutive interpretation deliberately because we want to achieve results and because we do not want any theses on Security Council

candidature and geographic distribution. I hope that the Security Council will pass on to action as soon as possible.

43. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel may now continue.

44. Mr. ROSENNE (Israel): I thank you, Mr. President, and, of course, I thank the representative of Syria for indicating to me how to make my views known. But I prefer to do it in my own way.

45. As long as these circumstances prevail, the Security Council cannot be considered as an organ capable of acting or entitled to act in the conflict between Israel and the Arab States. My delegation, however, comes before the Council to put its views on record.

46. The members of the Security Council are well aware of the Agreement, the so-called Cairo Agreement, which was signed on 3 November 1969 between the then Commander in Chief of the Lebanese Army, General Emile Bustany—he is now in retirement—and Yassir Arafat, whose name will be well known around this table. Mr. Arafat is the man who claims over-all responsibility for directing and co-ordinating terrorist activities against Israel. That is the Agreement which provides the basis and the licence for terrorist activity against Israel from Lebanese territory. Let me give members of the Council one or two paragraphs of that Agreement which are directly relevant to the situation on the affected part of the frontier between Israel and Lebanon. I will add that an English translation of that Agreement can be found in the weekly English edition of *Le Monde* of 29 April last. The first part of that Agreement dealt with what is called the Palestinian presence in Lebanon, allowing it to have its own army command and the necessary mechanisms to ensure relations with the local authorities, bearing in mind, *inter alia*, what is politely termed “the interests of the Palestinian revolutionary cause”. What is that interest? Let me quote from an interview given by that same Mr. Arafat to the Italian weekly magazine *L'Europeo*, as reproduced in the *Washington Post* of 29 March last. It is in the form of questions and answers:

“Arafat: We will not accept it”—that is, a peaceful settlement. “We will continue to wage war against Israel by ourselves until we get Palestine back. The goal of our struggle is the end of Israel and there can be no compromises or mediations whether our friends like it or not, the dimensions of our struggle will always remain those outlined by the principles of Al-Fath.”

“Question: Thus you are not at all seeking the peace everyone is hoping for.

“Answer: Right. We don't want peace, we want victory. Peace for us means Israel's destruction and nothing else.”

47. Those are the interests which are recognized by the Lebanese Government in the Cairo Agreement. That Agreement goes on with a section on resistance

action and it contains no less than fifteen points; such is the detail into which it goes. One point reaffirms that the Palestinians' armed struggle was in Lebanon's interest as it was in the interest of the Palestinian revolution and of all Arabs in general. In another point of that Agreement the Lebanese Army undertook to co-operate in the installation of supplies, rest and aid posts for the Palestinian commandos. I shall not take up the time of the members at this stage to read any more of this Agreement. But it is a matter of common knowledge and the existence of this Agreement highlights the excessive abnormality of the situation which subsists with the full knowledge of the Lebanese Government in the Mount Hermon foothills. It is against this background of continuous acts of aggression committed from Lebanese territory and of the admitted helplessness of the Lebanese authorities to control their own territory that again today it was necessary for my Government to exercise its right of self-defence and to take appropriate action in the affected part of Lebanon.

48. Yesterday and today a small unit of the Israel Defence Forces carried out a search and comb mission in the south-westerly foothills of Mount Hermon, east of the Hasbani. They completed their mission a few hours ago and have since evacuated the territory. Arms, ammunition, explosives and sabotage impedimenta were found. This was a minor action in which the Lebanese Army was not directly involved except for some shelling from a distance. As on a previous occasion this action was directed solely against terrorists in the area affected. Incidentally, according to a Reuter's report from Damascus today, the Syrian Government has admitted that the Israeli actions in this area were posing a very serious threat to the terrorist operations, especially those of the El-Saiqa Group.

49. I should like to add once more some statistics. In the four-week period ending today no less than eighty-four acts of aggression against Israel have been committed from Lebanese territory. In these five days of September alone we have endured from Lebanese territory seven cases of mortar shelling, three cases of mining, one case of sabotage in a village, and four attempts at hostile and illegal crossings into our territory. I think the Council might be interested in a statement of the Minister of the Interior of Lebanon, Mr. Jumbalatt, circulated by the wire services in the course of today. According to the Reuter's News Agency, Mr. Jumbalatt:

“... asked Palestinian terrorist organizations not to set up offices in Lebanese border villages in order to avoid giving Israel a pretext for retaliatory action against the villages. He also asked them to move what bases and offices were already close to the border back to some 10 or 15 kilometres from Israel.

“Mr. Jumbalatt told reporters he had made the request at his regular meeting with representatives of terrorist organizations here (in Beirut) yesterday. He added that the terrorist delegates had promised to consider his request and reply to him soon, probably after his return from a visit to Cairo.”

50. This same Mr. Jumalatt—the Minister of the Interior—reported once to his Government, according to a report of the Middle East News Agency from Damascus on 5 June, that the terrorists “now have a free hand to sport with our fortunes”. Well, some sport!

51. All this shows that in reality the Lebanese Government has long given up its control of the area concerned which, following a series of agreements and accords and understandings with the terror organizations, is now a central base for terror activities.

52. Does any member of the Security Council who is honest with himself, does any responsible Government in the world seriously expect the direct victim of this aggression to wait until these terrorist delegates will be obliging enough, to give Mr. Jumalatt their reply? Does not the very fact that the Lebanese Government had to adopt this manner of speaking with the terrorists show conclusively how hollow and how tendentious is that Government's request for this urgent meeting of the Security Council?

53. Resolutions adopted by the Security Council in recent debates have reflected the Council's disabilities to consider questions arising from the Israel-Arab conflict with equity and in conformity with fundamental Charter precepts. The Council has thus, I regret to say, failed to pronounce itself on the statements made repeatedly by Arab Governments, including the Government of Lebanon and their representatives in the United Nations and elsewhere, that their aim is to bring about Israel's annihilation as a State. The Council has failed to act on the incessant warfare openly pursued by Arab States against Israel. It has even failed to uphold and reaffirm the obligations to observe the cease-fire established by its own resolutions.

54. Neither Israel, nor the international community, requires Lebanon to favour Israel's interests or support Israel's views. Lebanon is obliged, however, as a Member of the United Nations to prevent irregular as well as regular forces from using its territory for aggression against another Member State. No pretext can weaken this obligation. No excuse can diminish the responsibility incurred in flouting it. No fine words can conceal the underlying truth. This has always been a tenet of international law and a United Nations principle repeatedly vindicated by United Nations jurisprudence. If Lebanon chooses to repudiate it, it opts for war, with all its dangers and repercussions. If Lebanon chooses to open its frontiers to aggression against Israel, it cannot claim to be immune to Israel's defence against aggression.

55. With that, and stressing once again the defensive and very limited nature of the action which was completed several hours ago, I wish to reserve my delegation's rights and position in this debate.

56. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, allow me first of all to welcome you, congratulate you and wish you every suc-

cess in your Presidency of this august body. You, Mr. President, can count on the complete co-operation of my delegation.

57. I should also like to send a greeting to your predecessor, the Ambassador of Poland, who, although he did not convene us in public, did call us together in private and with his great skill he succeeded in sparing us several meetings. Nevertheless, he carried out his duties as President.

58. My delegation would also like to send greetings to the Ambassador of Nicaragua for the fine manner in which he presided over the Council during July.

59. We have just heard the statements made by the representatives of Lebanon and Israel after having heard the statement made by the Secretary-General. Unfortunately, this is not the first time that the army of a Member State has penetrated by force into the territory of another Member State of the United Nations. These facts are undeniable and the delegation of Israel does not deny them although it attempts to minimize them. In this situation and without prejudice to the fact that the Security Council may in further meetings consider the facts in detail, and take pertinent decisions, it is evident that what is not possible is that the Israel army should continue to be present in the territory of Lebanon.

60. Last May, my delegation submitted a draft resolution which was adopted unanimously [279 (1970)] and which forced the Israel army to withdraw from Lebanon. My delegation still recalls that we were given assurances that the withdrawal had been completed at the moment when the Council was taking up the matter. The facts later proved that, because of a series of circumstances which I need not relate, the withdrawal had not been completed as had been announced here in the Council.

61. Under these circumstances my delegation believes that this Council cannot remain inactive. The facts have been proved. The invasion has occurred and the fact that a withdrawal has been initiated is not, in the opinion of my delegation, sufficient proof for the Council to remain completely inactive.

62. Under these circumstances and bearing in mind that it is a repetition of actions which have occurred in the past with the flagrant violation of specific principles of the Charter, my delegation believes that the Council should act with all the urgency required by the situation. Consequently, my delegation submits the following draft resolution:

“The Security Council,

“Demands the complete and immediate withdrawal of all Israeli armed forces from Lebanese territory.”

63. The appeal issued by this Council on 12 May has produced its results and we trust that the Government of Israel will immediately bow to this decision.

64. We hope that the present draft resolution will be submitted to the vote as urgently as is required and in any case before the conclusion of the present meeting. Once we have approved this draft resolution, the Council in its future meetings can consider the remaining problems which have been raised in the statements made by the representatives of Lebanon and Israel.

65. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, in tendering you our warmest congratulations, I should like first to thank you for the speed with which you called this meeting of the Security Council and to assure you of the complete support of my delegation in your delicate work.

66. I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to your predecessors, Mr. Sevilla Sacasa, Ambassador of Nicaragua, who presided over the Council in July with great mastery, and Mr. Kulága who, very happily, had no occasion to call a plenary meeting of the Security Council but who nevertheless carried on intensive diplomatic activity and many informal meetings with talent and tact to which I should like to pay tribute.

67. For my part, I am prepared to waive my right to speak so as to make possible a rapid vote on the draft resolution submitted by our colleague from Spain. If there were other speakers I should, of course, address the Council; if not, I would be in favour of proceeding as rapidly as possible to a vote.

68. In the circumstances, I reserve my right, if necessary, to explain my vote subsequently. I may add that I support fully the proposal of the Spanish representative.

69. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of Lebanon.

70. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon): I intended to reply to the spokesman of Israel, but under the present circumstances I shall waive my right until after the vote.

71. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of Israel.

72. Mr. ROSENNE (Israel): I shall be brief, but I should like, if I may, to refer to something that was said just now by the representative of Spain.

73. I should like to recall—I was listening to the English interpretation—that when he submitted the draft resolution, the representative of Spain found it appropriate to describe Israel's action—the word used was “invasion”—without however, referring to the warfare which, as everybody knows, is being waged continuously against Israel from Lebanese territory in flagrant breach of the Charter.

74. I have already mentioned in my statement that no contribution to peace in the Middle East can be

made by the adoption of one-sided resolutions. I have also informed the Council that the action has been completed and that Israeli forces have evacuated Lebanese territory. In these circumstances, as it was last May, the draft resolution which the representative of Spain has proposed is utterly divorced from reality. It would be unfortunate if the Council should now be stampeded into voting on and adopting a draft resolution which is marked not only by an absence of equity, but also by a refusal to take cognizance of the plain facts of the situation.

75. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I do not wish to hold up the work of the Council, since I myself have asked that we proceed urgently; however, my delegation does not wish to let a fact pass without comment. When an armed force of a State penetrates into the territory of another sovereign State—that, with all my respect for those who do it, is a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter, Article 2, paragraph 4, of which states:

“All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.”

76. Now, you can say “minor patrolling incidents” or whatever one wants to call them; but, in my delegation's opinion, the invasion of a territory by a foreign army is a flagrant violation of the Charter. And in the light of this my delegation believes that the Council should proceed to a vote and call for the immediate and complete withdrawal of the forces of the Israeli army which have penetrated into Lebanon.

77. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America): Mr. President, first of all I should like to join those who have already spoken in welcoming you to the Chair. Not only your distinguished record, but our experience of very cordial and very enriching contacts with you since your arrival in New York assures us that you will be presiding over the Council with great wisdom and great distinction and we look forward to your tenure in the Presidency.

78. I should also like to convey my congratulations to Ambassador Kulága for the very serene, competent and courteous manner in which he conducted our consultations during the previous month.

79. Turning to the matter at hand today, I think we all recognize that some of the facts which have been put before us about the current situation along the frontier between Lebanon and Israel are in dispute. However, there can be no dispute that for a long period of time now there has been a pattern of guerrilla-type raids conducted from Lebanese territory against Israel and Israeli counter-attacks directed against Lebanese territory. This problem has been subjected to lengthy consideration in the Security Council in August 1969, in May 1970, and more recent events have been reported in document S/9822 of 5 June 1970 and in

statements by official spokesmen both in Lebanon and in Israel.

80. The statements to this Council by representatives of the United States last May and August have made it abundantly clear, I believe, that my Government fully supports the political independence and the territorial integrity of Lebanon, that we cannot, we do not, condone any threat to Lebanese territory from any source. We were indeed happy to support Security Council resolution 279 (1970) in May, which called for the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli forces from Lebanese territory—and we were indeed happy when Israel complied.

81. The situation which confronts the Council today is in our judgment somewhat different. We have listened attentively to the statements made this afternoon, first of all to the report, delivered by the Secretary-General in such a thoughtful and timely manner, from the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, in which he informed us of allegations about continuing Israeli attacks on Lebanese territory, together with a statement by the Israeli representative to him that Israeli troops had been withdrawn. We have also heard before this Council the concerns which have quite understandably been reflected in the statement of our colleague from Lebanon about military operations on his territory and information from his Government that those operations continue. At the same time, we have also listened to a statement by the representative of Israel in which he has assured us categorically twice—at least, I took it as a categoric assurance—that all Israeli troops have in fact now been withdrawn from this most recent operation.

82. Therefore, this text which has just been handed us strikes me in a way as passing judgment not only on the principle that Israeli troops should be withdrawn—which we fully support—but in a sense is asking us to make a judgment as to which of the two parties is giving the accurate version of the present situation on the ground: to wit, are the troops still there or are they not there? If they are not there, then such a resolution is redundant. If they are there, then it would command the full support of the United States because we believe that they should not be on Lebanese soil.

83. But we frankly find ourselves in the face of this conflicting evidence confronted with a rather painful dilemma. We merely regret that the draft resolution has been introduced with such haste and that there has not been an adequate opportunity to ascertain through some impartial source, such as the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, what the precise situation is as of the present time along the border. Now, that being so and taking account of the conflicting evidence, the haste with which we are asked to pass judgment on a matter of this seriousness, my Government has instructed me under such circumstances to abstain, while making clear that this in no way detracts from our continued full and complete support for the maintenance of the territorial integrity of Lebanon.

84. There is one other point which my delegation would like to make in connexion with consideration of this complaint. However much we may deplore the Israeli attacks on Lebanese territory, we do not think that the Security Council in all fairness can continually disregard in such a total fashion the continuing provocations which are directed against Israel from Lebanese territory. Israel as well as Lebanon, and indeed all other Members, have a full and equal right under the Charter to freedom from outside intervention and attacks against its territory. Ambassador Yost said on 14 May: "I cannot emphasize too strongly that my Government continues to oppose all acts of violence across frontiers in violation of the cease-fire from any source" [1540th meeting, para. 34].

85. I should like today to reiterate that concern. I also wish to reaffirm our special concern for the integrity of Lebanon, a democratic State with an illustrious history and one which has repeatedly demonstrated its commitment to the United Nations Charter and to peace.

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

87. Mr. ROSENNE (Israel): Referring to the last statement made by the representative of Spain, I should simply like to express the hope and understanding that the doctrine which he advanced will always be applied by him even-handedly and that he would demonstrate the same degree of solicitude at the situation in which Israel finds itself.

88. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Lebanon.

89. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon): I should still like to reserve my right to reply after the voting has been completed.

90. However, may I just say now that I should like to reject categorically Israeli allegations that their forces of aggression have withdrawn from Lebanese territory. The fact is that right now Israeli forces are still inside Lebanese territory. We are all acquainted with Israeli tactics of distortion, which were referred to by the Ambassador of Spain.

91. The last time we came to this Council, Ambassador Tekoah declared in front of all the members that the Israeli forces had withdrawn. But at a later meeting he retracted that statement by stating that it was too dark for them to withdraw and therefore they remained on Lebanese soil. I believe now in Beirut that it is already later than twelve midnight and I am sure it is still too dark for the Israeli forces to withdraw. Therefore, I will refrain from replying to the Israeli representative until the vote has been completed.

92. The PRESIDENT: Are there any objections to the Council's proceeding to the vote on the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Spain? Are there any further explanations before the vote?

93. The draft resolution states:

"The Security Council

"Demands the complete and immediate withdrawal of all Israeli armed forces from Lebanese territory."

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: 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, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention.¹

94. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the United Kingdom who wishes to make a statement after the vote.

95. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): We have this afternoon heard conflicting statements from the parties about the present position on the ground and this has put my delegation in a difficult position. The representative of Lebanon maintains that Israeli forces are still operating on Lebanese territory. The representative of Israel maintains that all Israeli forces have now withdrawn. It seems impossible for the Council at this stage of the game to determine the exact facts. It is, however, clear that an armed incursion into Lebanese territory did take place and the representative of Israel has not denied this. Hence, in spite of the conflict of evidence, it is the view of my delegation that it was appropriate to adopt the resolution before us. If the Israeli forces have in fact withdrawn, the fact is welcome to us all. If they have not, then there is every reason for the Security Council to demand their immediate withdrawal. That is why my delegation voted in favour of the resolution.

96. In voting in this manner, however, my delegation nevertheless deplores all actions which are likely to impede the progress of Mr. Jarring's mission and of the negotiations for an eventual settlement. In this we include breaches of the cease-fire by the *fedayeen* which cannot in any respect assist toward this end.

97. The PRESIDENT: I should like to take this opportunity to extend a very warm welcome to the representative of the United Kingdom at this his first meeting of the Security Council. He is no stranger to many of us here as he has served before on his country's delegation, served with distinction during the past decade. We hope that his stay with the United Nations will be a fruitful and successful one and we look forward very much to his future deliberations in the work of this Council.

98. I now call on the representative of Lebanon.

99. Mr. MAHASSANI (Lebanon): I should like to thank you, Mr. President, for the remarkable manner in which you have handled our complaint. My thanks also go to all members of the Security Council for their support and understanding, particularly to the Ambassador of Spain who submitted the draft resolution.

100. It is a matter of distress and great regret to see one delegation unable to support the principle of withdrawal of foreign armed forces from the territory of independent and sovereign States, thus definitely implying support for aggression. It is ironical that this delegation in particular alleges that it is working for peace, particularly in the Middle East.

101. The spokesman of Israel referred to responsible Governments. I wonder if there is one responsible Government in the United Nations which has the audacity to send a representative to the Security Council to admit openly committing an act of aggression against a Member State.

102. Mr. Rosenne referred to the Palestinian people. Let me tell Mr. Rosenne that if there are 300,000 Palestinians on its territory, it is not Lebanon which is responsible but Israel which drove that Palestinian population from its homes. It is Israel which must bear the responsibility of failure to implement the United Nations resolutions adopted both before and after the war of 5 June 1967 and for the consequences of that failure. It shares that responsibility with all other countries which give it direct support. It can on no account shift the responsibility on to Lebanon. Indeed of the whole international community Lebanon is without a doubt the country which least deserves to bear the responsibility for the Palestinian presence and activity for which Israel claims to be punishing it.

103. Through its threats and its aggression Israel intends to compel Lebanon to force its 300,000 Palestinian refugees who are fighting heroically to return to their homes, through the use of armed force, to resign themselves indefinitely to the miseries of their exodus under penalty of itself suffering further aggression by Israel. Thus Israel's aim is none other than to destroy Lebanon either from the inside or from the outside by confronting it with the alternatives of undergoing Israel's raids against its own territory and its population or practising towards its own brothers who are resident in its territory a permanent policy of violence and civil war.

104. The Israel representative spoke of obstacles to peace talks. His very presence here in this Council is an excellent proof of who is obstructing the peace talks.

105. Mr. BUFFUM (United States of America): I shall be very brief in right of reply. I very much regret that my friend from Lebanon was apparently a bit preoccupied during part of my statement and failed to note that I made very clear that the abstention of

¹ See resolution 285 (1970).

my Government was in no way related to the principle of withdrawal. Let me set this forth succinctly and clearly. It appeared to us that unfortunately the facts before the Council about the state of withdrawal were in dispute. If the Israeli troops have been withdrawn, as we were assured, we welcome that. We do not feel that they should have entered Lebanese territory. If they have not been withdrawn, it is the view of my Government that they should be withdrawn immediately.

106. Mr. KULAGA (Poland) (*interpretation from French*): I have asked to speak not in order to deal with the substance of the question before us or even to explain the vote that my delegation has just cast. I shall do that at the appropriate time. However, Mr. President, I should like to extend to you and to my colleagues in the Security Council my thanks for the very generous, not to say too generous, things that they were kind enough as to say about me. I was particularly appreciative of the mention which you made, Mr. President, of my stay in your country and in other African States, a stay which remains a very pleasant memory.

107. I could not conclude these remarks without extending our congratulations and best wishes to you, Mr. President, upon your accession to the presidency of the Security Council for this month. The experience, tact and distinction which we know to be yours allow

me to express without hesitation the certainty that your Presidency will be marked with these outstanding qualities and, I sincerely hope, with results.

108. The PRESIDENT: I wish to thank members for their very kind words of congratulations addressed to the President, and so to the delegation of Sierra Leone. We are very grateful to them indeed and we shall do our best to conduct the Council's business with expedition and integrity.

109. As the representative of Spain has said, we have devoted this meeting to the discussion of an interim resolution, without prejudice to any further meetings which we shall hold to discuss this matter further. I understand that other delegations wish to participate in this debate. After consultations, we have fixed the date and time of the next meeting to be Tuesday, 8 September, at 3 p.m., but I hope that we shall stand in readiness should we be requested to hold further meetings before then.

110. I wish once again to thank members of the Council and the delegations of Lebanon and Israel for participating in this debate at such short notice during the holiday period. I wish to thank the Secretary-General and his secretariat for their willing and immediate response to our request for a meeting.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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