



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

UN LIBRARY

OCT 22 1973

TWENTY-FIFTH YEAR

UN/SA COLLECTION

1538th MEETING: 12 MAY 1970

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

| | <i>Page</i> |
|---|-------------|
| Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1538) | 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-EIGHTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 12 May 1970, at 4.30 p.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/1538)

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)

of Lebanon and Israel, to take seats at the Council table. In view of the limited number of seats at the table, the other representatives will be invited to take the places reserved for them in 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. Baroodi (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. The first speaker on my list is the representative of Morocco. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table in order to address the Council.

3. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like to express to you and to the members of the Council my gratitude at being allowed to participate in this debate. This is not the first time that a representative of my country has come to the Security Council table to speak about the increasingly serious events in the Middle East. I have done so very frequently as representative of Morocco, carrying out our responsibility as a Member State, anxious to express the views of my country on the peace which is constantly being jeopardized in that part of the world. It is my privilege today to appear not only in that capacity but also as Chairman of the Arab Group for the month of May, and I am pleased that my colleagues have honoured me by asking me to come here to express their anxieties, their feelings and their views.

4. Before I go on to the heart of the matter, I should like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on assuming the presidency of the Council, although I am sorry that I have not been able to do this in other circumstances. These pleasant comments to you, Mr. President, are my only consolation, for the rest of my statement will contain comments which will not, I must confess, be to everyone's liking.

5. The relations between Morocco and France were given expression recently by the highest authorities of both our countries when the Sovereign of my country made a trip to Paris. It would be immodest to add anything here to the sincere and courteous words which were said then about our relations and the co-operative spirit that exists between us. I can assure you that

what both our Heads of State said at the highest level will constantly be reflected in the relations which the delegations of France and Morocco will have in the future. Our relations in the future with you, Sir, will be exactly as they have been in the past with your distinguished predecessors.

6. This morning we heard a statement about the complaint by the delegation of Lebanon concerning Israeli aggression. We heard a brand of euphemistic rhetoric in the Council which stopped short of calling things by their proper name. The penetration of troops in foreign territories has always been called in all languages a deliberate act of aggression. For certain subtle reasons some people may wish in the Council to avoid use of this term in describing what actually took place. So it is then within the context of the full meaning of this term that we shall set forth our views.

7. I shall not add anything to the actual concrete facts which were set forth comprehensively this morning by the representative of Lebanon, who spoke on behalf of the victims. But, with your permission, I would, if I may, change somewhat the focus of this debate and put it in its true political perspective. This is not just an invasion by Israeli troops of another territory in the Middle East. This is not the first such act and it will certainly not be the last, although it is likely to last longer than others have in the past because it has been overshadowed by recent events in other areas of the world which bear the stamp of authority conferred by might and which have set an example, although I shall refrain from saying what kind of example.

8. The Council in our opinion should certainly not just concern itself with the violation of principles over which it has jurisdiction. I would beg the Council to go further, to consider more than just the human and material loss which has been caused in Arab countries over the past three years. I think the Council should consider the motivations behind this large-scale attack. Why was it made in the present circumstances and what are its true implications? The campaign to prepare for this attack was no surprise to those who can read between the lines of reports from Tel Aviv, or to those who realize that a general who is Minister of Information has a habit of linking propaganda to strategy. Very recently the delegate of Israel gave an interview over the Israeli military radio which made the news. That is, the Israeli delegate was simply told indirectly that he should prepare his case and call in his lawyers. This is what Mr. Tekoah stated:

"The United Nations and its Members are already accustomed to the idea of Israel answering in kind and retaliating. Thus, an operation from the Israeli army into the interior of Lebanese territory will surprise no one. Likewise, the present membership of the Security Council is such that it is practically impossible to expect the United Nations to take action in order to bring about peace."

9. Just taking this paragraph, although I am not a specialist in rhetoric, we can say that the representative

of Israel has here announced the attack: he claims that the Council is not prepared to take a harsh view of the matter and as he mentioned the composition of the Council, might I point out that it is no different from what it was on 1 January. His real meaning is doubtless that the international picture at the present time is such as to make it possible for the Council to deal with this matter in a manner not conducive to peace.

10. Today Lebanon has been chosen as the victim. This choice, I believe, was based on three considerations. The first was military: Israel could afford to confront a country whose peace-loving traditions and desire for a balanced budget had always induced it not to consider itself in a permanent state of war with Israel or Israel's equal in terms of arms. So militarily, this attack was a walkover. From the political point of view the Security Council by a unanimous resolution in December 1968 [*resolution 262 (1968)*] drew the attention of Israel to the consequences of renewed attacks on Lebanon. And certain major Powers used the Council, international forums and bilateral diplomacy to explain to Israel what the consequences of such a position would be. In taking this stand, Israel is provoking the Council, which has already pointed out the danger of repeated acts of aggression. It has also issued a challenge to the major Powers which through diplomatic channels have drawn its attention to the value of respecting the territorial integrity of Lebanon. But these calculations coincide with certain international circumstances which insure Israel's impunity. And this is what I mean. Today an attack of this scale has been undertaken after efforts had been made basically from the beginning of this year to provoke in Lebanon disturbances and conflicts between Palestinian resistance fighters and the Lebanese Government. But these attempts have failed. The Palestinians, who are not refugees in Lebanon but combatants on Arab territory, have reached an understanding in very specific circumstances with the Government of Lebanon to exercise their rights. Consequently, this manoeuvre has not been fruitful.

11. Secondly, another purpose of this undertaking has been, as a result of the size of the attack, to distort one's understanding of the situation in Lebanon, to destroy the social, political and institutional balance and to make it possible for some rather influential people to turn Lebanon into a Cambodia.

12. I assume the responsibility of making this parallel and suggesting a similarity between these two situations, because Israel's initiative and the diplomatic preparations behind it are clearly within this context; and this is clear to anyone who is not naïve. The major Powers of the world, when they take such initiatives in various areas of the world are invited to look beyond their own objectives, and try to anticipate what effect their action in certain areas of the world will have. It is well known that those who enjoy the protection of the major Powers can safely, and with impunity, act very much as they do. It would be very difficult, around this table, to find anyone who would support

or remain silent about interventions, whatever their military nature, which rest on a principle of international law that has never been recognized in the Council—namely, the condemnation of the right of pursuit. The Council has brought this out time and time again. The last such case was unfortunately in 1963—the dispute between Cambodia and Viet-Nam—and the Council came out against the right of pursuit. If political and military force has brought about this upheaval in other areas of the world, how can one be surprised to see those who for protection cling to the coat-tails of certain major Powers, pursuing their own goals with the certainty that there will not be a “call for peace” in this Council?

13. Whether it is the Parrot’s Beak (that is the kind of name places seem to have nowadays) or the Fish-hook, or the grottoes in northern Jordan, or the mountains in southern Lebanon—the similarity of political situations seems to lead to a similarity in geographical names.

14. I think that it is here in such matters that the Council should go beyond mere events, and consider the whys and wherefores and the political implications of what is happening. When people are invited to speak in the Council, obviously they are strongly tempted to be discreet; but it is equally important not to have any compunction about stating the political truth in a political body, no matter what the consequences. We are not simply a highway patrol out to establish the facts as they actually occurred. Our task is to safeguard peace. We must go beyond the mere facts, especially when they conceal long-range intentions.

15. For three years now the Arab world has been witness to this succession of events, and peace-loving Lebanon, which has not been active in the war in such a way as to make it possible for Israel to say it is an adversary or an opponent in war, has now become a victim, because that is the part of the world where Israel can act as it chooses.

16. This morning the Council endeavoured to discharge one of its primary responsibilities: it gave priority to an interim resolution to demonstrate its awareness of the gravity of the situation. It reached a decision which, pending a continuation of the debate, was designed to put a stop to aggression. But we witnessed certain manoeuvres which I wish to denounce one after the other. The representative of Israel even said, with a kind of naïve childishness: “Gentlemen, the troops have withdrawn; the Council should no longer consider this draft resolution.” When he said the troops had withdrawn he was careful not to say that they had first gone into Lebanon and had caused considerable damage and his implication was that the Council should be satisfied with that statement, that we should consider the case closed and that we should all go off to lunch.

17. The representative of Lebanon, directly thereafter, countered that manoeuvre, saying that, according to information received, Israeli troops were still

in Lebanon. According to the information which we have, I can assure you that they are still there.

18. There may be certain acts of intervention which, in view of military problems, the size of the territory, and the strength of the adversary, might take four weeks or six months to complete. But between dawn and dusk it is possible for Israel to do in Lebanon what it might take six months to do elsewhere. Lebanon, until those troops are withdrawn, will be living its longest day. But it is not a long day only for Lebanon: it is a most important day indeed for the Council. The international situation is such that one cannot say that events are isolated. The propaganda campaign which we have been hearing now for several weeks is based on certain events familiar to us all and the main parties concerned are fully aware of the realities. Suddenly there was talk of a change in the situation in the Middle East, which supposedly required a reassessment—meaning that what had been suspended as being too serious could now justifiably be undertaken. The danger here is that one side is trying, as it were, to prepare clean texts, while Israel seems to be satisfied with its old rough drafts. It is difficult for the Council to condone such manoeuvres, however.

19. We heard a typical piece of Israeli propaganda this morning. There was no justification for it on the basis of what had happened in the Council, but the Israeli representative suddenly came out with some Arab-Russian propaganda. When the representative of Lebanon speaks about what is happening in his country, there is no need for him to read the Russian press; although it may be necessary to read Tel Aviv prose to find out the exact intentions of Israel. Israel’s aim has been to make it appear as if there is collusion between certain parties to convey the impression that the whole problem really boils down to an international confrontation with the super-Powers pitted against each other. Of course all this requires some admission as to where Israel’s support comes from. The Israeli delegate was not tactful enough, however, to be discreet about the support he receives. I was surprised when obvious allusions were made to this support that such strenuous attempts were made to prove it.

20. The procrastination which we witnessed this morning to avoid an urgent vote calls to mind what happened in the Council in June 1967, when, after the cease-fire decision on the Israeli-Egyptian frontier, here in the Council we saw the same kind of manoeuvre. At the head of some delegations there were people who were doubtless most conversant with the kind of courtroom manoeuvres calculated to delay the work of the Council; and they wasted valuable hours in the Council before Israel’s army let us know when it would finally implement the cease-fire. But more time was requested. We were told that order could not be restored for a few hours because of the size of the armies involved. We witnessed this same manoeuvre on 9 June, when at its meeting at dawn the Security Council called for a cease-fire on the Syrian frontier, but it took Israel nine hours to carry out the cease-fire,

and during that time it occupied the Golan Heights, part of Syrian territory which today was used in order to penetrate into Lebanon more easily.

21. It is this kind of situation which is really more the result of Israeli propaganda than Arab-Soviet propaganda. It is this constant, relentless desire to have one believe that there are not just Arabs and Israel in the conflict, but that behind it all there are major Powers; and instead of there being a relevant debate in the Security Council on a specific situation, there is a desire to have the emphasis placed on a controversy which is of long standing and not about to come to an end. We refuse to let the Council be taken in by this invitation which has been issued with a certain amount of arrogance. It is our duty, no matter who our friends may be, no matter what our relations may be with others, to pause for a moment and rid ourselves of the compunctions which some may have to speak the truth; and in this body, above and beyond our own special interests, we must all say where we believe the international danger lies.

22. I should like to stress this point because once again this morning, contrary to the way the Israeli press used to handle this sort of thing some time ago (it used to say for example that Syrian and Israeli planes had clashed without specifying the nature of the planes), Israel reported that there had been a confrontation between MIGs and Phantoms. The implication clearly was that the war was not between the States of the Middle East but between certain categories of planes, which, of course, put the whole problem in the wrong perspective.

23. This morning the Council reached its first decision and we are pleased with it. As an interim resolution it expresses the desire of the Council to accord priority to the most immediate and serious aspect of the situation in the Middle East, the need for an immediate cessation of Israeli aggression. Call it what you will—each in his own language—but when we think of realities let us use the most appropriate word.

24. We do not wish simply to appeal to both sides to cease fire, for those appeals make it sound very much as if there is an international confrontation, especially if we say: "Stop military operations in the area". Lebanon is a country with clearly defined borders. And when the Council is to invite the party responsible for aggression to stop aggression, it should specify by name from what area it should withdraw. Elsewhere in the world the word "area" first covered a very specific part of a continent. Subsequently, as a result of references to history the term came to apply to a whole country in the vocabulary of politics and the press and then it was taken to refer to a larger region, the boundaries of which may very well go on expanding. In the Middle East we would not like to see this kind of escalation in geographical terms, in the vocabulary of politics or in international confrontations.

25. We must consider the case of Lebanon. Once again it has been the victim of a specific act of aggression

recognized by the Government of Israel and recognized by the Council as a whole. It is therefore up to the Council to consider not only the facts. It should bear in mind what Jules Romains said about the Battle of Verdun, "Let us forget the victory and seek its reflection". We would invite those who have undertaken military operations to follow us and the Council, for it is our duty as member States to say how far we shall go. If what is happening today in Asia should tomorrow come about in the Middle East, we may all, due to our habit of remaining silent, become accomplices.

26. I would not conclude without referring to something which was said this morning by the representative of Israel, who, I assume, knows many Lebanese proverbs. He said that those who sow thorns should not expect to harvest grape. I can assure him that it is not the victims who are sowing thorns. Again this morning he was accused of sowing thorns in the Middle East. I do not know what the harvest will bring to him and those who so clearly support him on the international level.

27. Sure of my facts and expressing the concern not only of all the Arab capitals but also that of the international community, I have drawn attention not only to the gravity of the situation in the Middle East, but also to the implications of that situation and how it could possibly spread and lead to more serious incidents with which we may have to deal in the future. I have shown that I am not in the habit in the Council of even alluding to events in certain countries which are national problems requiring our respect and discretion, but there are some things which have symbolic value in the world, and there are those in this country who have expressed their concern about intervention in the affairs of a country which is not involved in a conflict. I would hope that the conscience of this country will not only be reflected by its youth, but also by distinguished political personalities of whom fortunately there are many in this country. If this conscience is fair, it must be aware that intervention in Lebanon is no different from intervention in Cambodia.

28. I should like to reserve my right to speak again in the future, though I trust I shall not need to do so.

29. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The second speaker on my list is the representative of Lebanon, on whom I now call.

30. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): This morning we heard the representative of Israel repeating, as usual, some of his worn-out distortions. At least we owe him the recognition of having told the truth on one point and that is his admission that the troops of his country have in fact invaded southern Lebanon. In his delaying tactics unfortunately, supported by other members of the Security Council—to prevent quick action by the Security Council regarding the immediate withdrawal of the aggressor, that is, the Israeli troops, from Lebanon, he tried to convince the Council that according to his dispatches those forces had begun their with-

drawal from Lebanon. I owe it to the Council to state the real facts. At this stage, according to telephonic communications I had with Beirut just before entering this Chamber, the Israeli forces are still in large numbers in the region of southern Lebanon and do not show any sign of withdrawing.

31. Another distortion of the representative of Israel was the fact that the troops of his country were attacking commando regions and that they were not attacking or engaged in any action with the Lebanese army. The latest figure I have is that already five Lebanese soldiers have been killed and seven soldiers wounded in their fight to repel the aggression. The Israeli artillery has been constantly shelling the defensive positions of the Lebanese army in the region of Heyam, Marjayoun, Nabatiyye and other places.

32. However, I should like to extend to members of the Council the gratitude of my delegation for the prompt action they have taken unanimously on the resolution presented by the representative of Spain and seconded by the representative of Zambia. Now it is for the Council to judge, to see whether its authority is going to be effective, whether the Israeli troops are going to withdraw forthwith as the resolution has demanded.

33. We have always had misgivings about the Israeli tactics in this Council. At one time we described these tactics of the Israeli representative as those of a "Johnny come lately". They are already known to the members of the Council. The Israelis undertake military action and then come to the Council as if to seek its sanction. They accuse, they fabricate the pretexts; they distort the facts; they believe their own manufactured story; they take the law in their hands and carry out their sentence. They are in a way the accuser, the judge and the executioner at the same time. It follows that in international law there are two concepts and two law standards: one for the international community, for all of us, and another one for Israel—for Israel considers itself above the law of the international community.

34. When the international community, and in our case more particularly the United Nations, adopts resolutions and takes decisions against Israel, Israel unabashedly shows its contempt. This august body has witnessed many manifestations of Israel's contempt for international law and institutions. The Security Council itself has not been spared. Had Israel really had serious complaints or grievances, as its representative comes here and laments, it could have had easy access to the Council, as we have, by lodging its own complaint and not waiting until the victim of aggression had done so. But it has arrogated to itself the right of reprisals, of what is known as "the hot pursuit"—a measure not recognized by international law and morality, and least of all by this Council.

35. My colleague and brother, the representative of Morocco, very eloquently expounded on this theory a few moments ago and found an apt parallel between what has taken place in my country and what has taken

place recently in Cambodia. Israel could have benefited from international machinery to investigate its claims if they were truly founded; but it undertakes acts of aggression against Lebanon and expects the world to have faith in its pretences and approve its conduct. It has unilaterally denounced the Lebanon-Israel Armistice Agreement of 1949 and opened for itself a door—the door to violence, to attack, to murder, to death and destruction in the southern part of my country.

36. On a previous occasion my delegation stated in the Council our respect for the Armistice Agreement, which is binding on both parties to it. This view has been held very strongly by our esteemed Secretary-General. I quote from the Secretary-General's introduction to the annual report on the work of the Organization for the period 16 June 1966 to 15 June 1967, in which he said:

"There is no provision in them"—that is, the Armistice Agreements—"for unilateral termination of their application. This has been the United Nations position all along and will continue to be the position until a competent organ decides otherwise."¹

37. Strict adherence to the Armistice Agreements was strongly advocated by Israeli representatives themselves in the past. At the 433rd meeting of the Security Council, on 4 August 1949, Mr. Abba Eban, then Israel's representative at the United Nations, stated that: "The effective position, therefore, is that these Agreements have no time limit and can be altered only by agreed amendments . . .".

38. Mr. Ralph Bunche, the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs who witnessed and was instrumental in the formulation of these agreements, stated in his report to the Security Council of 21 July 1949: "Any breach of their terms"—that is, the Armistice Agreements—"would involve a most serious act of bad faith."²

39. None other than Mr. Rosenne, the Deputy Permanent Representative of Israel, in his essay entitled *Israel's Armistice Agreements with the Arab States*,³ published in 1951, came to the conclusion that the parties to the general Armistice Agreements "intended what was essentially an accord between States in armed conflict with one another, the accord taking effect within the context of the special law of the United Nations". Mr. Rosenne opined that it would be "a mistake to confuse this transiency with any contemporariness; on the contrary, the agreements themselves are agreements concluded for an indefinite duration".

40. The Secretary-General mentioned here in the Council only this morning that he had deployed efforts by proposing to both Lebanon and Israel the posting

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 1A*, para. 43.

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Supplement for August 1949*, document S/1357.

³ Tel Aviv, International Law Association, 1951.

of an adequate number of observers on both sides of the Lebanese-Israeli border or, as he calls it, the cease-fire line, in his note of 18 August 1969 [S/9393]. He was moved by the increasing seriousness of the situation in the Israeli-Lebanese sector and considered it to be his duty to propose to both the Governments concerned that United Nations observers should be stationed there in adequate numbers to observe effectively any breach of the Security Council cease-fire.

41. The Lebanese Government has informed the Secretary-General, in its letter dated 18 August 1969 [S/9393/Add.1], of its willingness to co-operate with him by strengthening the United Nations machinery within the framework of the Armistice Agreement should Israel agree to the United Nations observers resuming their function and discharging their duty. It is a known fact that Israel has refused for the last two and a half years to allow them to fulfil their mission on her side of the border. Were they there, I think the Council would have had easy access to reports from neutral observers to substantiate what the Lebanese delegation imparted to the Council this morning.

42. Another point which I should like to raise at this stage—and I should like to make it clear from the outset that it is a very important point to us—is that the agenda adopted this afternoon deals with two separate complaints: our complaint contained in document S/9794 of this morning, and the alleged Israel complaint contained in document S/9795 also of this morning. We expect the Council to deal with our complaint and decide on it separately. We have strong objections to equating them and allowing some negotiators to try to strike a just balance by placing on the same level the wicked aggressor and the victim as if they were pharmacists doling out a prescription gramme by gramme; that is to say, by counting words, letters and paragraphs to be allotted to Lebanon and those to be allotted to Israel in a so-called attempt to be fair and even-handed. This we consider to be in utter disregard for justice, equity, fairness and international law.

43. The attempt this morning to add a rider to the resolution presented by the representative of Spain was in this direction. It was intended to stop all military operations in all areas while we were dealing here with one complaint, and only one complaint, resulting from a definite, wanton, premeditated aggression launched by Israel against Lebanon, and we hope that the members of this Council will understand our position. If by the application of such formulas the intention is to save the sickly peace in the Middle East, the result would be, in our opinion, really to give it the *coup de grace*. There is a better means to save that sickly peace from dying. It is by administering to it the justice and fairness which has been denied the Arabs for a long time.

44. I said this morning that Israel was celebrating its twenty-second anniversary during the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations. Let us remember, all of us around this table, that the territories of three Member States of the United

Nations—and today the territory of a fourth—are occupied by armed forces resulting from aggression of another Member State of the United Nations, a State that owes its very existence to this Organization, to which it pledged, when it was admitted to it, respect for its Charter and its decisions.

45. That “respect” has been translated by complete disregard of all the resolutions that were passed during the last twenty years by the various organs of the United Nations regarding the Palestinian refugees, regarding the legitimate right of the Palestinian people to their homeland and to their homes. It took the form of disregard for the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly about Jerusalem, the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Human Rights Commission regarding the practices of Israel in violation of human rights and the Geneva Convention⁴ in the occupied territory—occupied militarily by force by Israel in disregard of so many resolutions of the Security Council and, in our case, in disregard of resolutions 262 (1968) of 31 December 1968 and 270 (1969) of 26 August 1969.

46. The representative of Israel always finds an excuse for the actions of his Government and the Israeli armed forces in the fact that we have Palestinian people on Lebanese territory. It is a fact; nobody denies it. We know it. We have been living with it here in the United Nations for twenty-two years. We have been discussing, on and on, the problem of the Palestinian refugees. Israel wants them to live, to breed, to vegetate in misery in their camp. It will not acquiesce to the calls of the United Nations to allow them to return to their homeland. These refugees are 300,000 human beings. They are like any one of us here, with brains, with hearts, with feelings, with ambitions, with love for their homeland, a homeland which was usurped by the Israeli aggressors.

47. I should like here at this stage—although it has already been recorded in the annals of the Security Council, in document S/9713 of 18 March 1970—to recall once more the position of the Lebanese Government regarding this matter. The proverb says that it does not matter if we repeat something because it is better understood if repeated twice. I quote from that letter, representing the official view of the Lebanese Government:

“The latest Israeli raids”—I am not speaking about today’s raid, but about previous raids; there have been many against Lebanon during the last year and a half—“against the Lebanese population have been referred to in a note from the delegate of Lebanon to the Security Council.

“Apart from and in addition to that note, and leaving aside even the most recent acts of aggression, we have another duty towards all Governments and in particular towards those who through their permanent membership of the Security Council assume even more urgently the duty of anticipating and pre-

⁴ Geneva Convention relative to the protection of civilian persons in time of war, signed on 12 August 1949 (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75 (1950), No. 973).

venting threats to security. It is important to denounce more clearly and solemnly than ever before the hypocrisy and deception of Israeli propaganda consisting of accusations and threats, the escalation of which especially in recent weeks is preparing Israel for every kind of violence"—we saw it—"and attempting to lead international opinion to regard such violence as acts of reprisal against Lebanon, because of the presence and activity of the Palestinians.

"1. If there are 300,000 Palestinians in its territory, it is not Lebanon which is responsible, but Israel, which drove that Palestinian population from its homes.

"2. If, despairing of exercising their right of return which is recognized by the international community, these refugees become, wholly or in part, combatants bearing arms in support of their cause, it is not Lebanon which is or can be responsible, but Israel, which has refused to implement the United Nations resolutions concerning *inter alia* the right of return of the Palestinians which it dispersed.

"3. It is Israel which must bear the responsibility for the 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.

"This evidence cannot but echo resoundingly in the conscience of all countries and all men of good faith. Taken as a whole, they show that Israel, in hounding the victims which it dispersed, wishes to label Lebanon as guilty of not finishing them off, in other words of not eliminating them systematically or killing them, through systematic violence, the need, pushed to the point where it becomes violence, to regain their homeland.

"Another way of presenting this same evidence and of fixing the original responsibility for the acts of resistance of which Israel is complaining would be to say that it would be sufficient for Israel itself to respect international law and United Nations resolutions, in particular those of the Security Council, in order to put an end to the disturbances on the frontier between the Lebanon and Israel and to restore throughout the whole region the only possible peace, a peace which is based on justice.

"Even now the internal law of most countries recognizes and embodies the principle whereby no one is justified in invoking his own misdeeds, in other words, *inter alia*, in deriving new rights and new justifications from the results of an injustice which he himself caused. The same principle must apply in international relations; no one can invoke as an excuse for further aggression the claimed need to defend himself against the victims of an earlier aggression which he has committed and perpetuated.

"It is also our duty to alert the Security Council to another aspect of the problem.

"Through its threats and its aggression Israel intends to compel Lebanon to force its 300,000 Palestinian refugees, 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 inside or from outside, by confronting it with the alternatives of undergoing Israeli 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.

"Confronted with this dilemma, Lebanon has already undergone seven months of political crisis whose origin can only be attributed to Israel. Today, Israel intends to push the Lebanon to every kind of violence, both along its frontiers and within its territory.

"Lebanon is a model of peaceful and fraternal coexistence among the various communities which make up the population, united in a single faith in God and mankind. It is also one of the most open countries in the world to everything human and universal.

"The significance of the harmonious synthesis which it is achieving goes beyond the frontiers of Lebanon. It represents, in fact, a solution to many problems in other countries. On the international level, it corresponds to the ultimate aspirations of all men for an era of understanding and fraternal co-operation. If because of the Palestinian drama, for which Lebanon is hardly responsible, and which *inter alia* calls in question the justice and authority of the Security Council, this human experiment which hitherto has been successful should be compromised, this would surely be a condemnation of the principles, activity and purpose of the United Nations, and in the eyes of history would constitute a real backward step for mankind.

"These words are addressed to all peoples. Lebanon urges their representatives to the United Nations and the Security Council to make the voice of conscience and reason prevail over the hypocrisy which marks Israel's propaganda. Among the members of the Security Council, this appeal is addressed in particular to the four great Powers which bear special responsibility and, even more particularly, among the great Powers, to that or those which through their conduct are allowing Israel to persist in its violence.

"While defending itself against the raids on it, which are increasing, Lebanon wishes to remind mankind and its conscience that, in accordance with the laws of inexorable justice, the blood of innocence is always visited upon those who shed it and those who wash their hands of the matter.

"Lebanon also proclaims its unshakable conviction that the justice and law to which it has bound its own destiny will take for it and will allow it to take the resounding revenge which history has always reserved for the victims of inequity."

48. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Saudi Arabia has asked to be allowed to speak. I therefore invite him to take a seat at the Council table so that he may address the Council.

49. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, I must thank you and members of the Council for allowing me to address the Council on the item before it. Before proceeding any further, I should like to say that it is indeed a privilege and an honour for me to take the floor under your chairmanship. I shall not embarrass you by praising you and your country. The admirable way in which you have been conducting the Council's meetings is more eloquent than any words of mine.

50. Yesterday we were jubilant because of the harmony and concord that prevailed in this Council when the report of the Secretary-General on Bahrain was discussed and endorsed unanimously in this chamber [1536th meeting]. It was magnanimous of our sister State, Iran, that—as its representative, none other than my good friend, Mr. Vakil told the Council—his Majesty the Shah and his Government decided to leave it to the Secretary-General to ascertain through Mr. Winspeare Guicciardi the desires and aspirations of the people of Bahrain on the basis of the right of self-determination enshrined in the Charter and reaffirmed time and again not only by covenants on human rights but by various resolutions of the General Assembly since its inception.

51. I must declare that the nobility, not merely in title but more essentially in character, of our illustrious colleague, Lord Caradon, representing an erstwhile colonial Power, was exemplary in the way he told us about the disengagement of his Government from representing Bahrain in the field of foreign affairs. Lord Caradon's Government was, like His Majesty the Shah of Iran, cognizant of the fact that Bahrain should exercise its right of self-determination. What a tragic contrast we have witnessed today in having to deal with the aggression of an artificial State which came into being by pressuring this Organization, by the partition in 1947 at Lake Success and subsequently by the recognition of that State, which has ever since usurped the homeland of the Palestinian people. What a contrast. What a shame. There was harmony and concord yesterday regarding Bahrain because the various parties who were interested in the ultimate political fate of Bahrain were brothers; whether Iranians or Arabs, they were brothers. In contrast, there is dissent and conflict today, when we have to deal with the aggression of an external element coming from eastern and central Europe, using Judaism, a noble religion, as a motivation for political and economic ends.

52. At one time I took exception to the term "neo-colonialism". I told my African and Asian colleagues that as far as I was concerned it had no content, legally or otherwise. However, when the erstwhile colonial Powers knew that their people would not be burdened by taxes to sustain colonial régimes abroad, some of the Powers had to find new machinery, new devices, to place foreign people under their yoke, more subtly,

sometimes through aid, sometimes cajoling people in the developing countries so that they might be at their command, or through economic pressure or, as in the case before us, aggression by proxy. This is a Western aggression by proxy. After the mantle of power fell on a country which, out of courtesy, I shall refrain from naming—it knows itself—it has been fighting us by proxy. What for?

53. The Khazars hailed from Europe. There is nothing wrong with being a Khazar. These Khazars became Jews in the eighth century. They are European in culture and in language. Although the language is Yiddish, it is a mixture of German and other vernaculars of the area, with a sprinkling of Hebrew. They were sent to our area because they succeeded in rail-roading the United States into the First World War in 1917. The United States had declared itself isolationist and did not join in the First World War until 1917. They sold our people down the Thames river and in 1947 down the Potomac river. These strangers remind me of the Crusaders, who were a foreign element in our midst. They were not Jews; they were Christians. There was a divergence in the eleventh century on account of the awakening of the vassals of the Pope, who in those days exercised religious and temporal power over Europe. Peter the Hermit was the propagandist and hordes from Europe marched into the Middle East, allegedly to wrest the Holy Sepulchre from the hands of the infidel. Who was the infidel? The indigenous people of Palestine who were Christians and Moslems and who believed in Christ. This is a repetition, a crusade of the twentieth century initiated by Western Powers, the Anglo-Saxon pair, as my friend said. I look their representatives in the face and feel sorry for them, because they are good friends of mine. What have we done to those Anglo-Saxons all those years? We opened our doors and our trade to them. What have we done to them that they should allow Israel, the usurping State, to exercise that proxy?

54. I have heard Mr. Tekoah time and again say: "You Arab States, suppress those Palestinians, and everything will be all right." I have been telling this Council since 1965, even before the conflict of 1967: "First of all, no Arab State wants to suppress the Palestinians who are fighting for their homeland." And if any one of those Arab States or Governments were to suppress the Palestinians, not only would the Palestinians make short shrift of the Governments, but also the people who have been galvanized from Morocco, from the shores of the Atlantic, to the confines of Iran, down to the Sudan and the Arabian peninsula—all the people are behind those so-called terrorists who are nothing but fighters seeking to liberate their country from the Khazars that hailed from Eastern Europe, as a proxy in order allegedly to defend certain economic and strategic interests.

55. Sanctuaries of those freedom fighters or terrorists as they are called by Israel, exist in those countries that are contiguous with Israel, namely, the four States of the United Arab Republic, Jordan, Syria and Lebanon. Really, Sir, to be frank with you and my

colleagues, I do not know whether there is a new style in international relations or in approaches towards solving certain problems. Those sanctuaries remind me that only a few days ago—was it ten days ago or so—a big nation declared that there were sanctuaries in Cambodia and it went in to clean out the people who were fighting from that part of the world. I do not know who apes who—whether a big nation apes a small nation or that small proxy nation apes the big nation. I have to find out. There is such close interrelation that having been here twenty-five years I am still sometimes confused whether the United States is a client of Israel or Israel is a client of the United States. I have not yet discovered how it is. Maybe they are clients of each other, I do not know.

56. But do not think that there is only an American youth that has awakened. There is an Israeli youth that has awakened. And I substantiate what I am saying to put things in their own perspective.

57. *The New York Times* or the *New York Post*, for reasons of their own, do not publish such interviews, but a small paper called the *Village Voice* has the courage to publish what at least some of the youth of Israel think. The *Village Voice* has a modest circulation and because it has a modest circulation, I find that it is my duty to familiarize this august body with the contents of that interview which reflects the youth of Israel. I will not read all of it, it is too long; but I will give you the gist of it, and let nobody say that Baroody is reading out of context. The interview will be open to anyone who would like to consult it. I will be happy to send a copy to anyone who would like to consult it, or they can subscribe or buy the issue from the *Village Voice*. It was published on 16 April 1970. The interviewer, or the one who inserted the interview, was Michael Zwerin—it sounds like a Jewish name, but there are some good Jews around who are not Zionists. We have no quarrel with the Jews as such. We have said that time and again, just as our friend here, Mr. Malik, Mr. Federenko before him and Mr. Vishinsky, have cited many illustrious Jews in the Soviet Union. They are pillars of the Soviet Union. They have no quarrel with Jews. We have no quarrel with Jews. We have quarrels with political Zionism—not even with spiritual Zionism: spiritual Zionism is something of the conscience.

58. A certain Mr. Oded Pilavsky—now, Mr. Tekoah, do not go and try to hunt him down and muzzle him, because the Arabs who are living in that State are not allowed to know what he says. He is only allowed to publicize what he wants in his inner circle. This is part of what he said in answer to the question: “What is it you would like to see happen in Israel? What are you fighting for?” Here is his reply in part: “There are problems of a nationalistic nature; we have them up to here. But we try to fix solutions on social grounds. So that when we say that the way to peace is through the recognition of the right of self-determination of the people, we mean the Palestinian Arab people and the Jewish Israeli people.”

59. The interviewer asked him: “Do you support el Fatah?” “No. I can sympathize with them from only one point of view . . . they are oppressed.” Then he is asked: “But Israel is at war. People ask me, ‘What would you do if someone was threatening your children!’ They asked this young gentleman, who is incidentally about thirty-eight, he is a little old for the rebellious youth all over the world, but I think he still has in him the spirit of youth. “But we are threatening their children, too”—that is what he said—“But we are threatening their children too”—meaning the Arab children. “This is a fact . . . a fact for fifty or sixty years. I was born here in 1932. And I was educated in the Zionist system of education . . . It is a fact of history that the Zionist State in Palestine was built on the ground of another nation.”

60. Who can refute that? The Security Council? Or the General Assembly that was fixed—and I was sitting in 1947 at Lake Success—to obtain the votes for creating that usurping State. I repeat that “the Zionist State in Palestine was built on the ground of another nation”—by pushing another nation out. A question of self-determination, pure and simple.

61. Then they asked him about labour conditions: “Do Arab workers have equal rights with Jews?”—meaning inside the State. His reply was—and I shall not read everything, because this is a long interview; I shall read merely the points relevant to self-determination and to the human dignity of the individual and to the question of discrimination—and the reply of this young gentleman was: “When there is recession, it is much worse for Arabs; they will be unemployed faster. Buy, you know, a human being does not live on wages alone.”

62. Another question: “Are you saying Israel is racist?” “It is.” That is what this gentleman said. “And it will get worse and worse, because the Jewish people were for many years very oppressed in Europe.” Thank God he does not say “in Asia”, because we never oppressed the Jews in Asia; the Jews in Asia were amongst the most illustrious Arabs in my part of the world. Look at Maimonides. I can cite many Jews. Just as there are now distinguished Jews in the Soviet Union, we had distinguished Jews. We did not call them Jews; we called them Arabs and they wrote in Arabic.

63. And, incidentally, for Mr. Tekoah’s information—because he hails from Shanghai, but he must have read the books—even the Jews when they were in Palestine spoke Aramaic, which is the Syriac language; they did not speak Hebrew. Did you know that? They did not speak Hebrew. Incidentally, Christ spoke Aramaic. You still have a couple of villages in Syria where they speak the same language, and they profaned the Syrians. The language of Jesus was renounced by the Western world—leave aside the theological part. They renounced Him too as a moral teacher. On Sunday they go to church and pray, and on Monday they begin to cut one another’s throats. Why should they not cut your throat and my throat? They are Christians. Shame. Hypocrites. Why?

64. I substantiate. You think that Jesus, according to the New Testament, was sold for thirty pieces of silver? Here. Look at this large advertisement. It is easy; you do not have to do any research; we provide you with the research: *The New York Times* advertisement: "A Christian response to Arab Terrorism". Look: in *The New York Times* on Friday, 8 May 1970.
65. Nobody raised his voice in advertisements like this in *The New York Times* when Deir Yassin was obliterated. And who are these people? Jews? No, the Jews have much more sense. They are ministers, priests, bishops. What do they know about Palestine? I do not know whether the Zionists gave them some Bibles, or built them an extension to their churches, the Iscariots. Poor Iscariot: I feel sorry for him—thirty pieces of silver. I do not know how much these people are receiving; there are so many of them listed in all this small print that I shall not read all their names as it would take half an hour and, as usual, they say, "To be continued". They are collecting money, these Christians here, in order to suppress us. They are collecting money.
66. By what have the Zionists bribed them? By what have they brainwashed them? By what have they convinced them? By what have they persuaded them? What do they know about the Holy Land, except, perhaps, from reading the Bible? Fundamentalists? Some of them are not fundamentalists. I looked into their past history. What is behind this advertisement? Why do they sell the indigenous people of Palestine? I do not know whether it was with silver, gold, or eroded, inflated dollars. In inflated dollars the price goes higher, as we all know.
67. The whole of Christendom, when the three astronauts were in danger, went to the churches and prayed. Men of religion prayed—and do not think that they were only Christians: some of us Moslems also prayed; we prayed that they should return to their fathers and mothers and their wives and children. They were young; they were human beings, three astronauts. Of course, going to the moon fires the imagination—and rightly so—people; but because the lives of these astronauts were endangered, prayers were offered in churches. Even His Holiness—and rightly so—prayed for their safe return. Mr. Nixon left the affairs of State and travelled to the South Pacific and we all commended him for his humanity—that he thought of the worth of the person and of human dignity.
68. But when the Arabs were terrorized during the days of the Mandate, between 1920 and 1939, and when we recall to our friends here what happened to the indigenous people of Palestine, nobody says anything. Oh, the Russians have an interest in us. Of course they have an interest in the Middle East. Why should they not have an interest? After all, they are only five or six hundred miles from the area; it is only human for them to have an interest. Brother and brother have interests between themselves; interests bind people. Oh, beware of communism. I am a monarchist; I am very wary of communism. It has nothing to do with communism; that phobia does not work any more. Russia is a big State, and it probably would like to trade in the future and extend its relations with the Arabs and it is doing so successfully. And they frighten us. Now, this bogey does not frighten us any more; it is an artificial fear.
69. My good friend our peace-loving Secretary-General, whom we all admire and hold in high esteem for his dedication to world peace, cannot of course articulate this and say it with me, but I believe all of you, including the Secretary-General—because it is our Organization, and we have a right to pronounce our fears—would agree that this Organization has become a shadow of what it was meant to be in 1945. I witnessed the signing of the Charter; I am not talking through my hat.
70. I still remember the signing on 26 June 1945 at San Francisco when the war was not yet over. Most people then had high hopes that our respective national interests would be subordinated and that the Charter would transcend spheres of influence—gradually perhaps, not overnight—and power politics. But what do we find today? We find fear of a confrontation of two major Powers in the Middle East and South-East Asia—not so much in South-East Asia. I think the Chinese are wise; they are biding their time there.
71. What do you find in my area? The United States claims that it has interests there. We never said that we want to work against their economic interests. In fact, they are, economically speaking, the preponderantly interested Power. Why should they treat us like this? What have we done to the United States? I am talking of the Arab world. We have opened our doors to them. We respected them. We admired them. Not so much now, but in the past the people admired them for their ideals. Now the people, I am sorry to say, tell you that at one time they thought, "God in the heavens and the Americans on earth". Now if you talk to the Arab people—I talked to them last summer, as I go on fact-finding trips every year—those who liked the United States will say, as they told me, "God in the heavens, yes, but the devil incarnate is the United States". It pains us because we do not want to spoil our relations with the United States. We do not want to spoil our relations with the Soviet Union or with any Power. We are a peaceful people. We may bicker among one another, the Arab States, like members of a family will bicker; but when it comes to that extraneous element which caused an abscess in the body politic and the body social of the Arab world, we cannot but have a fever. A foreign element in the body politic and the body social causes a fever. It is an abscess. It is not because they are Jews. It is because they have a different culture, a different way of life, like all those invaders who came to our area from Alexander the Great downward to the time of the mandates. Luckily for us the mandatory Powers left in peace, and we have excellent relations with them. But the mantle of power subsequently fell on those whom we had admired greatly, none other than the United States, and what are they doing now? They are espousing the cause of Israel. I have heard that Mr. Abba Eban will be here by way of Canada two

days from now to ask for more Phantoms. What are you going to use against the Arabs, the sling of King David? They should use the sling of King David. But they do not; they use the most sophisticated weapons to kill our Palestinian and other brothers. Millions have been spent—I do not say in what currency—to suppress those who are fighting to retrieve their homeland. I warned this Council—I have warned it in the past and today I warn it again—that no Arab dares to suppress the Palestinians in the Arab world. No one dares to suppress them—not even Arab Governments. The people would see to it that those Arabs who tried to suppress them would be trampled underfoot or would be shot like birds.

72. What do you opt for, our friends from the United States? Do you want anarchy? Do you want revolution? Do you want upheaval? Will your interests be secured and preserved if there is anarchy, if there is upheaval, if there is turmoil, if there is conflict in the Arab world? Well, the might of Israel is so great that 10 per cent of 3 per cent—how did I come to those statistics? I have been living here for a long time. The United States has only 3 per cent of the Jewish faith and only 10 per cent of that 3 per cent are active Zionists—that 10 per cent of 3 per cent want to dominate the American political scene and I am afraid that they have to a large extent dominated the American political scene. How do I know? Well, I am only making use of recent documents. One does not have to do the same research as that done when we were talking about the historical argument of past Jewish association with Palestine or about the fait accompli.

73. Those questions are now behind us. But here in this month of May, I again turn to *The New York Times*, the illustrious *New York Times*, that only prints the news that is fit to print. This is another advertisement from *The New York Times*. I do not know how much it costs. It used to be \$5,000 per page. A friend of mine used to insert advertisements. Now it must be \$20,000 per page. I do not know. *The New York Times*, Monday 4 May—this current month of May shows the title of an advertisement in bold letters, "You don't have to be Jewish to care". Here is the advertisement, with not a single Jewish name. In the subway—if any of you still use the subway—they advertise so-called Jewish bread. Have you ever heard of Jewish bread? "You don't have to be Jewish to enjoy it". One day they put in the advertisement the picture of a Chinese and on another day they put that of a Russian. I have not yet seen the picture of an Arab enjoying that bread. You don't have to be Jewish to enjoy that Jewish bread, as though bread has a nationality and a religion too. Look at those mass media of information, at Madison Avenue, at the crooks who sell you anything. I am not talking about news. They sell news but they are more subtle about it and affect the subliminal mind. That is another question. We worked here, Sir—maybe you recall, but it was before you were here—between 1949 and 1951 on the draft convention on freedom of information. It is all in the record, information concerning advertising affecting the subliminal mind of man. That is advertising: "You don't have to be Jewish to care".

74. Who are the honorary chairmen? Thomas E. Dewey, the erstwhile presidential candidate of the Republican Party. I recall—and you would be amused, Mr. President, I do not know where you were then—that when Mr. Truman was campaigning for the presidency after the tenure of his first term had finished, there was a campaign in 1946; I was in this country and he said that 100,000 immigrants should be admitted into Palestine from Europe, a hundred thousand. And Mr. Dewey, in campaigning, said: "What, a hundred thousand—several hundred thousand." You see, it was an auction, who could get more votes, Mr. Truman or Mr. Dewey. Mr. Truman was perhaps more of a wheeler-dealer and he got the votes.

75. The second one on the list is the illustrious Mr. John V. Lindsay. I hope those workers will not hit him on the head with a stone down in Wall Street. Then there is Mr. Nelson A. Rockefeller. There are two groups. Our friend David Rockefeller pushes one and Nelson Rockefeller pushes the other. One is certainly pro-Israeli, and one, they say, is allegedly pro-Arab. I do not know, I am lost.

76. Then we have Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. and Robert F. Wagner, the politicians. Another name is Lucius D. Clay. I have marked them here. Look at it. These are not Jews. Accordingly, you do not have to be Jewish to care. The next name is James A. Farley. I think he is from Coca Cola. Has Coca Cola gone to the Soviet Union, or not yet? Other names are Charles F. Luce, Bill Moyers—it strikes me that he was in the Kennedy administration—and Eugene Nickerson—he is a small fry William S. Paley, and this Greek who reminds me of the Vice-President, Spyros P. Skouras. It says "Committee in formation", as if it is not large enough. And they lent their names. There are a few missionaries who went to our part of the world and who come and shed crocodile tears to us. They say: "Oh, our sympathy is with you; those American figures are misled".

77. Some Americans here formed The American Friends of the Middle East. I never went to their luncheons, and some of my friends who were members of The American Friends of the Middle East asked me: "Baroody, all your Arab colleagues come and attend our luncheons. We do not see you. Why?" I said: "You do not have to profess as individuals your friendship to us. We know you. Some of you represented your Government very well in the Arab world and we like you as persons. But why do you want to profess your friendship? Instead of professing your friendship collectively, go to your Government and open its eyes to the fact that you are alienating the Arab people and espousing the cause of an element that came from Eastern Europe and is lording it in Palestine."

78. I never went to their luncheons. Finally we found out something; thanks to this great country, the United States, which is still great—not in might; we do not care about might. In our area only God or the designer

of the universe or the forces of nature are mighty. Who is man? A shadow on this earth, a grain of sand on the shore of eternity. Who is man? That constipated biped who needs to be psychoanalysed nowadays when he does not go to the priest to confess. That was easier and cheaper. Who is man? What did they do, those Friends of the Middle East? They were subsidized by the so-called CIA. What is it, the Central Intelligence Agency? There are so many abbreviations. They sell us a bill of goods, and some of them, in fairness to the members, did not know that they were financed by the CIA. They could not see me any more. Perhaps they were happy that I did not go to their luncheons.

79. Whom are we fooling around here? Baroody talks long. He takes his time. What have we got except words, people like myself who represent an Arab State which has no power to exercise? Even representatives of big Powers like France, like the USSR, like the United States and the United Kingdom seem to be paralysed by this Zionist movement. What can we do except talk? This is our stock in trade, hoping that the mass media of information will let my voice be heard by the American people. But the Zionists try to interfere with that. They would not give me coverage because they are afraid that the American people will learn the truth. The American people know nothing about the truth.

80. Recently somebody used the words "Silent majority". How do I know what the silent majority is thinking? We are of the articulate minority. Perhaps one day the silent majority will listen to the articulate minority. What other recourse have we but words? Baroody talks. I talk frankly, sometimes perhaps rudely, but frankly. The truth wounds. Far be it from me to put salt on the wounds of my friends, but we have no other recourse except to tell the truth as we see it.

81. We stand to be corrected if we are wrong about self-determination, about the population of Palestine which in 1919 constituted 94 per cent of the population, and which in 1945 was still more than two thirds of the population. When they talk about self-determination, whom do they think they are fooling? This is a new crusade, and the Arab people have to suffer until those who are there are either assimilated in time or accept, like this youthful gentleman from Israel whom I have cited, a state of affairs whereby the Jews will forget their political Zionism and the Arabs will not be intensely nationalistic, and where they will live side by side as people who revere the memory of Christ, of the Jewish Prophets and also of the Prophet Mohammed.

82. The three monotheistic religions are there, had their roots there in Palestine. The Jews have no monopoly on it. The land belongs to the indigenous people, whether they be Arabs, or whoever they may be, and no external people from outside can lord it over us. You try to kill us, we Arabs. Try to kill us. We are 110 million. I would not like to see any Jew or Gentile hurt. I would be sad if I saw all this happen because it would mostly be the innocent who would

suffer. We Arabs can afford to lose 20 million, 30 million. We are very prolific, incidentally. We do not have to use those birth control pills yet.

83. So what? The Zionists might involve you, Sir—not you personally, Mr. President but all of you—in a world war because they have the mass media of information at their behest and command in many Western countries. I do not know about the Soviet Union. I do not read Russian. Is Lebanon now the Cambodia of the Middle East? Is it a sanctuary for the people who are fighting for their self-determination?

84. Many have told us here, and repeatedly: "Never mind now, this is a fait accompli. Try to adjust yourself, you Arabs, to the situation, and if you do not make peace with Israel at least face the facts that the Zionists are there." This argument is not accepted by the people who were usurped of their homeland. What shall we do with them? Argue with them? Even if we were to argue with them, we would get nowhere with them—I mean the Palestinian people.

85. If we look into this in retrospect, I said that this country—the United States, the host country—was railroaded into the First World War to a large extent, by the efforts of the American Zionists with whom the Zionists in the United Kingdom during the Second World War communicated. Those American Zionists met at the Savoy Plaza, which was demolished a few years ago, on its site is the General Motors Building, I have known some of those people who attended the conference of those American Zionists. They succeeded in railroading this host country into the First World War in spite of the fact that it was isolationist.

86. Then there was a quarrel in Europe during the Second World War amongst the Allies and the Germans. I recall the late Mr. Roosevelt saying in this country: "Again, and again, and again I promise you that I will not send our boys to perish on foreign battlefields." But just as Mr. Wilson during the First World War began as an isolationist and had his hand finally forced to go into the First World War, so the Zionists unfortunately succeeded in enlisting the Government of this country to enter the Second World War. Why? Because they made sure of succeeding as they had done before. Can we not draw any lessons that the Zionists might yet succeed in pushing the whole world into a third world war? This is a serious matter for us all to ponder.

87. Now our British friends would like to forget the Balfour Declaration. This Balfour: had he a power of attorney from God? Was he so sacrilegious as to give those Eastern European Jews, converts into Judaism in the eighth century, a right to Palestine? He had a vast empire. Why did he not give part of it to them. And Mr. Truman, hailing from the Middle West, was a very good haberdasher with this Mr. Jacobson or Jacobs, whatever his name was, and they admitted Mr. Weizmann—all this is written in Mr. Truman's memoirs—through the back door of the White House and concocted this State which has usurped the Arab world, the Palestinians.

88. I am afraid there might be confrontation among the great Powers through miscalculation. No doubt the wisdom of the American people—especially the youth whom I salute—and the wisdom of the young in the Soviet Union will prevail so that there may be no confrontation. But let us not be too sure; the stakes are high. Why do they not leave Asia alone—both sides of Asia? Do you want to contain Asia? Six per cent, my dear friend, Mr. Buffum: you constitute 6 per cent of the population of the world. Mr. Malik's State constitutes 7 1/2 per cent, but Mr. Malik's country or Government is not trying to contain Asia. Why try to contain Asia? Asia is a big giant—somebody mentioned a giant the other day in a speech—it is a physical giant and also a moral giant. You cannot contain Asia, in South-East Asia or in the Middle East. You will become bankrupt soon if you try to police the world.

89. But why should we Arabs pay the price just because those Zionists have the means to brainwash certain Western peoples? I feel very apprehensive about some Jews who are friends of mine; they might become the scapegoats if things go wrong in the Western world. Was Germany part of the Western world or not? When things went wrong in Germany, economically speaking, they said: "The Jews are at the root of all our ills"—which was not true. The Jews were not at the root of their ills; it was the Versailles Treaty that was at the root of their ills, and Mr. Clemenceau and Mr. Lloyd George who incorporated part of the German people in Czechoslovakia and carved a corridor separating Danzig. Instead of the great Powers learning from the First World War the lessons of this, what did they do? They partitioned Berlin into four zones; they partitioned Germany; they partitioned Korea; they partitioned Viet-Nam and they created in our midst an artificial State from outside.

90. You ask why we should have trouble? Is it any wonder that this United Nations is paralysed? These are herculean problems that cannot be settled by us diplomats because those who are behind us have special arrangements and special treaties and relations of expediency. There might be confrontation one day.

91. We talk of Hitler. Many still malign Hitler. No doubt Hitler was a sort of a tyrant, but there were other tyrants. The Germans were not war criminals. There are many war criminals amongst the victor States. Nobody brought them to task. Those who destroyed Dresden and those who destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki got off scot-free. Why? Because they were the victors. What did Hitler do in Lidice, I asked my erstwhile Czech colleague in the General Assembly about twenty years ago. He told me: "They rounded up for retaliation the able-bodied men—nobody under eighteen or maybe twenty, and nobody above fifty—and shot them. They also spared the women and the children." What is happening in this world today? Poor Hitler. What is happening? What is happening in South-East Asia when, by push-button, cities, civilians, are erased, when poor soldiers have been driven mad in an unjust war and go and kill right and left? What did Hitler do in comparison?

Israel, the usurping State set the tone of its policy in Deir Yassin and, Joshua-style, killed the men, the women, the children, the animals, cut off the trees. This is the European way of doing things—the brutal European way—and, of course, imperialism.

92. And now Mr. Tekoah comes today and, as usual in his sonorous voice, tries to rationalize why they are attacking Lebanon. And he talks about twenty-two settlements and villages that had been allegedly aggressed upon inside so-called Israel by people from across the border in Lebanon. But he forgot that it was Palestinian land. He forgot that altogether. He forgot that the Israelis, the Zionists, hanged British "Tommies"—I was in the area in those days—British "Tommies" from the mandatory Power, they hanged them from the trees. There was the King David Hotel; they blew it up. They were the precursors of blowing things up. That was in the twenties and thirties, when I was a young man; I was not born yesterday. They used terror against Britain, the mandatory Power that promised them a national home. And now violence breeds violence and the Palestinians are using the same violence.

93. It is deplorable, but how can the Palestinians fight in an open battlefield, when this country, the United States, provides Israel with the most sophisticated weapons, including Phantoms? We Arabs cannot fight the United States. The United States is fighting us by proxy. Why should the GIs go to Palestine and fight us Arabs? They can do it through their agents, their clients.

94. What have we done to the United States? We like the United States. We are constantly trying to improve our relations with the United States, and the more we do so the more the United States opts for Israel. Their representatives come here to the Council and argue about procedure, with this skilful gentleman here—Mr. Malik whom I have known since 1948. I smile. My good friend Mr. Malik argues with Lord Caradon and my other good friend Mr. Yost—together, the pair. He called their bluff. Mr. Malik is an old hand. What is wrong with being an old hand? I am an old hand too.

95. No money spent there will suppress the *fedayeen*, the freedom fighters. Israel is, unfortunately for her, a beleaguered State, and it reminds me of those fortresses—I do not know if you have made a trip to the Middle East—the fortresses built by the Crusaders, where the tourists visit from all over the world.

96. In Northern Arabia we have a tribe called the Sulbiah tribe, the tribe of the Cross. They do not know a word of Arabic or French or any European language. We assimilated them—not in Saudi Arabia; there was no Saudi Arabia then. These remnants of the Crusades found refuge among the hospitable Arab tribes and became Arabs. They do not know a word of French or English. Richard the Lionhearted pledged to Saladin twice that he would not fight and twice he broke his pledge. With the Arab magnanimity of those days, he let him go free. He did not hang him as they hanged

people at Nuremberg. He did not decapitate him, or do to him what they did to Yamashita in Japan.

97. No magnanimity. Well, this is not strange because Europe is only recent. It has a comparatively recent history and culture, but we Asians go back to 4,000 BC. We imbibed a little culture of the spirit because of our suffering throughout the millenia.

98. In fairness to my friends around this table, I must bring this statement of mine to a close, with one last warning: that Asia will no longer accept the domination of anyone from outside—whether it is in South-East Asia or in the Middle East. And if the international community, the States that constitute this Organization, do not heed my warning it will not be too long before not only the United Nations founders, like the League of Nations before it, but the whole world may blow up and no one will be left to tell the tale.

99. However, I must say that it would indeed be ludicrous for us to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of this Organization at San Francisco and engage in ceremonies. I have not yet decided whether I will go or not. His Majesty left the choice to me. I was at San Francisco in 1945 with His Majesty the King. But what are we going to celebrate this year—the aggression against the Asian continent? What a sad commentary on making justice the central theme of our Charter—the disillusionment of the world, to which the United Nations is unfortunately becoming a laughing stock. I am talking as one who has been involved with this Organization since its inception. I am committed to the United Nations and hope to remain committed until I die.

100. There is only one hope left. Our hope resides in the youth of the world, including the youth of Israel, which has awakened and which will not be at the behest and command of the old fogies of my generation, the cheap politicians. This is the only salvation that remains for us. It remains to be seen whether wise men will direct their affairs of state in consonance with the principles of the United Nations.

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

102. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): Following my rather instructive experience at this morning's session, when I asked for the floor to make a brief remark, I cannot but express my sincere admiration for the patience of the Security Council—most profoundly impressive patience displayed this afternoon in listening to representatives of Member States.

103. My delegation has taken note of the fact that the Security Council has already adopted a text which is one-sided and ignores the facts. At this morning's meeting, I drew the Security Council's attention to this, but the Council has chosen to disregard it. The resolution has little relevance to the situation and simply underlines Israel's difficulties in getting a fair hearing at this table.

104. While the text adopted is irrelevant, there is ominous relevance to the situation in the non-adoption by the Council of the call for an immediate cessation of all military operations in the area.

105. Once again the Security Council has addressed itself to Israel only. Even though Israel had already announced that its forces were deploying to leave Lebanese territory, the Security Council thought it appropriate to go through the motion of calling on Israel to do something it was already doing in any case.

106. The Council has refused, however, to call even in general terms for a cessation of all military operations in the area, a call which would have encouraged us in the hope that Lebanon and other Arab States would put an end to the acts of aggression against Israel that are being perpetrated in violation of the cease-fire and the United Nations Charter. My delegation believes that this development must not go unnoticed and that those interested in peace in the Middle East will give it serious thought.

107. In this ominous development the representative of Lebanon will also find an eloquent reply to his alleged surprise that Israel finds it futile to initiate debates in the Security Council on the Middle East situation.

108. As for his attempt to question the statement of the spokesman of the Israel Defence Forces that Israeli troops have completed their combing operation and are deploying to leave the area, I should like to observe that it is already night in the region and that the Israeli forces which are still on Lebanese soil are refraining from moving during the night in order to avoid shooting incidents in the darkness that might involve civilians. The operation was directed against the terror organization and the terror bases and the Israeli forces intend to avert civilian involvement.

109. The Lebanese representative has again tried to create the impression that the Israeli mission was directed against the Lebanese army. I would simply say to Ambassador Ghorra: the Lebanese army knows better.

110. The nature and scope of the operation will become clear from the following first report of its results:

“In the Habariya Village eleven structures occupied by the terror organizations were demolished; a bunker containing Katyusha-launchers, Katyusha rockets, small-arms, machine-guns, sabotage equipment was demolished. Two jeeps belonging to the saboteurs and three other vehicles containing arms and ammunition were blown up. Two heavy anti-aircraft machine-guns and other equipment were seized.

“In the Kafar Hamam Village eleven structures were demolished. These served as equipment stores and living quarters for the terror squads. Two vehicles loaded with ammunition and one jeep with a recoilless gun belonging to the saboteurs were

destroyed. Six members of the terror organizations were captured, while four were killed. Quantities of arms and ammunition were seized.

"At Rashiya el Fahar two structures in which ammunition of the terror organizations was stored were blown up. An A/A position containing a 4-barrel machine-gun, two rifles and two bazookas were destroyed. A Land Rover ambulance belonging to the saboteurs was seized.

"At Shuba Village fifteen structures were destroyed of which nine served as living quarters for the saboteurs and the others belonged to persons assisting them. Two vehicles of the saboteurs were destroyed. One member of the terror organization was killed."

111. The representative of Lebanon has once more sought to defend aggression from Lebanese territory against Israel by reference to the presence of refugees in Lebanon. Israel is not the only one to dismiss this pretext completely. Lebanese leaders themselves have publicly condemned it. Thus the Middle East News Agency reports on 30 March 1970 that Mr. Jumail, the leader of the Christian Phalanges Party, declared that his party was opposed to the *fedayeen* activities carried out from Lebanon.

112. Saut-el Uruba of Beirut reported on 4 September 1969 that Mr. Raymond Eddé, leader of the National Bloc, attacked the *fedayeen* organizations since they were aiming at the "Jordanization" of Lebanon and he expressed total rejection of the presence of *fedayeen* on Lebanese soil. Would it not be wise to heed these counsels which can in no way be charged with being pro-Israeli?

113. Finally, we have heard much about Lebanon's peaceful nature. We in Israel are prepared to give Lebanon the benefit of the doubt. We still hope that Lebanon will terminate the use of its territory as a base for armed attacks against us. However, we still remember the declaration made in this very Council by Lebanon's Minister for Foreign Affairs on 30 May 1967. Mr. Hakim said:

"Look at your maps, gentlemen; examine them carefully. The Arab world extends from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean. It occupies a vast territory with immense oil resources. Its strategic location is well known. It is inhabited by one hundred million people. Countless more millions support them. In a total war the Arabs will use all means to defeat their enemy . . . In such a war, the Arabs would distinguish their friends from their enemies. The interests in the Arab world of those who would become their enemies would be completely eliminated. It would be a long war, with no cease-fire until final victory. No one can foresee the consequences, no one can foresee the dangers to world peace." [1344th meeting, para. 21.]

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of peaceful, innocent Lebanon.

114. Eight months later on 16 February 1968 we find the Prime Minister of Lebanon, Al-Yaffi, stating in the Lebanese Parliament: "Lebanon is in a state of war with Israel".

115. It seems that Lebanese policy has been guided recently more by these statements than by the professions of innocence the representative of Lebanon has produced for the sake of the present debate. In fact it is not difficult for Lebanon to prove its good faith. All it has to do is to terminate the violations of the cease-fire that are being perpetrated from its territory, to return the Israeli citizens recently kidnapped by raiders from Lebanon and to agree to peace with Israel.

116. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): Today the Security Council was called upon to hold an urgent meeting by the representative of Lebanon in his letter dated today, in which he informed us:

"Israeli armoured and infantry units in large proportions have penetrated Lebanese territory. Israeli air force and artillery are at this time bombarding several towns and villages." [S/9794.]

117. In the discussions that ensued afterwards, and while the representative of Spain submitted his draft resolution which was seconded by the representative of Zambia, the delaying tactics resorted to by the Israeli representative, together with the United States-United Kingdom duo, resulted in the failure of those delaying tactics and the resolution, which was adopted unanimously by the Security Council at 1.30 p.m., reads as follows:

"The Security Council,

"Demands the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli armed forces from all Lebanese territory."
[Resolution 269 (1970).]

That is the decision of the Security Council in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter which states:

"The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter."

118. We listened to the representative of Israel and his communiqué about the capture of so many *fedayeen* and arms. I am sure that those of us who listened to the news on CBS or NBC or ABC at 7 p.m. would have heard a similar United States communiqué about what the United States Army has done inside Cambodia. The pattern is the same; the argument is the same; the fallacy is the same; the sophistry is the same.

119. Now we have heard from the mouth of the Israeli representative himself that the attacking and occupying Israeli Army inside Lebanon cannot withdraw because of the darkness. However, you will recall, Mr. President, that you were called very early in the morning by the representative of Lebanon, and the attack on Lebanon started last night. It was 3 or 4 a.m. So the darkness last night did not prevent the Israeli aggressors from perpetrating their attack on Lebanon, but now the night is preventing them from withdrawing. This is the pattern of Israeli logic.

120. I insist that this resolution, adopted unanimously by the Security Council, is a decision of the Security Council, and the Israeli representative has to declare here and now that he abides by it. In the event of failure to do so, I cannot but repeat what I have already quoted in my last intervention at this afternoon's meeting—the last sentence of Article 40 of the Charter which reads:

“The Security Council shall duly take account of failure to comply with such provisional measures.”

121. A provisional measure has been adopted. The Israeli representative did not abide by it, and his Government has denied it. He said it was one-sided. It was adopted unanimously by the Security Council, including those who were using delaying tactics, and by that I mean the United States and the United Kingdom.

122. The second point is this. Mr. President, when you opened the meeting this morning we heard a report from the Secretary-General, coming from UNTSO in Lebanon. My delegation would ask whether the Secretary-General has received further reports. If he has, I am sure the Council would appreciate hearing them. In the event that he has not, we would request that reports from UNTSO be communicated to us at tomorrow's meeting.

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

124. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): It is interesting to find Syria coming to the support of Lebanon in its complaint before the Security Council. In *The New York Times* of 9 March, for instance, we read the following report from Beirut:

“Syria warned today that she would act ‘strongly and firmly’ against ‘any attempts to suppress the Palestinian commando movement’.

“The warning made by President Nureddin el-Atassi appeared to have been indirectly aimed at Lebanon.

“During the crisis between the Lebanese Government and the guerillas last October”—that is, October 1969—“Syria, in support of the guerrillas, closed her border with Lebanon.”

125. Of all the Arab States waging war against Israel in violation of the United Nations Charter, Syria is the most extreme. Of all members of the Security Council, Syria is the last one to be entitled to speak in the interest of peace. Syria has rejected peace. It has rejected Security Council resolution 242 (1967), calling for the establishment of a just and lasting peace with Israel. It has refused Ambassador Jarring's peace mission. It has made war the principal instrument of its policy in the region.

126. In a joint Syrian-Algerian communiqué issued on 6 February 1970, President el-Atassi joined President Boumedienne of Algeria in declaring *inter alia*:

“The two delegations agreed on regarding armed struggle as the only way open to the Arab nation. Hence the Arab nation must mobilize all its economic, military and manpower resources and capabilities for the battle of destiny. The two delegations believe that the plans put forward for solving the so-called Middle East crisis on the basis of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 would definitely lead to the liquidation of the Palestine question and the vindication of aggression, and therefore the two sides announced their firm rejection of all these plans and reaffirmed that armed struggle was the only way.”

127. These views and this policy deprive Syria of any right to give counsel on the present state of the Middle East conflict—not to speak of the travesty of law and justice resulting from Syria's membership of the Security Council.

128. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): The irrelevance of the remarks made by the representative of Israel, which reflect his utter bankruptcy regarding the points I raised, is as dark as the darkness of the night which prevents the Israeli Army from withdrawing from the territory of Lebanon.

129. The gimmicks used by the Israeli representative in bringing side issues into the debate are already well known to the members of the Council. The election of Syria to the Security Council has absolutely nothing to do with the agenda that was adopted today.

130. The peaceful intentions of Syria cannot be refuted by the claims of someone who as a criminal should be before the bar of justice but who, as in Dante's purgatory, sits here and has the freedom to speak. He spoke about Syria's rejection of resolution 242 (1967). What about resolution 235 (1967), adopted at 2 p.m. on 9 June 1967, demanding that Israel should cease hostilities forthwith? Because of the tactics of Lord Caradon, who was at that time sitting on my right—and I am sure he remembers—the Israeli army was able to occupy the Golan Heights, in spite of the fact that both Syria and Israel had accepted the cease-fire. Then another resolution, 236 (1967), was adopted on 11 June, paragraph 4 of which states:

“Calls for the prompt return to the cease-fire positions of any troops which may have moved forward subsequent to 1630 hours GMT on 10 June 1967”.

131. On 12 May 1970 the Israeli Army is still in occupation of the Golan Heights, in Syrian territory, and it was from that territory that it penetrated in the darkness, like thieves, last night, and it is still in occupation of Lebanese territory.

132. My question remains related to the agenda adopted by the Council: the complaint of Lebanon about the attack on Lebanon by Israeli regular troops which are still in occupation at this very hour as confessed by the Israeli representative, and contrary to the unanimous decision adopted by the Security Council this morning.

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

134. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): Allow me, Mr. President, to make only a very brief remark. The solidarity of Lebanon and Syria in the face of Israeli aggression does not need a bill of health from Mr. Tekoah, nor does Lebanon's solidarity with all the Arab States, victims of Israeli aggression. All that is beside the issue. The issue before the Council is that the Council adopted a resolution this morning, a clear-cut resolution calling on Israel to withdraw its forces immediately from Lebanese territories. From the mouth of the representative of Israel we understand that these forces are still in occupation of part of southern Lebanon. We request that the decision of the Council be made effective immediately as was intended by the Council when it was adopted.

135. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): For the organization of our work I believe that there arises a question of a time-table. I want to conduct these proceedings as diligently as possible in view of the seriousness of the events, and that is what we have done hitherto. However, I have been told that the Secretary-General, who legitimately wishes to attend our meeting, would not be able to be here tomorrow afternoon, because of other official duties. I propose, therefore, that the next meeting take place tomorrow morning at 10.30. In order that each representative may prepare himself, I would say right away that the meeting after that will be held on Thursday at 3 p.m.

136. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I should like to say two things.

137. First, I hope that tomorrow morning's meeting of the Security Council will begin with a report from

the Secretary-General on Israel's implementation of the resolution adopted by the Council today, which is firm, clear and categorical and calls upon Israel to withdraw its troops immediately from the territory of Lebanon.

138. Secondly, it might be advisable to decide the question of the Council's next meeting tomorrow rather than today and to confine ourselves today to a decision that we will meet tomorrow morning as you said, Mr. President.

139. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I see no objection to agreeing to the second proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union. We will indeed have time tomorrow morning to decide when to meet next. I just wanted to give some indication to help us prepare our work. As to his first suggestion, I shall transmit it, of course, to the Secretary-General who was taking note of the point while the representative of the Soviet Union was speaking.

140. I call on the Secretary-General.

141. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: Mr. President, regarding the request made by the representative of Syria and reiterated by the representative of the Soviet Union concerning the need for the submission of a report at tomorrow's meeting, I can assure you and the members of the Council that I shall submit whatever information I can get tonight and tomorrow morning from UNTSO in the field.

142. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next meeting of the Security Council will be held at 10.30 a.m. tomorrow.

The meeting rose at 7.50 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.
