

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR

UN LIBRARY

OCT 1 1989

UN/SA COLLECTION

2394th MEETING: 16 SEPTEMBER 1982

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2394)	1
Expression of welcome to the new representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	1
Expression of thanks to the retiring President	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 4 June 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15162);	
(b) Letter dated 28 July 1982 from the Permanent Representatives of Egypt and France to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15316);	
(c) Letter dated 16 September 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15392)	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.

2394th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 16 September 1982, at 5.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Masahiro NISIBORI (Japan).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Panama, Poland, Spain, Togo, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2394)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Letter dated 4 June 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15162);
 - (b) Letter dated 28 July 1982 from the Permanent Representatives of Egypt and France to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15316);
 - (c) Letter dated 16 September 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15392)

The meeting was called to order at 5.55 p.m.

Expression of welcome to the new representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

1. The PRESIDENT: At the outset of this meeting, I wish to extend a warm welcome to Sir John Thomson, the new representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. We look forward to the same close co-operation with him as we enjoyed with his predecessor, Sir Anthony Parsons.

Expression of thanks to the retiring President

2. The PRESIDENT: It gives me the greatest pleasure, as I preside at the first formal meeting of the Council for the month of September, to express to Mr. Noel Dorr, of Ireland, the deep appreciation felt by all members of the Council for his services as President of the Council during the month of August. Both during the formal meetings and in the course of consultations, Mr. Dorr demonstrated qualities of patience, courtesy, skill and wisdom during a particularly demanding period. I am happy to be in a posi-

tion to pay a well-deserved tribute to him for his dedicated leadership.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Letter dated 4 June 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15162);
- (b) Letter dated 28 July 1982 from the Permanent Representatives of Egypt and France to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15316);
- (c) Letter dated 16 September 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15392)

3. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings [2374th, 2375th, 2377th, 2385th and 2389th meetings], I invite the representatives of Lebanon and Israel to take places at the Council table; I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Cuba, Egypt, India and Pakistan to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon) and Mr. Blum (Israel) took places at the Council table; Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Roa Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Krishnan (India) and Mr. Mahmood (Pakistan) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

4. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Kuwait in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT: This meeting of the Council has been convened in response to a letter dated 16 September from the representative of Lebanon to the President of the Council and distributed under the symbol S/15392.

6. I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the following documents: S/15356, containing the text of a letter dated 12 August from the representative of Australia to the Secretary-General; S/15362, containing the report of the Secretary-General in pursuance of Council resolution 518 (1982); S/15371, containing the text of a letter dated 20 August from the representative of the United States to the Secretary-General; S/15376, containing the text of a letter dated 26 August from the representative of Egypt to the Secretary-General; S/15382 and Add.1, containing the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in the Beirut area; and S/15386, containing the text of a letter dated 3 September from the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General.

7. The first speaker is the representative of Lebanon, on whom I now call.

8. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): As this is the first time, Sir, that my delegation has been invited to the Council under your presidency, may I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your assumption of responsibilities and to say how pleased we are that our case is being debated today with you at the helm—you, personally, and as the representative of Japan. Not only has your country displayed every sign of friendship towards Lebanon and tendered every assistance to us but you, personally, have been the author, co-author and initiator of many resolutions which have contributed to the cause of peace in Lebanon and the Middle East.

9. May I also add a personal word. As you and the other members of the Council know, this is probably my last appearance before the Council as the representative of Lebanon. At first, I regretted that I was relinquishing my post without taking formal leave of the Council as a "permanent client" now for almost five years, if I may be permitted the expression. I now regret that the circumstances of my return before the Council should be under such dire and dramatic conditions, to say the least.

10. It has now been nearly a month since the Council last met to consider the Lebanese question. Many changes have occurred during this eventful month, and we were hoping that the cause of peace was advancing slowly but steadily in my country and in the Middle East.

11. During long, almost daily meetings over the course of weeks, the Council had in numerous resolutions laid a general framework within which we were moving forward. Bilateral and multilateral efforts inspired by Council resolutions had produced

unexpectedly successful results. The constitutional process in my country had not been disrupted by all the violence to which we had been subjected. We were struggling to survive—often in silence, always in determination and with an unfailing confidence in our ultimate right to lead our own life, control our own destiny and restore our total sovereignty over all of our territory.

12. Yet, we felt compelled to return once more to the Council to reiterate our call that Lebanon should be left to the Lebanese, and the Lebanese alone.

13. Yesterday, we were healing our wounds and drying our tears. We had barely finished burying a President, whose death has accented the hero-image he had assumed. He was the youngest President in the world and the first in our country to die a violent death. Emerging from years of strife, Bashir Gemayel, a unique leader, had come with a message of dialogue, pledging to reconstruct Lebanon and to create a new nation—young, vigorous, free and, above all, united. Fate struck the up-coming statesman just as he was on the threshold of success. Those he had dreamt of uniting around him in the Government of Lebanon and who were already responding were all mourning his death on the hilltops of his native village before the dream could come true.

14. That was the day the Israelis chose to invade Beirut, occupy government buildings, houses and streets, flouting every possible international law, let alone challenging the Council's resolutions and violating cease-fire agreements and other commitments which we considered as the beginning of the end of a long tragedy. I refer in particular to the agreement negotiated by Mr. Philip Habib, the special envoy of the President of the United States, who had performed what was described as a miracle of diplomacy. I should like to express here my country's gratitude not only to Mr. Habib's Government but also to those of France and Italy, which, along with the United States, had dispatched troops as part of a multinational force to ensure the fulfilment of the agreements that had then and there been reached.

15. It is not my intention to debate once more what we have all spent endless hours debating in this chamber—that is, the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, which has been presented by Israel as yet another phase of its struggle against the Palestinians. I should like to limit my remarks specifically to the most recent episode in the long tragedy—namely, the invasion of Beirut, which has been described by Israel as a "peace-keeping" act.

16. Indeed, Israel's pretenses are so ludicrous, so intolerable and so revolting that one is tempted not even to try to respond, for by what right can Israel pretend to allot to itself the "mission" of maintaining law and order in the capital of a sovereign country and preventing so-called factional feuds precisely at the

very moment when, in mourning, my people had come together as they had hardly ever done before? By what right can the Israeli army describe itself as a force of stability in a country which has been destabilized for years because it had become the theatre of Israel's wars? By what right and by what mandate can Israel pretend that it could not allow the Lebanese armed forces and the Lebanese security forces to perform their mission because Israel decided that they were not capable of doing so with success?

17. I need not pursue this any further. We feel that it would be an insult to the Council's wisdom and judgement even to want to discuss the Israeli pretenses and the mockery they are making of international law. We believe that our case is perfectly clear and simple. The nations of the world have expressed themselves unanimously in supporting our desire—nay, even our determination—to preserve our territorial integrity and the unity of our land and its people and to restore our sovereignty.

18. Lebanon must not continue to be the theatre and the arena of wars and revolutions waged on its soil by friends and foes alike. War in Lebanon has become not only a danger for Lebanon and the Lebanese but also a threat to world peace and security and to the integrity of every single nation in the area.

19. Many a world leader, particularly the President of the United States, has recognized publicly that peace in Lebanon has become a moral as well as a political imperative—an imperative for all, an imperative of peace, both regional and international. Indeed, it is now universally admitted that peace in Lebanon cannot be the end of the long and arduous Middle East peace process to which we are all committed. It should be the beginning, for, as long as there is no peace in Lebanon, there can be no peace, no stability anywhere else in the Middle East.

20. Lebanon is determined to perform once more its role—its mission—within the Arab community, to which it belongs, and it must be allowed to restore its institutions and to recover its land. Within the next few days, new presidential elections should be held and, we trust, will be held. The Lebanese earnestly wish that the new President should be elected in a spirit of unity and harmony.

21. Could it not be that Israel has invaded our capital precisely to disrupt the constitutional process and to prevent our democratic institutions from functioning freely and unhampered?

22. The Council has a clear responsibility towards Lebanon which we are certain it will fulfil, as it has done so many times in the past. We ask that, in simple terms, previous resolutions be now reaffirmed and that Israel be called upon unequivocally and immediately to withdraw its forces from Beirut, it being understood that that withdrawal in no way prejudices

Lebanon's determination to continue seeking the total and unconditional evacuation of Israeli forces and of all non-Lebanese forces from Lebanese territory.

23. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): As this is my first occasion to speak at a formal meeting of the Council this month, may I express my most sincere congratulations to the President of the Council for September, Mr. Masahiro Nisibori, of friendly Japan, on his assumption of office, and wish him all the best. Mr. Nisibori truly reflects his great country, foremost among the enormous accomplishments of which has been its dedication to peace and its renunciation of military means as an instrument of policy.

24. I should like also to take this opportunity to pay the highest tribute to the President of the Council for the month of August, Mr. Noel Dorr, of friendly Ireland, for the outstanding skill with which he carried out the heavy responsibilities of the office of President in a month of very grave turbulence.

25. I wish most warmly to welcome Sir John Thomson as the new representative of the United Kingdom and to express my conviction that his renowned diplomatic skills and experience will be a great asset to the functioning of the Council.

26. We have just heard that Mr. Tuéni will be leaving us, and I wish to express my very profound regret at the impending departure of the representative of Lebanon, Ghassan Tuéni, who has given so much of his time, dedication and health in serving the cause of the redemption of Lebanon and its people, under the most exacting conditions. He has always risen to the challenge and done an outstanding job. We shall deeply miss him here, but I am sure that he will continue his noble pursuits in other fields of public life.

27. I wish to express my country's deep appreciation to the Secretary-General for his timely, objective and illuminating report on the present tragic situation in Beirut [S/15382] and the addendum to that report [S/15382/Add.1], concerning today's events, and for his innovative oral presentation, including the highly instructive map, which enlightened us all at the informal meeting held earlier.

28. We are meeting today at the request of the Government of Lebanon to take up once more the renewal and intensification of yet another chapter in Israel's genocidal war against the independence, territorial integrity and inviolability of Lebanon, in the very heartland of Beirut, in a stunning unravelling of Israel's long-laid plans to wipe Lebanon off the map of the world by destabilization, dismemberment, vivisection and the planned annexation of large chunks of its territory in the south by lackeys and proxies, embodied in the renegade Major Saad Haddad, with whom the Council has become all too familiar after this years of ignominious treachery.

29. While large parts of Lebanon have been enduring the indignity and ruthlessness of Israeli occupation for months, Israel's insatiable lust for further bloodshed and subjugation has reached a climax in its ongoing conquest of west Beirut, one of the great cultural centres of the Arab world and, since the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the birthplace of its contemporary renaissance. It is indeed sad and sickening beyond any human tolerance. Its psychological impact will for generations to come long outlive the totally uncalled-for military aggression which we are experiencing at present.

30. The sequence of events in which the Israelis committed their latest act of aggression and their conquest of half a million inhabitants of west Beirut is crystal-clear, for all to see and judge. A dastardly criminal act against the President-elect of Lebanon, the late Mr. Bashir Gemayel, which we and the whole world have condemned, was cold-bloodedly cited by the rampaging Israeli military vulture as a convenient excuse for the conquest of west Beirut.

31. I am a fervent believer in the due process of law; I make no vain accusations. But on the basis of overwhelming evidence—indeed, of a consensus belief in our part of the world and elsewhere in all knowledgeable circles—I charge that the planting of the 450 pounds of highly sophisticated remote-controlled high explosive which resulted in the shocking death of President-elect Gemayel was perpetrated by Israeli agents to achieve the following ends.

32. First, the Israeli aggressors, not knowing—despite their pretences—the Arab, and particularly the genuinely Lebanese, mind, had grown increasingly disenchanted with the late President-elect Bashir Gemayel when they failed, after persistent and high-handed efforts, to treat him as a pliant tool in the same manner as they sought out and obtained their servile lackey Major Haddad in the south. They should have known that Mr. Gemayel and his party were, first and foremost, Lebanese nationalists and patriots who would not tolerate subjugation by anyone.

33. Secondly, Prime Minister Begin and Mr. Sharon had been aggressively seeking the reinstatement of the renegade Major Haddad to a prominent position in the Lebanese army, but to no avail. For the Lebanese army, notwithstanding its divisions and weakness over the past few years, has an honourable and long record of military tradition which it would never forsake.

34. This so angered the Israeli leaders that they threatened to augment not only Haddad's mercenary forces—to the extent that they were talking about increasing them to the point of putting 50,000 troops at his disposal—but also the area under his control, as an Israeli protégé, beyond the occupied city of Sidon. Indeed, the renegade Major Haddad turned back the men and closed down the offices of the Phalangist party a few weeks ago. The Israelis served

notice on the late President-elect that they were planning practically to sever the whole of the south from southern Lebanon and give it a "special status" as a prelude to possible annexation and the seizure of the waters of the Litani, an old Israeli plan approved as far back as 1954 or 1955 but awaiting implementation.

35. Thirdly, the Israelis have been insisting on imposing a full-fledged peace treaty on Lebanon at bayonet-point in total disregard of the fact that genuine peace can never be imposed by force and occupation—that is not the way to achieve peace—and the equally important fact that Lebanon had not invaded Israel on 6 June but that Israel had been the invader. The Lebanese State and army did not even participate in the conflict, which the Israelis repeatedly claimed was directed solely against the PLO and the Palestinian refugees, even though Lebanese civilians suffered a preponderance of casualties and destruction in the Israeli's genocidal war.

36. Relations between Lebanon and Israel, since Israel's uprooting of the Palestinian people, had been governed by the General Armistice Agreement of 1949,¹ the efficacy of which had been proved for decades.

37. Fourthly, perhaps the overriding reason for Israel's conquest of west Beirut, the seat of Government, housing the Prime Ministry and most of the other ministries and departments, institutions and agencies and the Central Bank, which the Israeli bombardment apparently set on fire, and most of the embassies—and the latest two days of shelling have not accidentally hit the embassies of France and Italy—is the fact that, in spite of hitherto sharp internal differences, all too natural in any country, for in every country there are varying views, all the prominent leaders of west Beirut agreed with the late President-elect on a "framework of agreement for a government of national unity". That was a mere few days before his headquarters in east Beirut were savagely blown up. It would have meant the emergence of a strong and unified central Lebanese authority that would restore normality and amity to war-torn Lebanon, an objective which Israeli designs on Lebanon cannot countenance. The Israelis have been destabilizing Lebanon since 1968, since they raided the Beirut international airport and virtually destroyed Lebanon's entire national airline and its more than 14 Boeing aircraft, in addition to its various installations.

38. I witnessed that aggressive and unprovoked attack from a house a mere few hundred yards from the international airport. There was not one PLO fighter that the Israelis could use as an excuse. Indeed, this and numerous other attacks against unprotected Palestinian refugee camps were what mainly impelled the endangered refugees to arm themselves in self-defence.

39. Fifthly, the siege and genocide inflicted on Beirut for two and a half months were eventually resolved through the mediation of Mr. Philip Habib, the special envoy of President Reagan. The agreement signed by Mr. Habib and the Lebanese Government—of which Israel was a signatory and the United States, a super-Power, a guarantor—specifically provided that, in exchange for withdrawal of the PLO forces, the Israeli army of invasion would not enter west Beirut. Aside from the Israeli duplicity, which has come as no surprise to us because there is such a massive record of duplicity over decades, what is of deep concern, even though the agreement was reached outside the jurisdiction of the Security Council, is that Israel has chosen to lay bare either the ability or the credibility of a super-Power, the United States, which is a guarantor of that agreement. It is an enormous challenge involving the honour of a super-Power without whose massive assistance an expansionist Israel could not pursue its policies of aggression and expansion. I need hardly emphasize that such undermining cannot be taken lightly, either in the Middle East or in other regions of the world. Many peoples, not only the victimized Lebanese people, are still awaiting the response of the United States to this blatant challenge in concrete terms. It is up to the United States to redeem its word.

40. Sixthly, the Israeli invaders allege that they marched on Beirut to restore law and order. What had happened in west Beirut to disturb that law and order? There are no Palestinian fighters left to repel any invasion of west Beirut, as they successfully did for two and a half months. That is proved by the fact that there was scattered and scant resistance to the invasion by possibly a few hundred or a few thousand armed Lebanese militia. But they were Lebanese.

41. Seventhly, the legitimate Lebanese army was in full control of the city and life was returning to normal at an astonishing speed, which testifies to the genius and the ingenuity of the Lebanese people. We have been reading the daily dispatches of on-the-spot observers.

42. Reconstruction and repairs were in full swing; government bulldozers were opening and repairing highways and roads which had been closed since 1975. To what factional fighting were the Israelis referring to justify their invasion? Indeed—and this is the irony—the invasion took place when all the leaders of west Beirut were attending the funeral services in the mountains of Bekfaya, east of Beirut, for the late President-elect.

43. The Israelis claim that they had also marched on Beirut to prevent the return of Palestinian fighters to west Beirut when those fighters had deferred to the wishes of the leaders of west Beirut and withdrew in their totality to spare the civilian inhabitants the scourge of further Israeli savagery. Besides, the Israeli army rings Beirut from all sides. How, then,

could the Palestinian fighters return, even if they had wanted to—unless, of course, the Israelis regard every civilian refugee as a fighter?

44. The Israeli invading forces are in virtual occupation of the whole city of Beirut, in spite of scattered civilian resistance here and there which the Secretary-General explained fully to us this evening. The Israelis have occupied ministries, government departments and vital institutions. They have not yet occupied foreign embassies, to the best of my knowledge, even though they have hit the French and Italian embassies, presumably to show their appreciation for the valiant contingents contributed by those two great countries to the multinational force which supervised the withdrawal of the Palestinian forces under extremely hazardous conditions.

45. At present, the Israeli invaders have encircled and cut off the Palestinian refugee camps from the rest of the city to commit the kind of atrocities—they sometimes call them interrogations—which they had committed in the south after their occupation, including the massive graves in which innocent Palestinian refugees, men, women and children, have been laid to rest and thousands others deported and subjected to unspeakable torture, including thirst and hunger. I hope that the Red Cross will be doubly alert and will report to us on the fate of those PLO refugees whose safety was guaranteed when they agreed to evacuate Beirut and leave their families, children, wives and mothers behind.

46. Last, but not least, of the Israeli objectives in conquering west Beirut is the Israelis' paranoid fear of any serious talk or initiatives for a peaceful solution of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. They clearly want to derail this process, to divert attention, in spite of the fact that that process was agreed to at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held recently at Fez (Morocco) [see S/15510, annex], and, along similar lines, in President Reagan's initiative. It is rejected outright by a chauvinistic Israel to which, apparently, peace is anathema.

47. Yesterday, Mr. Brezhnev reiterated more or less similar ideas, as has virtually the whole international community [see S/15403, annex].

48. A few days ago, His Majesty King Hussein of Jordan reiterated clearly and forcefully what he has been stating since 1967: withdrawal from all the Palestinian and Arab territories occupied since 1967 and restoration of Palestinian rights including the right to self-determination, in exchange for peace.

49. Nothing thwarts Israeli designs more than meaningful prospects for peace—and there has been an Arab consensus on working to achieve that goal. Evidently, certain circles in Israel thrive on perpetual war. But we are determined not to leave a stone unturned to achieve the rights of the Palestinian people

in all their aspects. We intend to act, not to react, as we have inadvertently done in the past, paying heavily for our mistakes.

50. The Secretary-General has warned the world of the dangers inherent in a drift to international anarchy. Nothing better exemplifies that drift than the adventurism of an Israel acting totally outside the framework of international law and morality. The Council is duty bound to demand that Israel, at the risk of all the punitive measures in the Charter of the United Nations, withdraw immediately from Beirut as a prelude to total and complete withdrawal to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon, in accordance with unanimously adopted Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) and subsequent resolutions.

51. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Kuwait. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

52. Mr. ABULHASSAN (Kuwait): In my capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month and to express my delegation's firm belief in your dedication and leadership. I should like also to commend the skilful manner in which your predecessor, the representative of Ireland, conducted the Council's work in times of crisis.

53. We are meeting today yet again to discuss the dangerous situation created by the Israelis, a practice which has become so symptomatic of the Israeli character and Israeli behaviour and can be described as anything but acceptable in international terms.

54. The Israeli invasion of Beirut yesterday, under the pretext of filling the vacuum—a pretext which was not acceptable even to Israel's friends—is yet another example of the Israeli insult to our intelligence. This invasion is a grave and flagrant violation of the agreement sponsored by the United States Government which had led to the withdrawal of the Palestinian and Syrian forces from the capital of Lebanon.

55. The fact that Israeli troops have moved into Beirut and occupied the whole Lebanese capital at a time when the Lebanese people are trying to establish a strong constitutional government casts doubts on the sincerity of the Israeli claims that one of the objectives in the invasion of Lebanon was to assist in that attempt. It also casts doubts upon Israel's credibility as a party to an agreement which was genuinely entered into by the other parties to it.

56. It is no coincidence that the Israeli army, which could not enter west Beirut when it was well defended, found it so convenient to invade and occupy the undefended Lebanese capital under the protection of an agreement which Israel chose to violate before the ink with which it was written was dry.

57. It is also ironic that the Israelis, who were claiming that the Palestinians were hiding behind civilians in Beirut in an effort to justify the mass murder of that population, are the same people who have in so cowardly a fashion invaded the city after its evacuation by all armed elements.

58. We believe that this latest Israeli act of aggression is only another episode in an overall strategy, a strategy that aims at establishing only one military force in the Middle East and at seeing to it that that military force alone has the right to dictate in the Middle East. It is also our conviction that the United States has a major responsibility to force the Israelis to withdraw forthwith from west Beirut, particularly because the other parties to the agreement concluded by the American envoy have abided by the spirit and letter of that agreement.

59. There is no doubt that American credibility is now at stake, and the sooner the United States compels Israel to abide by that agreement, the better the chances for peace, particularly at this time when the Lebanese people are trying to elect a new president.

60. We should also like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization, of 7 September, in which he states:

“There is a tendency in the United Nations for Governments to act as though the passage of a resolution absolved them from further responsibility for the subject in question.”²

Nothing could be more illustrative of that particular remark than the fact that not only have all of the Council resolutions demanding the unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli forces from Lebanon been ignored by the aggressor, but they have not been followed by action.

61. It is our conviction—as I am sure it is the conviction of many other nations of the world—that the Israeli acts of aggression have already gone beyond all comprehension and that it is time to stop the Israeli madness. This, we believe, could largely be brought about by the one country without whose many-faceted support and protection it would be impossible for such a small nation to become the number-one aggressor in the world today. Needless to say, the Council should also assume its responsibilities in a way that will put an end to this abnormal Israeli phenomenon.

62. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States, to whom the Council extended an invitation at the 2347th meeting under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

63. Mr. MAKSOUD: I should like to take this opportunity to share in the universal congratulations and

appreciation expressed to you, Sir, on your assumption of the Presidency of the Council for this month. Your graciousness as a diplomat and your wisdom and that of your great country have been a source of tremendous and resilient friendship between the Arab people and Japan. I should also like to take this opportunity to express our deep appreciation for the tremendous wisdom, knowledge and articulation of conscience that your predecessor, the representative of Ireland, exhibited during his presidency last month.

64. We are meeting again today to discuss yet another unfolding of Israel's designs and the consequences of its piecemeal eating up of whatever territory it wants to take. We have apparently been avoiding a just and comprehensive peace and a solution of the problem of Lebanon's unity, independence and integrity, as well as restoration of the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the establishment of a State in their homeland. It is as if these elementary and obvious aspects of a comprehensive peace, one that is just and durable, have become mere rhetorical expressions by the international community because the might of Israel has chosen to reduce those definitive commitments by the international community to purely juristic, legalistic rhetoric.

65. Aglow with the power of destruction, living in saturated euphoria, drunk with military power, Israel looks upon the world—upon its resolutions, upon its will, upon its desire—with its usual contempt, as if it had been endowed with total righteousness and as if everybody were wrong and Israel not only right, but absolutely right. Let the world community discuss, debate and deliberate; let it adopt resolutions: Israel will always be capable of finding pretexts and excuses. It does not matter whether they are related to truth or reality; what is more important is that they buy time, that they deflect the world community, that they insult it if it ever dares to question any aspect of Israel's behaviour, if it ever casts any doubt on whatever Israel might think or do, because Israel wants the world to know that whatever it does has a built-in sanctity and immunity.

66. The annexation of Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, the proliferation of settlements, the occupation of Lebanon and the march into west Beirut: all those acts emanate from Israel's inflated self-righteousness that it is unaccountable to anybody and that the world must be answerable to it and its dictates.

67. It is in this context that we have witnessed in the last few days that method of intellectual and political terrorism which Israel has now elevated to a perfect technique of communications, in which it has insulted one of the great spiritual leaders of the world because he had the courage and, in Israel's view, the temerity to receive in audience the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO. In a way, the Vatican and the Pope did not accept the defini-

tion which Israel applies to the Palestinians or their leadership. They did not acquiesce to the diktat of the semantic acrobatics that Israel seeks to impose. Therefore, if it is not coterminous with what Israel describes, then it resorts to its own intellectual terrorism, which is the blasphemy of questioning motives and trying to exploit the fact that the Vatican has not consistently pursued its humanitarian endeavours and its spiritual vocation.

68. In this respect, Israel has attempted today to use the unfortunate and tragic events in Lebanon, which led to the assassination of the President-elect of Lebanon, Mr. Bashir Gemayel, as a pretext to pursue an objective which was, in its opinion and in its judgement, temporarily arrested by the intervention of the international community and the agreement that was negotiated by the United States special envoy, Mr. Habib. Does anybody in the world believe that Israel wanted to comply with that agreement? Does the United States now believe that Israel was intent on complying with that agreement?

69. Israel invaded Lebanon on the false pretext that the PLO had attempted the assassination of its ambassador in London. That was another pretext for a large-scale invasion of Lebanon, as if there had been no plans, as if there had been no designs and as if there had been no details in the intelligence and defence departments of Israel and in the Israeli Cabinet of any invasion of Lebanon and as if Israel had suddenly been overtaken by the grief of the attempted assassination and all of a sudden had decided to invade Lebanon to penalize it. And now it claims that the invasion of west Beirut is another unravelling of a design that it did not intend to carry out, had it not been for the assassination that has taken place inside Israeli-occupied east Beirut. And then what happened? Israel immediately presumed that in Lebanon there was going to be a breakdown of law and order because Israel, throughout its equation with Lebanon, could never conceive, admit or recognize the vitality and resilience of Lebanese unity and Lebanese national cohesion. Therefore, Israel used this pretext when there was absolutely no evidence that there was any potential for factional struggles or conflicts in Lebanon. On the contrary, there was growing evidence that, despite earlier polarizations, the election of President Bashir Gemayel, whatever might have been the background, led to a desire on the part of all Lebanese, irrespective of the background and motivations of earlier conflicts, to rally behind the united State of Lebanon, to rally behind constitutional legitimacy, irrespective of political and ideological differences.

70. It was that visible evidence of growing cohesion and political reconciliation within Lebanon that confirmed that Israel was being foiled in its attempt to perpetuate destabilization, factionalism and conflict in Lebanon.

71. That is why, no sooner had the assassination taken place, than the contingency plan to violate the agreement and occupy west Beirut came into action. And not only that: the ready-made propaganda machine came into play to the effect that the Israelis had entered west Beirut to preserve law and order and to assume policing. They even had the audacity to call it a "peace-keeping" role, thus insulting the terms "peace" and "peace-keeping". They had assumed a "peace-keeping" role because Sharon had been prevented from indulging his conquest mentality and his mania to take over all of Beirut. He considered that an interruption in his designs and in his schemes. Why? Because at that moment Beirut had no PLO forces anymore. The international community and Mr. Habib had all testified to the orderly and dignified manner in which the PLO forces withdrew after Israel had heaped its genocidal attempts on the population of Beirut for two and a half months. It is as if Israel had a historical revenge to take against the reconstruction of Beirut. How could there be a resilient capital like Beirut, where the cultural, intellectual, journalistic and informational renaissance not only of Lebanon but of the entire Arab world might be able to recover? How dare the people of Beirut resist the onslaught of the Israeli war machine? How dare the population of Beirut find in themselves the ability to reconstruct and recover? How dare the newspapers in Beirut—the newspaper of Mr. Tuéni—be able to publish regularly every day? How dare freedom of expression continue?

72. Then Israel had to seek pretexts. On the one hand, it wanted to save Beirut from so-called international communism, hoping to cause a gut reaction in professional cold warriors. On the other hand, it tried to say that there were still remnants of Palestinian forces there, as though the poor refugees—Palestinians who were not even allowed to reconstruct their tents in the refugee camps that are their temporary residences—constituted an obstacle.

73. Thus, there was a vendetta against Beirut, not only the city, not only the population, but the institutions.

74. How dare Lebanon allow itself the luxury of its Parliament electing a president? How dare the President-elect refuse the two options that Israel wished to present to, force upon and dictate to Lebanon: either to accept a treaty dictated by Israel's military presence or to accept the rupture and the tearing apart of southern Lebanon and its functional, if not theoretical, annexation to Israel? How dare Lebanon and its President-elect refuse those options so that they might secure for Lebanon national reconciliation and national entente?

75. This whole accumulation of Israel's false glory and its attempts to create havoc were counterpoised by a developing situation in which the international community sought to render credible its resolutions,

to render credible its will to translate its convictions into policies. Israel witnessed the beginning: it witnessed a Secretary-General openly stating that the United Nations mechanism and United Nations resolutions must be not only respected but implemented. Here was a Secretary-General willing, eager and perhaps determined to bring to fruition the international community's will that the United Nations should be the anchor of peace and the peacemaker. Should the United Nations regain its credibility and effectiveness, Israel would be totally incapable of continuing its repeated contempt and characteristic defiance.

76. Then Israel saw that President Reagan's speech was a firm attempt to distance the United States from the mad dimension of Israel's behaviour-patterns, that the United States was no longer eager or willing to underwrite without question all of Israel's behaviour, that there was no longer an American disposition to give the green light in advance to whatever Israel intended to do.

77. If any Government, any Arab Government, had answered President Reagan in the manner that Israel answered President Reagan, there would have been the beginnings of a rupture in international relations. But there is residual leniency in the United States that acts as a shock absorber for many of the insulting attacks launched by Israel in recent days.

78. Israel realized that the Palestinian movement, in the aftermath of the Beirut withdrawal, re-established the mandate of the PLO, regained its unity and recouped its political effectiveness as the articulator of the aspirations of the people of Palestine. It began to function in such a way that it was no longer what Israel wanted it to be when it forced the Palestinians to mirror its own addiction to terrorism. Instead, it found the Palestinian movement retaining its militancy and determined to achieve its political objectives. Not only that: there was the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference at Fez. Israel hoped that divisiveness and fragmentation among the Arabs would give it further leeway to manipulate and manoeuvre the whole region in order to establish its military and strategic hegemony, in order to dictate the destiny of the peoples of the area, in order to utilize our human and economic wealth and in order to run rampant in the area, uninterrupted and without interference.

79. Then it found how the people and Government of Greece welcomed the PLO, as did the Inter-Parliamentary Union yesterday. Then, to top it off, there was the moral victory in which the highest spiritual leader received the leader of the PLO.

80. All this took place while Israel was proliferating more settlements, encouraging new settlers, destroying the freedoms and democratic rights of the population under occupation and trying to create new facts inside Lebanon in order to pre-empt the resumption by the central authority of its sovereignty.

81. And then Israel came before the world with its pathetic claims. As Mr. Sharon said today to the United States ambassador: "We have saved Lebanon for you." Now the Israeli cabinet meets for four hours and states clearly that: "Israeli forces have taken over positions in west Beirut in order to prevent the danger of violence, bloodshed and anarchy."
82. But if Israel itself causes bloodshed, violence and anarchy, as it has done in the last two days in Beirut, destroying institutions, banks, schools and hospitals, that is permissible. The cabinet statement went on to say that "this danger was indeed averted" and that the Government would instruct the IDF—do not laugh: that stands for "Israel Defence Forces"—to yield control over its positions when the Lebanese army is able to assume responsibility for ensuring public order and security in co-ordination with the IDF. This means that the Lebanese security forces—the Lebanese army—has to co-ordinate with and seek permission from the Israeli forces in west Beirut to resume their functions of protecting public order and public security.
83. And, Mr. President and members of the Council, if you do not like it, you will be subjected to the constant insulting manner in which every attempt to criticize Israel is attributed either to lingering anti-Semitism or to attempts to encircle and suffocate pathetic Israel. Even in their moment of Fascist arrogance, the Israelis will try and play on the sympathies of their audience.
84. There is definite anger in our approach. But we have seen that, despite the tragedy Israel is trying to inflict upon us and the humiliation it is trying to force upon the international community, there are certain positive signs, and we want the Council to galvanize them into a credible deterrent against Israel's further pursuit of its aggressive designs and into the realm of factoring the Council's determination to bring about for Lebanon the healing process that has long eluded it and for the Palestinian people the exercise of its right to independence and sovereignty.
85. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization. I call on him.
86. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Mr. President, it gives us reassurance to see you presiding over the Council at this crucial time. We are fully aware of, appreciate and express gratitude for the understanding position of your Government on the fate of the Middle East and especially your assertion that the Palestinian people must freely exercise its right to self-determination in its own country as well as its right to establish its own State in its own country.
87. I should like to address a few words to Mr. Dorr, of Ireland, who has demonstrated articulate skill and sincerity. His perseverance and dedication merit great praise and admiration. If I were an Irishman, I should be proud of him.
88. At the beginning of his statement, the representative of Lebanon informed us of the sad events that have resulted from a criminal attack committed in Lebanon. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO, sent a cable of condolence to Sheik Pierre Gemayel, in which he said:
- "We convey to you our warm condolences for the grievous misfortune that has befallen you, and we pray to God to bestow upon you patience and consolation. This criminal act is directed against fraternal Lebanon and only serves our common Zionist enemy."
89. Those who seized the opportunity and immediately took advantage of the crime could only be those who perpetrated the crime. The criminals must have had prior designs to commit further violations and crimes and acts of State terrorism, making a mockery of the concept of stability and peace.
90. The criminal record of the murderers of innocent civil servants in the King David Hotel annex, the secretariat of the civilian mandatory government in Palestine—and they were civilians and not armed forces of occupation; the murderers of the innocent villagers of Deir Yassin and Kafr Kassem; the murderers of Jewish survivors of the Nazi detention camps who were being saved on the *Patria*—those Judeo-Nazis who collaborated with the National Socialists have a bloody record, a record they still pursue in occupied Palestine, in Lebanon and in Beirut in particular.
91. Early in August, the Council unanimously took note of the decision of the PLO to move the Palestinian armed forces from Beirut. The PLO took that decision to spare Beirut further destruction and devastation and to save civilian lives. It took many, many days and weeks to reach some sort of an agreement, and that agreement stated, among other things, that:
- "Law-abiding Palestinian non-combatants left behind in Beirut, including the families of those who have departed, will be subject to Lebanese laws and regulations. The Governments of Lebanon and the United States will provide appropriate guarantees of safety."
92. The Secretary-General had his hands tied; the only power the Council had given him was the power to report through his observers. But through them he informed us about the withdrawal of the Palestinian armed forces from Beirut. The Secretary-General and the Council had—willingly, I would say—deprived themselves of any authority to safeguard peace and security in the area. And the price was the resumption of Israeli criminal attacks on Beirut and more blood-

shed. Is this the price of bypassing the Council? Do we not have any more faith in the Council, or does the Council not have faith in itself anymore? That is my question.

93. In his letter to the Government of Lebanon, the representative of the United States, Mr. Robert Dillon, said:

"The United States is prepared to deploy temporarily a force of approximately 800 personnel as part of a multinational force to provide appropriate assistance to the Lebanese armed forces as they carry out their responsibilities concerning the withdrawal of Palestinian personnel in Beirut from Lebanese territory under safe and orderly conditions. It is understood that the presence of such an American force will in this way facilitate the restoration of the Lebanese Government's sovereignty and authority over the Beirut area, an objective which is fully shared by my Government."

94. The withdrawal of those Palestinian forces and the Lebanese who did stand in the face of the Israeli occupation of Beirut only facilitated disruption of law and order and only facilitated disruption of the restoration of the Lebanese Government's sovereignty and authority over Beirut.

95. The question is this: was the Government of the United States aware of the Israeli designs and did it engage in, so to speak, collusion? Or was the Government of the United States taken for a ride? And were others, such as France and Italy, which willingly participated in the multinational force, also taken in, as a cover for the implementation of further Israeli designs?

96. Today, the Executive Committee of the PLO has issued the following communiqué:

"The new barbaric Israeli aggression against the Lebanese and Palestinian people, and especially against the Palestinian refugee camps in Beirut, reaffirms to the whole world that the aim of the Israeli leadership is to continue the war of annihilation against the Palestinian people and to liquidate the Palestinian camps.

"The Palestine Liberation Organization calls on the world community to stop this criminal aggression against the Palestinian and Lebanese people. The Israeli army started to storm west Beirut despite the guarantees given by the multinational force and the United States. These guarantees were specifically made to safeguard the Palestinian refugees and the camps. This was the primary role of the American, French and Italian troops.

"This new aggression indicates the critical situation in the region.

"Chairman Arafat raised the issue of the guarantees given by the participant States of the multi-

national force during his meeting with the Italian Foreign Minister. He demanded that contacts be made with the United States and French Governments to ensure their commitment to the guarantees which safeguard the Palestinian camps and which force the Israeli troops to withdraw. Of course, the Italian Foreign Minister did indeed inform both Governments on the subject, and Chairman Arafat sent a memorandum to the French Foreign Minister in this regard.

"The Palestine Liberation Organization calls upon world public opinion to take immediate steps at this critical moment to put an end to this aggression against Palestinian and Lebanese women, children and the elderly. It is time to save the Palestinian people from the holocaust and to deter the Israeli aggressors and stop their insane crimes."

97. The State Department of the United States this afternoon stated that what the Israelis have done was contrary to assurances given to it by Israel, both in Washington and in Israel. It said: "There is no justification, in our view, for Israel's continued military presence in west Beirut. We call for an immediate pull-back."

98. I wonder how many of us sitting here place any credibility in what the United States is saying. Is it really serious about it? Why wait all this time—that is, about 48 hours—and let the Israelis reap what they want in Beirut—capture all of Beirut, destroy the greater part of Beirut, imprison and detain the young people and the elderly of Beirut, while the State Department says there is no justification for them to stay in Beirut, as if there were justification to enter Beirut in the first place, as if there was justification to enter Lebanon. This is, I would say, some twisted juristic approach to issues.

99. Again I repeat: is this the price, or is it an advantage for bypassing the Council and eroding the Council's powers when dealing with such issues? Be that as it may, we still maintain our confidence that the Council will fully assume its responsibilities as prescribed in the Charter of the United Nations.

100. Before I conclude, I should like it to be known very clearly here that, while we are engulfed in acts of aggression on one front—in Beirut and Lebanon—Israel is persisting in its policy of vindictive repression of our brothers under occupation in Palestinian territories occupied since 1967. But this will be the subject, I hope, of another meeting and, God willing, under your presidency, Sir.

101. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): First of all, permit me to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the responsible post of President of the Council for this month and to wish you success in your important task.

102. Permit me also to express my gratitude to the representative of Ireland, Mr. Dorr, your predecessor as President of the Council last month, for his skilful and highly qualified conduct of the Council's work in very difficult circumstances.

103. I should like also to associate myself with the good wishes addressed to the new representative of the United Kingdom, Sir John Thomson, and wish him success in his work.

104. More than three months ago, the Council adopted resolution 509 (1982), which called for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon. That was followed by a number of Council decisions which confirmed that fundamental demand as a key element in the normalization of the situation in Lebanon. Throughout this period, Israel has provocatively ignored all decisions of the Council and unswervingly raised the scale of its aggression.

105. History knows of many wars, but I do not think it would be an exaggeration to say that never, so far, has an annexationist acted so cynically and so arrogantly. Never in history has it so deliberately and cold-bloodedly and openly pursued the policy of genocide against a whole people. Israeli aircraft and guns bombed Lebanese towns and villages and dropped thousands of tons of deadly bombs and shells. Israeli tanks have ruthlessly crushed peaceful inhabitants of Lebanon, right under the United Nations flag.

106. Today, the Israeli military has written a new bloody page in the tragic saga of Lebanon. Israeli troops have totally seized the capital of Lebanon, Beirut, to which it has laid siege for two months. This is obviously a new act of aggression; it has exposed to the whole world the barefaced arrogance of Zionist terrorism which has held Beirut and the whole of Lebanon hostage to its sinister designs.

107. What has been done during the last few days by the Israeli military in Beirut is but the latest link in the chain of its sinister actions. This chain as a whole shows that Israel has openly embarked upon an expansionist policy in the Middle East. The links in this chain include the attack on the nuclear reactor in Baghdad, the violation of the airspace of Jordan and Saudi Arabia, the bombing of the peaceful population of Lebanon, the annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights, the large-scale intrusion into Lebanon and the occupation of one third of its territory and its capital, and the creeping annexation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

108. All that is the direct result of the treaty on strategic co-operation between Israel and the United States. In that alliance, Israel, with United States money, with United States arms and under the political cover of the United States, including in the United Nations Security Council, is carrying out the goals of American imperialist policy in the Middle East.

109. Accordingly, what we are facing is joint American-Israeli aggression in the Middle East against Arab countries and peoples. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Brezhnev, speaking yesterday in Moscow, made the following statement:

"The Israeli aggressor has finally revealed its predatory nature for all the world to see. Never before has an invader acted so cynically, violating the integrity of a sovereign country, methodically committing mass murder of Palestinians and Lebanese, and brazenly flouting the generally accepted norms of international law and the decisions of the United Nations Security Council.

"During the bloody war, the essence of United States policy in the Middle East was also revealed in the clearest of terms. Not only did the United States make no attempt to restrain the Israeli aggressor; it actually delivered Lebanon into the hands of Israel. As a result, the Israelis have occupied a considerable portion of Lebanon, killing tens of thousands of people and leaving hundreds of thousands of peaceful inhabitants homeless.

"And all this time in Washington, where they are so fond of all sorts of 'sanctions' and 'punishments', there was not a single word of condemnation addressed to the aggressor, much less any concrete measures to curtail its actions." [*Ibid.*]

110. The joint American-Israeli line in the Middle East is a cynical one, a policy that fundamentally contradicts the interests of a just and lasting peace in that region. It is designed to disregard the legitimate rights and interests of the Arab countries and peoples and to impose upon them American-Israeli conditions for their existence in that area. It is precisely because of the totally open and flagrant character of that policy that the United States and Israel have found themselves totally isolated. The United States was in total isolation in the Security Council when it was forced, alone, to veto the draft resolution submitted by Spain [S/15185]. Similarly, it was in total isolation when it vetoed the draft resolution submitted by France [S/15255/Rev.2] and when it vetoed, alone, the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union [S/15347/Rev.1]. In the General Assembly, Israel and the United States were the only two delegations to vote against a draft resolution submitted to that body.

111. This policy of Israel and the United States is wrong: it is an imperialist policy. It is for that very reason that it is doomed to failure. The Council is now faced with the task of rebuffing the most recent raid and incursion by the Israeli aggressor. In the view of the Soviet delegation, the Council must decisively condemn Israel's flagrant violation of its many decisions. We must call for the immediate withdrawal of

Israeli troops from west Beirut. We should provide for the use of the machinery that would enable the Council to monitor implementation of whatever measures might be called for in any resolution. Ultimately, we must issue a decisive warning to Israel to the effect that if it does not immediately withdraw its troops from west Beirut, it will have applied against it the due and necessary measures set forth in the Charter of the United Nations. In the view of the Soviet delegation, that is the very least the Council can do in this situation.

112. Yet, even that minimal action, in so far as one can judge, is already meeting with resistance on the part of one delegation. It is no accident that many members of the Council have recently been saying that the institution of informal consultations quite often serves as a hindrance to the adoption of necessary measures in the Council. The truth of that became apparent today: one delegation, the delegation of the United States, in essence opposed the adoption of any serious measures by the Council. For example, we did not hear from the United States delegation that it condemns Israel's actions in Beirut. Today, the State Department published a statement apparently condemning those actions. The United States delegation ought then to have called for the outright withdrawal of Israeli troops from west Beirut and, at least on that formal level, have supported the statement of the State Department. However, we heard nothing of the sort. Why not? Surely because the official United States statements with regard to Israel are made to divert attention, to allay public anxiety and to soothe feelings in the Arab countries, while in actual fact the United States delegation rejects all demands to condemn Israel. The United States has, I must say, found itself in an unenviable situation: either to be forced in the Council to vote in favour of the condemnation of Israel and the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from west Beirut, or to stand fully exposed.

113. In resolving the problem that has arisen today, of course, the Council should not lose sight of the need to ensure total and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from the whole of Lebanese territory. The task before the Council is still to give active support for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Only a just peace can be a lasting peace. But a piratical peace, the peace of the grave, one dictated by the Israeli aggressor and its Washington partner, cannot exist. It must not exist and it shall not come about.

114. The Head of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet State, Mr. Brezhnev, speaking yesterday in the Kremlin, stressed that, for its part, the Soviet Union intended to continue to use the resources available to it to exert active support in favour of the Palestinian resistance movement, the Lebanese patriots, Syria and all those who were not willing to bow their heads to the aggressor and who were struggling for a just settlement and peace in that area.

115. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Israel, on whom I now call.

116. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Mr. President, permit me at the outset to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of September. We are confident that you will discharge the duties of your high office with the wisdom, skill and courtesy that have become the hallmark of your activities at the United Nations. I should also like to associate myself with the words of welcome which you addressed to our new colleague, the representative of the United Kingdom.

117. The criminal assassination of the Lebanese President-elect, Mr. Bashir Gemayel, referred to by Mr. Maksoud as "unfortunate and tragic events in Lebanon" [*para. 68 above*], has created a most dangerous situation in that country and in Beirut in particular.

118. The terrorists left behind in west Beirut over 2,000 of their operatives armed with large quantities of light and heavy weapons.

119. Paragraph 1 of the Habib plan for the withdrawal and departure of the PLO terrorist groups from Beirut, published on 20 August, calls specifically for all the PLO terrorists in Beirut "to leave Lebanon peacefully for pre-arranged destinations in other countries". That same paragraph continues as follows: "The basic concept of this plan is consistent with the objective of the Government of Lebanon that all foreign military forces withdraw from Lebanon."

120. Paragraph 18 of the same document states that the PLO will turn over to the Lebanese armed forces all heavy and spare weaponry and munitions left behind in the Beirut area.

121. It is a matter of public record that not only were all these and other provisions of the Habib plan not adhered to by the PLO but that gross violations of the general cease-fire occurred over the last four weeks by the terrorists. Among these violations are the failure to evacuate all the terrorists from the Beirut area, large numbers of whom, running apparently into the thousands, have been left behind in the honeycomb dug-outs and tunnels of the refugee camps in the Beirut area. Heavy weapons were not turned over to the Lebanese armed forces but, rather, to various private groups acting on behalf of, and in league with, the remaining terrorists.

122. It is also a matter of public record that large numbers of terrorists have been infiltrating back into the Bekaa valley and have opened fire at the Israel Defence Forces through a protective screen of the Syrian army. Indeed, in a dastardly attack on an outpost of the Israel Defence Forces only a few days ago, the terrorists abducted eight Israeli soldiers and are now attempting to blackmail Israel by threatening to mistreat these prisoners.

123. But as if neither this nor the methodical and continued violations of the cease-fire were enough, 100 or so terrorist bosses have slipped back to Tripoli and other locations in Lebanon and some of them have made public speeches inciting to renewed fighting and violence. Surprisingly, there has not been any reaction from any quarter to these blatant violations by the terrorists of the Habib plan, by virtue of which Israel agreed to let the terrorists go and save their skins.

124. With all these adverse developments in the background, the assassination of the Lebanese President-elect, Bashir Gemayel, threatened and was apparently designed to completely disrupt the cease-fire agreement and plunge the area into renewed violence. This situation was especially true of the Beirut area. The calculation of the murderers of the President-elect was that, if the *status quo ante* could be re-established, the remnants of the PLO would use this smoke-screen as a cover for regaining their lost positions in Beirut and to fan out from there.

125. It was in order to shatter these designs and to prevent the PLO from exploiting what might have turned out to be the gambit for a renewed take-over that the Israel Defence Forces moved into west Beirut.

126. As we have already had occasion to state elsewhere, the operation of the Israel Defence Forces is of a limited scope and duration. The Government of Israel will instruct the Israel Defence Forces to relinquish their positions in west Beirut when the Lebanese armed forces are ready to assume control over those positions in co-ordination with the Israel Defence Forces in order to ensure public order and security.

127. As I have stated on many occasions before in the Council and elsewhere, Israel has no intention whatsoever to remain in Lebanon or in any part thereof and, with the departure of the foreign forces from that country, the Israel Defence Forces will also leave Lebanon. As the representative of Lebanon has rightly pointed out here again today, Lebanon should be left to the Lebanese and to them alone.

128. The representative of the Soviet Union has introduced a humorous dimension to what should have been a serious debate. The representative of the leading annexationist Power of our time fulminated here against annexation. The representative of the country that has cynically murdered millions of innocent civilians, in its own country as well as in other countries, has spoken here against cynicism and has feigned compassion for innocent human beings.

129. The representative of the foremost aggressor State of our time has sermonized here tonight against aggression. The representative of the country that is commonly considered as the worst violator of human rights has spoken in support of human rights. The

representative of the country which by common accord is one of the worst offenders—if not the worst offender—against international law has posed here as the champion of international law.

130. Need one say more about the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union?

131. I do not believe I have to address myself in great detail to the unmitigated and unadulterated nonsense that we heard today from Mr. Nuseibeh. Let me therefore only briefly remind him that, with the election of Bashir Gemayel as President of Lebanon last month, Arab propagandists in various countries, and particularly in Damascus, embarked on a campaign of incitement and intimidation against Mr. Gemayel, calling actually for his liquidation.

132. Thus, for instance, on the day of the election of Mr. Gemayel, the newspaper *Al-Ba'ath*, published in Damascus, had the following to say in its issue of 23 August:

“Lebanon is not the Lebanon of Bashir Gemayel and his gangs. It is an Arab land, the population of which is represented by patriotic leaders who have rejected the candidate of the occupiers. These leaders will continue to oppose this candidate until he falls from power; and with him will fall all upon which the enemies of Lebanon have gambled.”

133. Four days later, on 27 August, another mouthpiece of the Syrian Government, the daily *Ath-Thawra*, stated the following:

“We need a concerted mobilization to eradicate those defeatists who sold themselves to the devil and became, by means of the devil's support, a real and influential force, a force starting with Sadat and culminating in Bashir Gemayel, who agreed to serve as the new military governor of Lebanon in place of the Zionists.”

134. On the same day, 27 August, Radio Damascus, another mouthpiece of the Syrian régime, stated the following:

“The national trend in Lebanon must be the expulsion of the Zionist invaders from Lebanon and the overthrow of the agents of occupation which have associated themselves with them. Bashir Gemayel is not interested in a national army. He is the leader of corrupt gangs which sow destruction throughout Lebanon.”

135. Only last week, on 7 September, international terrorist Naef Hawatma, who was not supposed to be back on Lebanese soil, having been evacuated from Beirut only days before, in a speech in Baalbek, Lebanon, threatened Bashir Gemayel with the same fate that had befallen President Sadat.

136. Mr. Nuseibeh, who knows of the many attempts on the life of King Hussein and who knows full well who murdered King Abdallah, should have known better than lay his astounding and shameless accusations at Israel's doorstep. But it is this logic of recklessness, which transcends the present debate, that truly reflects the outlook which is responsible for the creation of the Arab-Israel conflict in the first place and for its perpetuation over the years and decades.

137. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

138. The PRESIDENT: I now invite the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

139. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic): Mr. President, I thank you and the other members of the Council for allowing me to make a statement.

140. I should like to put on record that my place at this table is not the right one.

141. I should like, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this difficult month. The month before was no less difficult, and the representative of Ireland distinguished himself as President and as a just and humane person.

142. I wish on this occasion to congratulate the Secretary-General for his report [S/15382 and Add.1], which is very pertinent to the work of the Council.

143. Our resolutions are being filed and not implemented. And the Secretary-General has warned—excuse me for using the word “warned”—the Council as to the present and future of peace and security, of which the Council is a guarantor and protector.

144. I really had not intended to speak in the debate today but for some preposterous insinuations made by the representative of the settler colonialist entity of Israel, the ever-aggressive. And along with aggression there has been the spreading of lies—not just today, but since the inception of this movement—the big lie: “a country without a people for a people without a country”—the big lie of Israel, the constitution of Israel. Israel exists because aggression exists.

Israel is an aggressive entity which is dragging our world—and I say it without any hesitation—to a conflagration the consequences of which will be felt in the area and in the world at large.

145. I do not wish to enter into the heart of the matter. All my colleagues, Arabs and non-Arabs, including you, Mr. President, and every member present here, except one, have in one way or another spoken publicly about the character of Israel, condemned its acts as violations of international law, resolutions and everything civilized that we have come to know since the Second World War. The heart of the matter, the essence of the matter, is clear. The Council has condemned it time and again, and had it not been for the United States, Israel would not have become a Member of this Organization. We would not have to listen to lies spread among our colleagues here, as well as insinuations, allegations and accusations concerning what the press in Syria has said. We have a free press. We are free to say whatever we like. But, inasmuch as we are free to say whatever we like, the members of the Council must also listen to our official pronouncements.

146. A spokesman in Damascus made a statement on the assassination of Mr. Bashir Gemayel. But certainly, the representative of Israel, in his selective intelligence, his selective Zionist approach—because Zionism is selective in its nature since it is a racist theory—chose to quote from the press but not what has been published in Damascus by an official spokesman of the Syrian Arab Republic.

147. The text of the statement is in Arabic. I shall paraphrase since I did not have the time to translate it word for word. Commenting on the assassination of Mr. Bashir Gemayel, an official spokesman from our Government in Damascus said the following:

“There is no doubt that Israel has assassinated Mr. Bashir Gemayel, despite the close relation at that time between Israel and Mr. Gemayel. Mr. Gemayel began to emphasize, underscore and stress the imperative necessity of a total Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon and he expounded his reluctance to conclude a treaty—a treaty of the grave, a treaty of surrender—with Israel. And during the last few days he was speaking in this sense: no treaty with the conqueror; total Israeli withdrawal. No treaty under duress, no treaty under occupation.”

You will not find another Sadat.

148. Let us remember facts. We have the report by the Secretary-General in document S/15382/Add.1. There are episodes and dates in that report. Let us refer to Tuesday, 14 September. It was on that date that President-elect Bashir Gemayel and several others were killed in the blast. That is found in paragraph 6 (c) of the document to which I referred. The

very next paragraph, 6 (d), states that: "Early on 15 September, IDF"—which means Israeli forces of occupation, not Israel Defence Forces—"infantry personnel and armour moved forward from their previous positions in west Beirut. . ." The words "Early on 15 September" should attract the attention of every member of the Council. We have information. Mr. Blum, do not think you have the means for getting information. I do not think that you have information. You fabricate information. You are good at getting information from certain sources. You co-operate with the intelligence services of your protector and ally: you exchange information. According to the spokesman, from whom we derive our information, the military commander of the Israeli forces in and around Beirut, at 9.30 a.m. on Tuesday, 14 September, began calling for a meeting that was held at 6 p.m. among the officers of the racist Israeli occupation forces around Beirut. During that meeting, each officer was assigned a certain task. Among the tasks assigned were entering Beirut, taking up positions and reassembling in certain parts of Beirut.

149. However, the most interesting thing is that at the very moment—and I emphasize that word, for in my opinion the word "moment" corresponds to the words "early on 15 September"—the assassination of Mr. Gemayel was confirmed and orders were issued to Israeli units to carry out their pre-planned, pre-arranged task, namely, the invasion of Beirut. At the very moment that the death of Mr. Gemayel was confirmed, the invasion of Beirut was proceeding according to plan and a curfew was immediately imposed.

150. All of this clearly indicates that Israel planned the assassination of Mr. Gemayel in advance and that whatever happened while Israel was carrying out that assassination or after the deed was done is the result of that assassination. Facts—not to mention history—will soon speak for themselves. Members of the Council should listen carefully to and read what I say tonight: Israel has assassinated Mr. Gemayel. I repeat: Israel has assassinated Mr. Gemayel. Israel is the only one with territorial ambitions, ambitions that go far beyond what any one of us imagines, as history has proved. Israel has declared here through its representative that it has no territorial ambitions. Yet if Israel has no territorial ambitions, why is it now implementing its plans by setting up El Al offices, banks and water-resource programmes near the Litani? This corresponds precisely to what Mr. Sharett said when he denounced his own friends by relating in his memoirs the story of the occupation of southern Lebanon. One day, we shall also quote Mr. Blum and rebut what he has said in document S/15386, lying as he did so, when he quoted from his statement to the General Assembly on 17 August, at the 26th meeting of the Seventh Emergency Special Session, that:

"Israel has no territorial ambitions whatsoever in Lebanon. We do not covet even one single square inch of Lebanese territory. . .

"Israel wants peace in and with Lebanon. Israel has no quarrel with Lebanon, only with those who have subjugated it."

151. But who has subjugated Lebanon? Who has killed 30,000 or more Lebanese? Who has displaced 600,000 Lebanese? Who has maimed 18,000 Lebanese? Israel wants to terrorize Lebanon, to subjugate Lebanon, to exploit Lebanon and to annex those parts of Lebanon that are of interest to it, and the interests of Israel are all too well known to everyone because of the many precedents that exist—Jerusalem, the Golan Heights, the *de facto* annexation of the West Bank where we have lost count of the number of settlements, settlements the construction of which, we are told, should merely be frozen; they need not be dismantled; they may be kept there.

152. The hour is late. I took the floor categorically to rebut the Israeli allegations, insinuations, lies and fabrications. As this juncture I shall end my statement and resume it at a later stage. I would only take this opportunity to express a welcome to the presence among us of our new colleague, the representative of the United Kingdom.

153. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply, and I now call on him.

154. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The representative of Syria has confronted us with a serious question. He asked the Council, and I suppose he asked it in all seriousness: "Who has subjugated Lebanon?" I think the answer is clear. Syria has subjugated Lebanon. For the past eight years, the Syrian army of occupation, in conjunction with the terrorist PLO, has been terrorizing the Lebanese people all over Lebanon, including Beirut, which they shelled and bombed for weeks in October 1978.

155. The representative of the Soviet Union calculated that about one third of Lebanon is now under Israeli control. That leaves two thirds of Lebanese territory unaccounted for. I presume the representative of the Soviet Union does not know who controls those two thirds of Lebanon's territory, but I think it would be difficult to assume that the representative of Syria does not know under whose control those two thirds are. But I should like to ask him: who controls those two thirds of Lebanese territory? What is the purpose of their presence there? Who regards all of Lebanon as part of greater Syria, of *Suriya Al-Kubra*? Who has never established diplomatic relations with Lebanon because of the fraternal relations that exist between the two countries? When was the Syrian ambassador recalled from Beirut, Mr. El-Fattal? He was not recalled, because he was never appointed. Will Mr. El-Fattal be good enough to explain to the Council the reasons for the non-appointment of Syrian envoys to Lebanon during all these years?

156. But I believe that we are all grateful to the representative of Syria for an important and sensational piece of information. He informed the Council that there is freedom of the press in his country. Well, some of us were not aware of this interesting fact until now, but I am sure that it is as true as the existence of democracy in Syria—the multi-party State of Syria, I should add. But if the representative of Syria really wants to know more about the true situation in his country, I would refer him to the parting shot of his predecessor, to the press statement made by his immediate predecessor when he left office and told all of us about the democracy, freedom of speech, freedom of the press and all the other freedoms that existed under the régime of the Assad brothers—the majority régime of the minority Alawites of Syria.

157. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to make his statement.

158. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic): I believe that we are here for a very important question—the invasion of the second part of Beirut.

159. We are faced with a situation that, in accordance with Israeli designs, would lead to the annexation of part of Lebanon if permitted to continue. Let us be very frank about that.

160. I should like to remind the members of the Council that Syria is in Lebanon because it was ordered to do so by the League of Arab States of which we are a member, and we are proud to perform our national duty in Lebanon, a national duty which stopped once and for all the civil war which Israel is restarting today through the killing of Mr. Gemayel, the civil war which Israel, through its occupation of west Beirut, is rekindling again. That is why Syria and the Arab Deterrent Forces are performing a sacred national duty. This must be understood very clearly by the Israeli representative. It is a sacred national duty; "Greater Syria", "Smaller Syria"—there is nothing of the sort that should be of concern to him. Israel has become super-Israel; it has destroyed Palestine; it has destroyed part of my country; it has occupied one third of Lebanon, as the representative of the Soviet Union said; then the Israeli representative claims that Syria has objectives in Lebanon which are different from the objectives of the Arab people of Lebanon. That is the biggest lie. To be more polite, I could say "misrepresentation", but in my dictionary it is a lie. Syria is performing a national duty and it will continue to do so until the last of the colonialist Israeli soldiers, coming from all parts of the world to grab land and water, leave the entire territory of Lebanon. This should be made very clear to the Israeli representative and to those who perhaps have intentions to portray our presence in Lebanon as something other than a national duty.

161. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel again wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I would appreciate it very much if he would bear in mind the lateness of the hour. I now call on him.

162. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Mr. President, I shall certainly bear in mind the lateness of the hour and be very brief.

163. I want to address myself to just one sentence in the statement of my Syrian colleague. He has again treated us for the umpteenth time to the fiction of the Syrian presence in Lebanon being at the request of Lebanon and of the Arab League. I am sure that he knows that that claim has been a fiction all these years and that the Syrian army of occupation was hiding in Lebanon behind that fig-leaf. But even that fig-leaf has disappeared since last July. The so-called mandate of the so-called Arab Peace Deterrent Force—a very curious designation but that, I think, was the official designation—expired on 27 July. The Lebanese Government did not ask for the extension of that mandate; in fact, it asked that all foreign forces, including those of Syria, leave Lebanon. And yet, here we have the Syrian representative six or seven weeks later pretending that the Syrian army of occupation is on Lebanese soil at the request of Lebanon and of the Arab League. I leave it to members of the Council to determine for themselves who fabricates facts and who fabricates information here.

164. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I have before me the text of a draft resolution, which in actual fact is a working paper and which I did not and still do not intend to introduce to the Council before further consultations with the members of the Council. As I stated to several of my colleagues and to members of other delegations, I should like to put on record that I would deeply appreciate any proposals, amendments or changes which any delegation might wish to submit to this working paper which has appeared in provisional form [S/15394].

165. Even though it has already appeared in provisional form, I think there must be further consultations among the members of the Council, because our principal aim is to achieve consensus on an extremely grave situation in Lebanon; our principle aim and motivation is solely to safeguard the integrity of Beirut and its population.

166. I therefore hope that my colleagues around this table will consider this as an initial draft and that they will make proposals for inclusion in this draft resolution, which I shall then officially submit to the Council.

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

168. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): I am not going to speak in exercise of my right of reply at this stage.

169. I wish to thank the representative of Jordan for having submitted his working paper and for welcoming observations from other members. I would, however, draw the attention of the President and the other members of the Council to the urgency of the situation and ask for extreme celerity in reaching the

consensus which we hope it will be possible to reach in the Council.

The meeting rose at 8.30 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 4.*

² A/37/1, p. 3.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودرور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经销处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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