

UNITED NATIONS LIBRARY



JUN 15 1982
UNISA COLLEGE

SECURITY COUNCIL

OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR

2375th MEETING: 6 JUNE 1982

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2375)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: 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)	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.

2375th MEETING

Held in New York on Sunday, 6 June 1982, at 7.45 p.m.

President: Mr. Luc de La BARRE de NANTEUIL
(France).

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/2375)

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

The meeting was called to order at 8.15 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

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)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with decisions taken at the 2374th meeting, 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.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon) and Mr. Blum (Israel) took places at the Council table; Mr. Abdel Rahman (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Members of the Council have before them document S/15171, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Ireland. Members also have before them document S/15170, which contains the text of a letter dated 6 June from the representative of Oman to the President of the Council.

3. I now call on the Secretary-General.

4. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: The present report is submitted in pursuance of Security Council resolution 508 (1982), which was adopted unanimously at the 2374th meeting of the Council on 5 June 1982 at 1730 hours (New York time). In that resolution, the Council called upon all the parties to the conflict to cease "immediately and simultaneously all military activities within Lebanon and across the Lebanese-Israeli border and no later than 0600 hours (local time) on Sunday, 6 June 1982", i.e. 0400 hours (GMT) on 6 June, or midnight (New York time) on the night of 5/6 June. The Council also requested me to undertake all possible efforts to ensure the implementation of and compliance with the resolution and to report to the Council as early as possible, and not later than 48 hours after the adoption of the resolution.

5. As the Council is aware, prior to the adoption of the resolution I had already made an urgent appeal to the parties for such a cessation of hostilities. Thereafter, following the adoption of the resolution, the representative of the PLO reaffirmed its commitment to stop all military operations across the Lebanese border while reserving its right to respond in case of any Israeli aggression. The representative of Israel informed me yesterday at 2300 hours (New York time) that, while Israeli reactions were in exercise of its right of self-defence, the resolution of the Security Council would be brought before the Israeli Cabinet.

6. In a message to Lieutenant-General Callaghan, the Commander of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), I instructed him to use every possibility of following up on my appeal to the parties and the subsequent resolution of the Council.

7. I regret to state, however, that despite all efforts throughout the night, it was not possible to effect a cease-fire. Indeed, hostilities have escalated dangerously. In this connection, it is relevant to record that Mr. Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Committee of PLO, in response to a message from me, informed me that in spite of heavy Israeli airstrikes after the scheduled time of the cease-fire, he had given orders to all PLO units to withhold fire for a further unspecified period. This was, of course, before the Israeli ground operations had started.

8. The following is the information received from the Commander of UNIFIL.

9. Between 2100 hours (GMT) on 5 June 1982 and 0400 hours (GMT) on 6 June, there were intermittent

and relatively light exchanges of fire between positions of the armed elements (mainly PLO and the Lebanese National Movement) on the one hand, and the Israel Defence Forces and the *de facto* forces on the other. The exchanges of fire involved, or affected, the following areas: on the one side, in Lebanon, Tyre and vicinity, Château de Beaufort, Nabatiyah and the Kawkaba-Hasbayah area; on the other side, Marjayoun in Lebanon and the area of Metulla in Israel.

10. From 0424 hours (GMT), i.e. 0624 hours local Lebanese time (and after the cease-fire time set by the Council), to 1235 hours (GMT), intensive air-attacks were launched by Israel, with approximately 110 strikes being recorded by UNIFIL. These strikes occurred principally in the area of Château de Beaufort and Tyre and its vicinity, from where there was anti-aircraft fire. One aircraft was observed to have been downed north of the Litani river, near Château de Beaufort.

11. At around 0930 hours (GMT), UNIFIL reported that Israeli ground forces—including a very large number of tanks and armoured personnel carriers—had begun to move into Lebanese territory in strength. They moved along three main axes: in the west, along the coastal road; in the central sector, towards Ett Taibe and the Akiya bridge; and in the eastern sector, through the Kafer Chouba-Chebaa area. As at 2100 hours (GMT), the Israeli forces are reported to have reached the following locations: Tyre, on the coastal road, where heavy fighting is reported; in the central sector, Israeli forces have neared Nabatiyah, but it is not known whether they have entered the town; in the eastern sector, Israeli columns are moving towards Hasbaya. There is also a heavy concentration of tanks in the Khardala and Blate areas. I have also been informed by General Callaghan of extremely heavy aerial bombardment of Tyre, which is bound to cause numerous casualties as well as extensive destruction.

12. As the Israeli forces moved into southern Lebanon, the Commander of UNIFIL gave instructions for the standing operational procedures to be put into effect by all units. These include measures to block advancing forces and also defense measures. The overwhelming strength and weight of the Israeli forces precluded the possibility of stopping them, and UNIFIL positions in the line of the invasion have thus been overrun or bypassed.

13. UNIFIL is, of course, a peace-keeping force with a specific mandate entrusted to it by the Security Council, which is based on the assumption that the parties to the conflict will take the necessary steps for compliance with the decisions of the Council. The Force has neither the mandate, nor the military capacity, to counter an invasion such as is now taking place, which is estimated to comprise more than two mechanized divisions with full air and naval support.

14. Finally, I must inform the Council with profound regret that a Norwegian soldier has been killed by shrapnel in circumstances that are not yet clear. I shall report to the Council on further developments.

15. Mr. DORR (Ireland): As we all know, the situation in Lebanon at this moment is extremely grave. Over the past 24 hours there has been a massive invasion of Lebanese territory. Many lives have already been lost. With this invasion the spiral of violence in the region has taken another and most serious turn. Escalation now is rapid. The direction of the spiral is always upward.

16. That rapid escalation causes us the most grave concern. This is not a time for long speeches or for extended debate; it is a time for action—rapid action—by the Council. If that action is to be truly effective, the Council should try to act in unison. We need to bring the full moral and legal authority of the Council to bear on the situation in order to call a halt. As a Council we carry the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. In exercise of that responsibility we must demand an end to all hostilities and the strictest respect for the territorial integrity, the sovereignty and the political independence of Lebanon.

17. That is the aim of the draft resolution contained in document S/15171, which I wish to introduce formally to the Council on behalf of Ireland.

18. In the preamble, the Council reaffirms the need for strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. That must always be the starting-point and the basic aim of all action by the Council in this matter.

19. In operative paragraph 1, the Council demands that Israel withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon; it demands that all parties observe strictly the terms of paragraph 1 of resolution 508 (1982), which we adopted yesterday, and operative paragraph 2 spells out those terms. In paragraph 3, the Council calls on all parties to communicate to the Secretary-General their acceptance of the present resolution within twenty-four hours and in paragraph 4, the Council decides to remain seized of the question.

20. I believe, on the basis of our informal consultations, that it is possible that this draft could be the basis for common and urgent action by the Council in this grave situation. I therefore commend the draft to the Council and I hope that it will be adopted.

21. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Israel, on whom I now call.

22. Mr. BLUM (Israel): In the Council's meeting yesterday [2374th meeting] the representative of Lebanon made what was apparently a slip of the tongue. Since slips of the tongue are not likely to be recorded in the minutes of the Council, and because of the revealing nature of the case in point, I should like to commit it to posterity.

23. Mr. Tuéni called upon the Council to consider "the aggression against Israel". Mr. Tuéni is, of course, right. Israel, indeed, has been the target of ongoing aggression for many years. Yet, the Council has not evinced the slightest interest in all those acts of warfare, violence and terrorism which in their totality manifest the ongoing Arab aggression against my country. Let me assure Mr. Tuéni that the Council will remain equally indifferent now to the display of Arab aggression against my country and against my people.

24. The Council cannot even plead ignorance in this regard. Israel has regularly informed the Council, over the years, of the attempted atrocities and the actual atrocities perpetrated by the PLO against Israel, Israelis and Jews around the world. In fact, I would even venture to say that we have long been among the most diligent correspondents of the Council in recent years. Permit me, therefore, Mr. President, to refresh the Council's memory and to remind its members of some of the "highlights" of PLO barbarism in recent years.

25. On 22 April 1979, four PLO terrorists landed at night on the coast of Nahariya in a rubber dinghy after setting out from the Lebanese port of Tyre. On reaching Nahariya, the terrorists attacked an apartment building, killing one Israel civilian, his two small children and an Israel policeman. This was reported by me to the Security Council in document S/13264 of 23 April.

26. On 6 April 1980, five PLO terrorists of the so-called Arab Liberation Front infiltrated Israel from Lebanon and attacked a children's nursery at Kibbutz Misgav Am on Israel's northern border. A two-year-old child and a kibbutz secretary were murdered by the terrorists and one soldier was killed. One adult civilian, 4 children and 11 soldiers were injured. This was reported by me to the Council in document S/13876 of 7 April.

27. On 27 July, a PLO terrorist hurled two grenades into a group numbering 40 Jewish schoolchildren waiting to board a bus outside a community centre in Antwerp. One child was killed outright, seven others were wounded, in addition to ten adults and a pregnant woman all of whom sustained injuries. This was reported by me to the Council in document S/14081 of 30 July.

28. On 29 August 1981, terrorists of the PLO faction "Black June" attacked a synagogue in Vienna using hand grenades and machine-guns. Two worshippers

were killed and 19 people were wounded, including 2 children and 2 Austrian policemen. This was reported by me to the Council in document S/14670 of 31 August.

29. On 7 October, an explosive charge went off at a building in Rome housing the offices of Israel's national airline, El Al. Eight people were wounded and the premises were badly damaged.

30. On 20 October, a booby-trapped car exploded opposite the Jewish Portuguese Community Synagogue in Antwerp, only minutes before special holiday services were due to begin. Three people were killed and about 100 wounded.

31. On 15 January 1982, the PLO bombed a Jewish-owned restaurant frequented by Jewish patrons in West Berlin. The explosion killed a 14-month-old girl and wounded 24 other people. This was reported by me to the Council in document S/14842 on 20 January.

32. On 3 April, a PLO terrorist shot and killed a diplomat at the Israel Embassy in Paris, outside his home in the French capital. The murder of Mr. Yacov Barsimantov by a 20-year-old female terrorist, who shot him at point-blank range, was witnessed by his family. Responsibility for the murder was assumed by the "Lebanese Armed Revolutionary Faction", one of the many aliases of the terrorist PLO. Being the seasoned criminals that they are, the PLO terrorists have developed the fine technique of adopting such aliases specially invented for the purpose of covering up their crimes. This was reported to the Council by the Chargé d'affaires of the Mission of Israel in document S/14951 of 3 April.

33. And last week, on 3 June, a group of PLO terrorists attempted to assassinate Israel's Ambassador to the Court of St. James, Mr. Shlomo Argov, as he was leaving a hotel in central London. One of the PLO terrorists of the group fired at point-blank range, seriously wounding our Ambassador, who underwent brain surgery and remains in critical condition in a London hospital. This was reported by me to the Council in document S/15158 of 4 June.

34. That is by no means the statistical sum total of PLO atrocities over the years. Let me just point out, in this connection, that even in the relatively short period of time which has elapsed since the July 1981 agreement on cessation of hostilities, the total of dead and wounded at the hands of the PLO has steadily mounted to a point where it now reaches 17 dead and 241 wounded in a total of 141 terrorist acts, all of them originating from terrorist bases inside Lebanon. And to give some indication of the escalation of terrorist activity in the last few weeks, I would point out that since 9 May this year—less than one month ago—28 acts of PLO terrorism have been reported in Israel and abroad and against the area under the control of Major Saad Haddad in southern Lebanon.

35. These and many hundreds of additional terrorist attacks against Israel, Israelis and Jews were regularly reported by us to the Council. All our reports have gone unheeded. The Council has remained unmoved and did not see fit to act with a view to curbing the criminal activities of the PLO. Nor did the Council ever pronounce itself against the harassment by the PLO of Israel's civilian population in the northern part of our country, which has been repeatedly subjected to massive bombardments, shelling and rocket attacks by the PLO using long-range artillery pieces and Katyusha rocket launchers supplied to them by the Soviet Union.

36. When is the Council galvanized into action? When Israel, after years of unparalleled restraint, finally resorts to the exercise of its right of self-defence, the fundamental and inalienable right of any State, which is also recognized by the Charter of the United Nations as the inherent right of Member States of the Organization. In order to save a terrorist organization from well-deserved and long-overdue retribution, the Council is convened in emergency meetings, urgent meetings and every conceivable form of extraordinary session. It is the same Council which over all these years has not found the time to devote even one such meeting to a debate on the situation in Lebanon as a whole and to the causes underlying that unfortunate country's predicament. It is the same Council which has not found the time to discuss the mass murder and bloodbath perpetrated by the régime of the Assad brothers of Syria against the people of Hama, the fifth largest city of that country, last February. It is the same Council which has not found time over the past 19 months to discuss the Iraqi aggression against Iran and the resulting misery for millions of people, including more than 2 million refugees. It is the same Council which has not seen fit to discuss since January 1980 the ongoing rape of Afghanistan by the Soviet army of occupation. It is the same Council which has not found time to discuss in over three years—since January 1979, to be precise—the continuous genocide of the people of Kampuchea, a country which has been subjected equally to external aggression from Viet Nam. And it is the same Council which has never found time to consider the suppression of the Polish people by a military régime imposed on it from without.

37. Perhaps I have been a trifle naïve, but I have been under the impression that the primary duty of the Council was and remains the promotion of international peace and security, not the encouragement of international terrorism or the protection of its practitioners.

38. Let me ask the Council a simple question: how many Israelis have to be killed by the PLO terrorists for the Council to be persuaded that the limits of our endurance have been reached? How many passengers on civilian buses, how many Israeli schoolchildren, how many Israeli toddlers, how many Israeli women

simply doing their shopping, how many ordinary Israeli civilians asleep in their beds, how many of Israel's diplomats must be murdered by the PLO for the Council to realize that Israel and its people are one of the prime targets of international terrorism and of its foremost exponent and linchpin, the murderous PLO? The answer is simple. It is grounded in the bitter experience of many years. Given the parliamentary situation in the Organization and the constellation within the Council, Israel cannot expect this body even to deplore PLO barbarism against Israel's civilian population, let alone take any steps with a view to curbing that barbarism.

39. It thus becomes imperative for the Government of Israel to exercise its legitimate right of self-defence to protect the lives of its citizens and to ensure their safety. Indeed, I would ask how many States represented here would agree to sit back passively and watch their own women and children murdered and maimed by terrorists? How many States represented here in the Council are willing to accept an unconditional cessation of hostilities without guaranteeing what they perceive as their vital interests? Yet we are still confronted with the strange phenomenon that countries that one day vote against such a call for an unconditional cessation of hostilities when the matter affects them in one part of the world have no compunction about supporting, the following day, a similar call in another part of the world.

40. Reference was made in the Council yesterday to the fact that the hit list of the PLO terrorists involved in the assassination attempt in London against Mr. Shlomo Argov apparently included the resident PLO terrorist in the British capital. If indeed this information is correct it should not occasion any surprise. After all, the settling of scores in the criminal underworld is a well-known fact of life and there is no reason to expect that this should be any less applicable to the PLO criminal community. In fact, its constant internecine feuding and reciprocal assassinations have proved over the decades a characteristic and salient feature of Arab terrorism in general and of Palestinian Arab terrorism in particular. The warring factions within the PLO have excelled themselves in this field. Let me give the Council a few examples: the murder of PLO henchman Sa'id Hamami in London in April 1979—the man who in fact served as the immediate predecessor of the present PLO operative in London, who is said to have figured on the latest hit list; the murder of Ali Yassoun, the PLO operative in Kuwait, in June of the same year; the murder in Cannes, France, of Zohair Mohsein, the chief of the As-Saiqua terrorist faction within the PLO; the murder of the PLO terrorist Na'im Khader in Brussels in June 1981. To borrow an expression from English company law, it is not incumbent upon Israel "to lift the veil" with regard to the internal blood feuding of the PLO with a view to researching the mutual relationships of its factions and members. To make such a demand on Israel would be about as reasonable as to

demand that the law enforcement authorities of a particular State should absolve a known criminal of responsibility for his crime simply because he has also had the intention of murdering another member of his gang.

41. The simple and incontrovertible fact remains: all the groups which together constitute that multitentacled octopus known as the PLO have their headquarters, training grounds and bases of operations in Lebanon. This fact is unaltered by the feuding that remains a permanent feature of PLO existence and that occasionally erupts into full-fledged violence between the various PLO groups.

42. Not many weeks past, on 25 February of this year to be precise, in a remark that did not go unnoticed, Mr. Tuéni told a meeting of the Council that: "we shall never become accessories to anybody's strategy in the destabilization process that is today tearing the Middle East apart" [2332nd meeting, para. 142]. Now Mr. Tuéni has requested a meeting of the Council to complain in substance that Israel has attacked PLO bases in his country.

43. Israel has stated on numerous occasions that it has no territorial ambitions in Lebanon, that it respects and honours Lebanese independence and territorial integrity. My Government reiterates this clear policy today, but the least that we are entitled to expect is a full measure of reciprocity. We are perfectly willing to believe in the earnestness of Mr. Tuéni's declaration, which I just quoted, and another serious undertaking, and I quote him again: "my country"—Mr. Tuéni said at the same meeting of the Security Council—"is not for hire nor for sale; it is not negotiable and it is not dispensable" [*ibid.*, para. 141].

44. If all this were true, what—may one ask—are 15,000 armed PLO terrorists doing on Lebanese soil with their artillery and tanks? What of the well-documented comings and goings of international terrorist organizations finding succour and enlightenment in the academies of international terror run by the PLO to the glory of murder and rampage? Under what authority are they receiving international delegations, including United Nations committees, on Lebanese soil? Why is the Syrian army of occupation laying down the law in Lebanon? What are 25,000 well-armed Syrian soldiers, one third of the Syrian army, doing in Lebanon, in Beirut, its capital, in Tripoli and in other cities in the Beka'a valley, which has been annexed to Syria in all but name and where Syrian currency is being used as legal tender? In short, where do Lebanese sovereignty begin and Mr. Tuéni's hollow protestations end?

45. The tragic reality prevailing in Lebanon must be recognized by all of us. We are all painfully aware that the situation in the southern part of Lebanon cannot be detached from the situation in Lebanon as a whole. The situation prevailing in the south of the country is

merely one symptom of a much larger problem. The internal problems of Lebanon are of long standing. They were greatly aggravated by the arrival of large numbers of armed PLO terrorists there. With its far from gentle expulsion from Jordan in 1970 and its exclusion from other Arab countries, the PLO took advantage of Lebanon's inherent weaknesses to establish operational bases and headquarters there. Indeed, the erosion of Lebanon's sovereignty began in the early 1970s when the PLO set up what was virtually "a State within a State" in Lebanon, principally in southern Lebanon where one of the areas was even dubbed "Fatahland".

46. Over the last few years the PLO with increasing intensity turned southern Lebanon into a staging post for its murderous incursions into Israel. Names like Avivim, Ma'alot, Kiryat Shmona, Nahariya and Misgav Am came to denote the scenes of bloody massacres of women and children. All of those acts and many others were perpetrated by PLO terrorists operating from Lebanese territory. Nor were the PLO terroristic activities confined to Israel.

47. A reign of terror swept Lebanese villages in the south as the PLO gradually tightened its grip over the area. Moreover, southern Lebanon became the training ground, logistic centre and refuge for members of the terrorist internationale from all over the world. Their activities have plagued numerous countries and the international community at large.

48. From the early 1970s onwards, Lebanon lost much of its sovereignty over its own territory to the terrorist PLO, but in the bitter and brutal war in Lebanon between 1974 and 1976 the country also lost its independence to Syria, which saw in the steadily deteriorating situation in Lebanon an opportunity to realize its long-standing ambition—to swallow up Lebanon within what the Syrians refer to as "Greater Syria". Between 1974 and 1976 Syrian allegiances jockeyed and changed for reasons of political expediency to suit Syria's own purposes. At one stage the Syrians presented themselves as the protectors of the Christian Lebanese against the PLO and did not hesitate at that stage to bombard and demolish PLO strongholds, such as Tel El-Zaatar. Later on, roles reversed and the Syrians turned brutally on the Christians with horrifying results, mercilessly bombarding civilian centres, killing uncounted thousands of civilians and turning up to a million Lebanese into refugees. Indeed, the images of Syria's indiscriminate brutality in Lebanon are familiar to anyone who watches television news. Most vivid are the pictures of last year of the merciless Syrian siege of Zahlé, the largest Christian city in the Middle East. That siege went on for weeks and by the time it was lifted it had resulted in more than 1,000 casualties.

49. In all these activities, both the Syrian army of occupation and the terrorist PLO have been aided, abetted, trained, equipped and financed by the Soviet

Union, whose attempts at destabilizing and subverting the Middle East as a whole are well known and whose sinister role in the Lebanese tragedy is common knowledge. As a result of all this, Lebanon has been in recent years and still remains a country occupied by alien forces. Syria still maintains in Lebanon a sizable portion of its army—that is, about 25,000 troops and upwards—and the PLO still has over 15,000 armed terrorists operating in the country, of whom over 2,000 are positioned south of the Litani River. About 1,500 of these terrorists are located in the so-called Tyre pocket and around 700 are deployed in some 40 pockets and nests within the UNIFIL area of operation, with the clear intention of using that area as a springboard in their attempts to terrorize Israel's civilian population, particularly in the northern part of our country.

50. As long as these non-Lebanese elements are allowed to operate within and from Lebanon no real progress will be achieved towards the return of the effective authority of the Government of Lebanon throughout the length and breadth of that country. Peace cannot be restored in Lebanon and the Lebanese Government cannot re-establish its effective authority while a massive Syrian army of occupation holds down the bulk of the country and while PLO terrorists, trained and armed by the Soviet Union, are given free rein on Lebanese soil.

51. Ever since its occupation of Lebanon in 1976 Syria has denied the Government of Lebanon any semblance of free and independent political decision-making and action. No decisions affecting Lebanese national policies, either internal or external, are taken any more by the Government of Lebanon, and no longer are those decisions made in Beirut, its capital. They are now made by its fraternal neighbour, Syria. To rub it in, Syria has eliminated along its border with Lebanon all remaining vestiges of Lebanese sovereignty and authority, especially in the Beka'a valley. International frontier demarcations between the two countries have been removed, Syrian currency has been introduced, and various Lebanese Government signs have been taken down and destroyed. Various statements of the representative of Lebanon in the Council must also be viewed against that background.

52. To the outsider it may seem that Lebanon has been divided into spheres of influence, principally between the Syrians, who keep their army in the north of the country, and the terrorist PLO, which operates throughout much of the south. The fact is that the PLO in Lebanon operates under complete Syrian control. It is Syria which oversees the supply of the PLO armaments and logistic facilities. It is Syria which decides how that terrorist organization will be deployed and what tasks it will undertake within the framework of wider Syrian designs.

53. Over all these years of turmoil in Lebanon the Council has not seen fit to devote any time to dis-

cussing the subversion of Lebanese sovereignty, first by the PLO and subsequently by Syria, except for the five desultory minutes which it accorded the topic on 6 October 1978 [2089th meeting]—that is to say, more than three and a half year ago—at the end of which it nervously adopted, without any formal debate, a milk-and-water resolution [resolution 436 (1978)] which avoided even indirect reference to Syria, which was then involved in the massive bombardment and destruction of civilian quarters of Beirut and the large-scale massacre of its population. This pattern of behaviour by the Council, totally at variance with the facts and realities prevailing in Lebanon, will also be duly reflected in tonight's deliberations. The Council apparently is still not aware of the fact that Lebanon is an occupied country, dominated by the Syrian army of occupation and by the PLO armed terrorists. This bizarre pattern of behaviour by the Council may perhaps be understood by its members, but is certainly far from being comprehensible to world opinion. It can only further lower and compromise the Council's already badly shattered credibility on any matter affecting the Arab-Israel conflict.

54. In the normal course of international affairs, a sovereign State assumes the responsibility for the actions not only of its Government but also of its subjects and "guests". Lebanon's duty to prevent its territory from being used for terrorist attacks against other States is based on general international law. As has been stated in Oppenheim-Lauterpacht's well-known and authoritative treatise on international law:

"States are under a duty to prevent and suppress such subversive activity against foreign Governments as assumes the form of armed hostile expeditions or attempts to commit common crimes against life or property."¹

This principle has been embraced by the General Assembly on numerous occasions, including, for example, in the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty, adopted by the General Assembly on 21 December 1965 [resolution 2131 (XX)] and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly on 24 October 1970 [resolution 2625 (XXV), annex].

55. For Israel, all this is a matter of the utmost concern, especially regarding Lebanon. The PLO, the so-called guest of Lebanon, whose variety is legion and whose sense of responsibility is nil, is acting with its customary brazenness in trespassing against the citizens of a neighbouring State, Israel. Israel must hold Lebanon fully responsible for any atrocity committed against it when it is conceived and planned in Lebanon, irrespective of whether it is carried out from Lebanon or from any other territory.

56. Our attitude should hardly appear strange to the Lebanese authorities. They know full well what the score-board indicates. It bears witness to assassinations and attempted assassinations, murders and attempted murders, all of which reflect the objectives of PLO strategy—namely, the maximum loss of life and limb among Israelis and Jews, wherever they may be.

57. When the cessation of hostilities on the Lebanese border went into effect on 24 July 1981, after laborious and protracted efforts by the United States envoy, Mr. Philip Habib, it soon became clear that the Lebanese Government, for all the protestations of Mr. Tuéni, was unable to enforce it, control it or ensure its continuation. Violations of the cessation of hostilities began almost immediately and have continued unabated, culminating most recently in the attempted assassination of Mr. Argov in London. In the face of great provocation, Israel has been acting with the utmost restraint, but the most recent terrorist outrages make too heavy demands on Israel's patience.

58. It is customary for the PLO terrorists, as well as for their protectors, financiers and supporters, to voice surprise at Israeli acts of self-defence when the limits of forbearance are reached but the Security Council should consider Israel's situation when confronted with the unending harassment, the indiscriminate and senseless killing of innocent people, by the PLO, and it would do well to bear in mind the sinister association of the PLO with one of the super-Powers, with the bandits who parade in military uniforms and make use of the PLO in promoting their inter-Arab ambitions, with the potentates who buy insurance by paying ransom to the PLO chieftains. Propaganda has elevated these men to the ranks of courageous freedom fighters. In reality they are cowards, whose custom it is to use men, women and children as human shields in an attempt to ward off the retribution which they deserve.

59. Israel sincerely regrets any loss of life that may have occurred among persons not directly responsible for PLO activities. The responsibility must be borne fully by the PLO and attributed to its total disregard of human life, be it Israeli or Arab, Jewish, Christian or Muslim. In this connection, I wish to express to the Government and people of Norway our profound sympathy on the death of a member of the Norwegian contingent of UNIFIL.

60. Hardly a day passes in Lebanon when the PLO is not exercising its skills in butchery. Recent weeks have seen the unfolding tragedy of more PLO activity directed to gain the upper hand over the Shiites beyond the Litani River. Together with their so-called leftist comrades-in-crime, they have been roaming the length and breadth of the Shiite villages, killing, looting and razing houses. Many thousands of Shiites have been fleeing the area in an effort to escape from the PLO, which is apparently planning to reassert its presence in the territory which it has staked out for itself.

61. More recent testimony of Shiite Muslim resentment of the PLO presence in that country is supplied by a *Washington Post* article of 27 May 1982. In a dispatch from Sidon the *Washington Post* reports a weakening of popular support for the terrorists. The situation is described by Walid Jumblatt of the "national movement", which groups Lebanese leftist militias with the PLO, as a "crisis of confidence". According to the dispatch, the PLO leadership is being asked to show more respect for Lebanon's own concerns when they differ from those of the Palestinians.

62. This so-called crisis of confidence has found its most recent expression in sharp clashes between Muslim militias and PLO terrorists in Sidon. This is a repetition of acts committed only a few years ago in southern Lebanon, where the PLO entrenched itself with the purpose of striking out across the border into Israel territory. That phase of PLO activity is now over, but the feverish build-up of arms and the building of fortifications, as well as terrorist probes into Israel, spell more trouble and bloodshed ahead.

63. A PLO broadcast from Lebanon on 29 July 1981, only days after the agreement on the cessation of hostilities, said:

"The Palestinian front in south Lebanon will be an integral part of the internal front in all portions of the occupied land, in order to strike once again the Zionist enemy and attain international achievements for the Palestinian cause, which introduced the warrior's rifle into all corners of the world."

64. The message is clear: the killings will go on from Lebanon against Israel, against Israelis and Jews everywhere. But Israel will not remain unmoved by the repetition of endless murders, sabotage and incitement. Those who overstep the boundaries and see themselves under no obligation regarding the life and property of Israel's citizens must be put on notice. Israel has always sought negotiations with its neighbours with a view to arriving at a peaceful settlement of all the outstanding issues. Israel's neighbours, with one well-known recent exception, have declined to negotiate with us.

65. Faced with intolerable provocations, repeated aggression and harassment, Israel has now been forced to exercise its right of self-defence to arrest the never-ending cycle of attacks against Israel's northern border, to deter continued terrorism against Israel's citizens in Israel and abroad, and to instil the basic concept in the minds of the PLO assassins that Jewish life will never again be taken with impunity.

66. The Government of Israel, after all these months of cautioning and warnings, has now decided to act, justifiably and within clearly delineated parameters, to free the inhabitants of the Galilee from PLO harassment. The Israel Cabinet, in its meeting today, thus resolved as follows: first, to instruct the Israel Defence

Forces to place all the civilian population of the Galilee beyond the range of the terrorists' fire from Lebanon, where they, their bases and their headquarters are concentrated; secondly, that the name of the operation is "Peace for Galilee"; thirdly, that during the operation the Syrian army will not be attacked unless it attacks our forces; fourthly, that Israel continues to aspire to the signing of a peace treaty with independent Lebanon, its territorial integrity preserved.

67. No one in the Middle East is as eager as Israel to see Lebanese sovereignty restored, its internal strife resolved, the Syrian occupiers removed, the PLO subdued and freedom and tranquillity returned to that war-torn land. Israel will do everything in its power to maintain good-neighbourly relations with Lebanon, and the Lebanese leaders know this. If Lebanon is now helplessly given over to its captors, having forfeited its independence, it must not expect Israel to relinquish its responsibilities as a sovereign State. Israel has no quarrel with Lebanon, only with those who have subjugated it.

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

69. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): This has been a very long day, Mr. President, and I must thank you and the others members of the Council, and the Secretariat, for your endless patience—particularly in listening to the speech of the representative of Israel.

70. It is obvious to the Council and to myself that this has been a standard filibuster, aimed at buying time before the Council acts on an aggression, buying time to pursue the aggression which is the subject of the item on our agenda today. It is obvious also that this is an attempt to blackmail the world Organization, the Security Council, my Government and myself, trying to intimidate us and prevent the Council and us from acting.

71. I have no taste for the black humour of the representative of Israel, nor shall I engage with him at this late hour in a contest in his own reading of international law, of history and of international politics in the area. I would rather say the following.

72. The representative of Israel seems to have forgotten that it is his country which is accused, not mine. It is therefore he who must answer accusations and not Lebanon. Indeed, it is a very strange method of helping a country to establish peace and to assume its responsibilities under international law. This is indeed the first instance in history where peace is to be established by aggression and where the aggressor pretends to be the aggressed, while having sent its armies, its air force and its navy to kill and destroy endlessly.

73. One point cannot go unnoticed. In 1978, the Council adopted resolution 425 (1978). When that resolution was being voted upon, the predecessor of

the present representative of Israel, Mr. Herzog, made pretty much the same speech. If my memory serves me adequately, I think it was identical in portions, and possibly the representative of Israel should update his stock of quotations.

74. We made our position clear then: we have made it clear since; we have nothing to add. UNIFIL was established for a very specific purpose, with a very specific mission indeed, a most difficult mission, a mission that has cost the lives of citizens of your country, Mr. President, and of other countries, particularly Fiji, Ireland, Nigeria and Norway. It has cost the lives of some of their valiant soldiers who came to establish peace in my country and in the Middle East. Ever since its inception, UNIFIL has been challenged, and so has the Council, by the Government of Israel and its troops who claim to be the sole agents of international law.

75. If we are to follow Mr. Blum's reading of international law, what we should do in fact is to dismantle the Organization and entrust him with the implementation of the Charter and the preservation of the rights of nations. But this we shall not do, and I am sure the Council does not want to do it.

76. Allow me to say that I very much thank the representative of Ireland for his words and for specifying that the aim of the present draft resolution [S/15171] is the preservation and guarantee of the security, sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon. I know of the endless efforts that he and his colleagues on the Council have made all day to try to draft a resolution that would express the Council's desire for action and for peace. My Government would indeed have preferred that the debate had followed a different course, and that a different resolution had been submitted. However, I think the draft which is now before the Council is an important step towards the implementation of peace and the guarantee of everybody's rights.

77. The Israeli-Lebanese General Armistice Agreement² with Israel which is an instrument of international law—and we have insisted over and over again on the necessity of implementing it—has been violated. But it would appear ridiculous indeed, in the face of the war which we are witnessing and living and of the scars on our land, to speak of an armistice agreement. I reiterate our commitment to that Agreement merely as an indication of my country's desire for peace and its commitment to international law.

78. One last word to the representative of Israel. If his country desires peace, may I tell him very candidly that peace cannot be achieved by the establishment of barbed wire States, ghetto States, in the Middle East. If his country wants to integrate in the area and wants to live peacefully, it cannot live peacefully by endlessly killing and destroying.

79. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, upon whom I now call.

80. Mr. ABDEL RAHMAN (Palestine Liberation Organization): I apologize for having to start my brief intervention tonight with a few remarks on the lies and distortions that the representative of the Government of the arch-terrorist Menachem Begin has uttered here in the Council. Violence and terrorism are a trademark of the Zionist movement, and everybody knows that. Before Menachem Begin and his clique came to our land, Palestine, we did not know violence and wars. They brought war with them and they brought violence with them to our land.

81. When Menachem Begin, the former corporal in the Polish army, came to Palestine he started a terrorist organization of mad, paranoid men like himself who were responsible for the killing of 254 Palestinian men, women and children in the village of Deir Yassin on 9 April 1948. I think that at that time his present representative was not in Palestine; he was still in Czechoslovakia. He immigrated later to Palestine. His counterpart, Moshe Arens, in Washington, was still studying in the United States as an American citizen.

82. In the problem of Palestine it is perhaps fortunate for us to be in the vanguard of those who fight against one of the most racist movements in the history of mankind. It is no surprise that this movement is allied to the *apartheid* régime in South Africa. It is a movement that has as its purpose the expulsion and destruction of a whole people, the Palestinian people, and the ingathering of all those madmen like Menachem Begin, Sharon and Goodman, bringing them to Palestine to sow hatred and killing in our peaceful land. They should remember that as long as our children sleep in refugee camps in Lebanon, no peace can be expected for them in Palestine. They should know that as long as our men and women are terrorized by settlers who come from Florida or Brooklyn in New York to settle in Ramallah and Nablus, there will be no peace in the Middle East. They must remember that as long as the Palestinian people does not enjoy its inalienable right to self-determination, to live in freedom and dignity in its homeland, there can be no peace in our part of the world.

83. The representative of Menachem Begin puts the cart before the horse: he never asks why there are 500,000 Palestinians in Lebanon, and why there are 1 million Palestinian refugees in Jordan, 350,000 others in Syria and probably the same number in the Gulf region. He, and others like him, are living in my home, in my country and in my cities. They are living in houses that they did not build. They are gathering the fruits of groves that they did not plant. They have attempted genocide against our people, against our culture and against our existence. I would remind them that those who commit aggression cannot expect to live in peace unless they respect the rights of others. It was Benito

Juarez who said, "*El respeto al derecho ajeno es la paz*"—respect for the rights of others is peace.

84. Anyone who tries to step on the rights of others cannot expect to live in peace. No criminal should be able to get away with his crime: such a precedent should not be tolerated. I am sure that no one seated at this table believes the lies that were spoken here tonight by the representative of the paranoiac madman Menachem Begin in Tel Aviv.

85. The Council meets today to consider the criminal assault by Israel on Lebanese and Palestinians residing in Lebanon. The massive attack by Israel—equipped with the most sophisticated United States instruments of death, from F-15 and F-16 jets to cluster and concussion bombs and napalm, used on what are, in fact, civilian targets—continues. Israeli troops, however, are being opposed by Palestinian men and women, who, in extremely difficult circumstances, are exercising their primordial right of self-defence. What they face is nothing less than extermination. No human being on earth can be expected simply to die in the face of brutal attacks.

86. The United States representative, today on American television, made two distortions. One was that she said that the Palestinians do not have the right to self-defence because they do not constitute a State. What strange logic! Clearly, the United States representative lives in a world that knows very little about the will of our people, which, for dozens of years, has been the target of the most savage, genocidal onslaught. The other distortion made was that the PLO violated the cease-fire. I think that the report of the Secretary-General answers that lie.

87. Of course our people has the right—indeed, it has the duty—of self-defence. No power on earth—and certainly not that of Israel and the United States—can take that right from the Palestinian people. The whole world knows this and respects our people: it respects our people's noble and just resistance. We will fight until there is no more fighting to be done.

88. We want to alert the world body to the fact that the Israeli attack came through United Nations lines in southern Lebanon. Israeli soldiers were unopposed in this barbaric action taken by a State bent on the destruction of another people, a people whose only crime is that it exists. There is no international body, no world conscience capable of representing moral conscience and principle that will not condemn Israel unreservedly. That a nation of refugees, the remnants of those who suffered and died in Nazi extermination camps, is now acting as barbarously and viciously as this staggers the mind.

89. The Palestinian people will resist as long as it lives. Israel attacks Palestinians everywhere: in occupied Palestine, in Lebanon, wherever there are Palestinians. What Israel does on the West Bank

—oppressing unarmed civilians, mostly young people—it is now doing in Lebanon. What is taking place on the ground in Lebanon is phase two of the Sharon plan. The purpose of that plan, put quite simply, is to destroy the national will of the Palestinian people, to impose servitude on them and to create an *apartheid*-like régime for them in Palestine. To do this, the Begin Government must attempt principally to obliterate the military and political stature of the Palestinian people, and this means obliterating the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

90. We wish to put our enemies on notice that for most of this century our people has faced wars and plots to “spirit it away”, to use the phrase of Herzl, the father of Zionism, Our resistance is our history: we have no intention of disappearing. The world will continue to hear about the Palestinian people and we will continue to fight for peace and justice.

91. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I understand that the Council is ready to vote on the draft resolution submitted by Ireland, which has been circulated as document S/15171. If there is no objection I shall now put that draft resolution to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously [resolution 509 (1982)].

92. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to make statements after the voting.

93. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): This resolution focuses on two elements as a means of ending the present military confrontation in Lebanon: a cessation of hostilities by all of the parties and the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon. Paragraphs 1 and 2 seek to accomplish these two inter-related objectives. We wish to emphasize that these two objectives are, in fact, inextricably linked and that their implementation must be simultaneous. This, in our view, is the clear, logical and necessary meaning of the resolution.

94. I need only add that it is the fervent hope of my Government, which has devoted so much effort to the resolution of this conflict—and which even at this very moment is carrying forward its commitment to the task—that the bloodshed be ended immediately and that the conditions be established for a just and enduring peace in the region.

95. Mr. KARRAN (Guyana): Yesterday the Council met as a matter of urgency [2374th meeting] to consider what it rightly conceived to be a serious situation in southern Lebanon and along the Lebanese-Israeli border area, and its implications for peace and security in the region.

96. After listening to a report from the Secretary-General, the Council, in exercise of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, unanimously adopted resolution 508 (1982), which called upon all parties to the conflict to cease immediately and simultaneously all military activities within Lebanon and across the Lebanese-Israeli border no later than 0600 hours, local time, on Sunday, 6 June 1982—that is, today.

97. Instead of hearing of a cessation of military activities, what do we hear? The report of the Secretary-General here today gives information of a massive invasion by Israel on Lebanese towns and villages and on refugee camps of the Palestinian people, and the violation of the territorial integrity of a sovereign State. Israel, instead of complying with Council resolution 508 (1982), with which the PLO agreed to comply, launched its massive attack. Hundreds of civilians have been killed and the number of casualties is yet unknown.

98. How can Israel justify this kind of international lawlessness? It is absurd to link Israel's action with the attempted assassination of the Israeli Ambassador to London, Mr. Shlomo Argov. It is most unfortunate that such an act should ever have taken place. My delegation joins with all others in deploring this wanton act of violence. But even if the two acts could be linked, there is no justification for the widespread destruction and human suffering, or for the illegal invasion of the sovereign territory of a neighbouring State. To accept any such justification would be to usher in a system of inter-State relations based on vengeance and violence.

99. My delegation views the situation as extremely dangerous for international peace and security. It is of the utmost importance that there should be an immediate withdrawal of the Israeli forces from all Lebanese territory, an immediate cease-fire and a cessation of all hostilities by all parties concerned. Draft resolution S/15171 made provision for this. It was therefore a pleasure for Guyana to vote in favour of the resolution.

100. Mr. LING Qing (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation listened attentively to the statements made by the representatives of Lebanon and the PLO. We fully support their stern and just exposure and indictment of the crimes committed by the Israeli aggressors, and we deem it extremely necessary and timely for the Government of Lebanon to have called for an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the question.

101. On 4 June the Israeli authorities dispatched large numbers of bombers to carry out nine intensive bombing raids on the city of Beirut and its outskirts, and hit non-military targets in densely populated areas. Later, Israeli warships joined in the shelling and killed defenceless innocent civilians, thereby causing severe loss of life and property damage to the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples.

102. In the light of the situation, the Council, on 5 June, adopted resolution 508 (1982), in which it expressed grave concern at the massive losses in life and property resulting from the Israeli aggression against Lebanon, and demanded a cessation of all military activities within the borders of Lebanon no later than 0600 hours, local time, on Sunday, 6 June 1982.

103. However, in disregard of the just public opinion of the international community and of the solemn resolutions of the Council, and in obstinate pursuance of their policy of aggression and expansion, the Israeli authorities blatantly dispatched once again large numbers of aircraft and ground troops across the UNIFIL area on 6 June to attack the Palestinian refugee camps and launch a massive act of aggression against Lebanon, thereby violently trampling upon the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

104. Up to now the Israeli aggression troops have been driving deeper into Lebanese territory and the situation is developing to an extremely dangerous point. All this cannot fail to draw our serious attention.

105. For a long period of time Israel has been plotting to infringe upon the sovereignty of Lebanon by dividing and annexing Lebanese territory; it has been sowing discord among the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples and destroying relations between them, in an attempt to annihilate the liberation forces of the Palestinian people. Since April of this year, the Council has held many meetings to consider the question of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. However, the situation in southern Lebanon, far from being alleviated, has in fact been deteriorating. The Israeli authorities' escalation of the war of aggression against Lebanon is not only another insolent challenge to the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples and the whole Arab world, but also a serious step deliberately to exacerbate the Middle East situation, thereby endangering world peace and security.

106. The Chinese Government and people express strong indignation and condemnation of the Israeli acts of aggression and firmly support the Lebanese Government and people in the just struggle against aggression and in defence of independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

107. The Lebanese Government has launched many appeals to the Council to take effective measures against the flagrant acts of aggression by the Israeli authorities. The Chinese Government and people firmly support the just demands of the Lebanese Government. In our view, the Council should adopt a resolution which in explicit terms condemns the Israeli acts of aggression and demands that Israel immediately cease the aggression and immediately, totally and unconditionally withdraw its troops from Lebanese territory so that the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon can be strictly respected.

108. Today, in view of the urgent situation, and after consultations in the Council, the Chinese delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document S/15171. At the same time, I wish to take this opportunity to reiterate that the Chinese Government and people will, as always, firmly support the Arab peoples in their struggle to safeguard their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and firmly support the Palestinian and Arab peoples in their just struggle to restore their national rights and recover lost territories until they win their final victory.

109. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Council has again been urgently convened to consider Israel's direct act of aggression against Lebanon, an independent and sovereign State Member of the United Nations. This morning Israel carried out a large-scale invasion, using ground, air and naval forces, against the territory of Lebanon. As the Council is meeting, Israeli troops continue to penetrate deep into Lebanese territory. The massive incursion by the Israeli aggressors into Lebanon, the barbaric bombing raids on Lebanese towns and populated areas, as a result of which hundreds of innocent civilians have been killed and wounded, cannot fail to call forth our wrathful indignation and vehement condemnation.

110. It is quite clear that what we have here is an open wanton act of aggression against Lebanon whereby the ruling circles of Israel are crudely trampling underfoot the most elementary norms of international law, the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the many resolutions of the Security Council, including resolution 508 (1982), which was adopted unanimously by the Council yesterday [*ibid.*], regarding an immediate cease-fire in Lebanon. With its typical offhandedness and cynicism, Israel has not only failed to implement that resolution but unleashed a massive invasion of Lebanese territory.

111. The cutting edge of Israel's aggression is pointed not only against the State of Lebanon. The Israeli leaders have not hidden the fact that now they intend to realize the criminal designs they were unable to carry out in March 1978, that is, to deal with the PLO, the staunch vanguard of the Palestinian people, which is fighting for the restitution of its legitimate rights.

112. The Israeli war machine, sowing death and destruction in Lebanon, has again been put into action in an attempt to annihilate the valiant fighters of the Palestinian resistance movement, to frighten the Palestinian people and to break their will and resolve to struggle for their freedom and independence. There is no doubt that these attempts will meet the same fate as all the other previous attempts and that those who for many years sow the wind will sooner or later reap the whirlwind. The Soviet Union has repeatedly warned that the adventurist policy of the Tel Aviv ringleaders could produce catastrophic consequences for the people of Israel.

113. Yesterday the Council appealed to the Member States to use their influence to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Lebanon and across the Lebanese-Israeli border. It is quite clear that that appeal was made primarily to the "strategic ally" of Israel, the United States. It would seem that certain persons had illusions that the acuteness and explosiveness of the present situation in the Middle East would impel the United States to actions dictated by a sense of responsibility. Today these illusions have been dispelled. It is clear that the entire Middle East policy of the United States, based as it is on all-round unconditional support of Israel, has given Tel Aviv the go-ahead for any fresh acts of aggression and expansion.

114. The Council must weigh very seriously the present events in Lebanon. This was an attempt which was previously planned and carried out by the Israeli leadership in cold blood in order to plunge the entire Middle East region into the flames of a new military conflict to subvert any chance of attaining any just Middle East settlement. Israel's actions *vis-à-vis* Lebanon pose a direct threat to international peace and security.

115. We are convinced that the resolution adopted today by the Council does not fully respond to the extremely serious and steadily worsening situation in Lebanon. Unfortunately, the draft resolution did not reflect the need to condemn Israel for its fresh acts of aggression against Lebanon. None the less, taking into consideration the demand contained in it for a full and unconditional—and I stress a full and unconditional—withdrawal of Israeli troops to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon, the Soviet delegation deemed it possible to support it.

116. Mr. NOWAK (Poland): Sir, as this is the first time my delegation has spoken in the Council this month, I should like at the outset to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of June. My delegation pledges its cooperation in assisting you in the successful discharge of your important function.

117. I also wish to express our gratitude to Mr. Ling Qing for the effective manner in which he presided over our work in May.

118. My delegation went along with the other members of the Council in accepting the draft resolution submitted by Ireland, on the understanding that it was acceptable to the victims of the Israeli aggression, that is, to Lebanon and the Palestinians. At the same time we wish to make the following observations.

119. First, it is beyond any doubt that Israel has launched a full-scale attack against its northern neighbour, and there are good reasons to believe that it is only the first stage of a larger military and political design.

120. Secondly, in contrast to the attitude taken by the P.L.O. there has been no reaction so far from the Israeli authorities to resolution 508 (1982), unless we are to understand that the massive military operation to which I have just referred is precisely in response to the call of the Council immediately to cease all military activities within Lebanon and across the Lebanese-Israeli border.

121. Thirdly, one cannot but wonder for how long the Council will allow Israel to trample with impunity upon the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, and in particular of its Article 2, paragraph 4, and of numerous resolutions, including the Council's resolution 508 (1982), adopted yesterday.

122. We believe that the Council cannot simply gloss over acts such as this latest—and still, as far as we know, continuing—violation of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon, coupled as it is with substantial loss of life and destruction of property. In our opinion, something more forceful than remonstrations has to be applied in order to stop the aggressor in his tracks and to deter him in the future. My delegation stands ready to cooperate fully in efforts the Council should undertake along this line.

123. As for the remarks of the representative of Israel concerning my country, it would be beneath our dignity to respond to them in any way. No amount of unprovoked rhetoric—which in mine as well as in Mr. Blum's language I would call "chutzpah"—is going to divert the world's attention from the fact that Israel has elevated armed aggression and State terrorism to the level of instruments of its foreign policy.

124. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, the Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure at its 2374th meeting. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

125. Mr. MAKSOUD: Yesterday, the Council adopted a resolution [*resolution 508 (1982)*]. In my statement then on behalf of the League of Arab States, I said that Israel's intervention was a prelude to the invasion of Lebanon [*2374th meeting, para. 86*]. It seems that that anticipation has been fulfilled. Today, another resolution has been unanimously adopted by the Council [*resolution 509 (1982)*]. The unanimity with which that resolution was adopted indicates the gravity of the situation that has developed in the aftermath of Israel's invasion of Lebanon.

126. What we are witnessing here is not only the fact that Israel has invaded Lebanon, but that Israel is attempting to encroach upon the prerogatives of the Council as well and to undermine its credibility and its effectiveness, rendering its resolutions no more

than sheer, empty rhetoric. The insults heaped upon this body both today and yesterday in the harangue of the Israeli representative represent an attempt to extricate Israel from any responsibility to comply with any resolution of the Council. What Israel is trying to do is to enter into a head-on confrontation with the international community. It is trying to undermine the unanimity of the Council and to state that it assumes for itself the right to take international law into its own hands.

127. What we are confronted with, therefore, is not only the invasion of Lebanon, catastrophic as that may be; it is not only the barbaric attacks on Palestinian refugee camps and on Lebanese villages and towns. We are also witnessing a head-on collision with the Council and what it represents in terms of the international will, international consensus and international legitimacy. We are witnessing an attempt by Israel to establish a counter-legitimacy of its own, one that rejects international unanimity and its right to define what constitutes international law and jurisprudence. We are witnessing, therefore, Israel's assumption for itself the right to establish its own laws, to establish its own hegemony and to undermine continuously and perpetually the effectiveness and credibility of the United Nations.

128. In the midst of this situation, in the midst of the threat to peace that Israel's invasion of Lebanon constitutes, it is thus becoming increasingly necessary and essential that the Council assume two functions, the first being that of redressing the aggression that Israel has carried out and the second that of relieving the world community of the anxiety created by Israel's getting away with its contempt for the Council. We would therefore like to interpret the resolution that was adopted yesterday and the resolution that has been adopted today as necessary transitional resolutions to rectify a basic and fundamental transgression of Lebanese sovereignty. I say "transitional" because we have been warned today, as we were warned yesterday, that invasion is inevitable and the filibuster to which Mr. Tuéni referred today was an attempt to buy more time in order to circumvent the will of the international community.

129. Hence, it is necessary to state—and on behalf of the League of Arab States and of the Arab people I do so—that the attack on the Council and on its record of performance is an attempt to extricate Israel, *a priori*, from any compliance with the Council's resolutions. But the Council must see to it that its resolutions are respected and implemented. The Council must also see to it that there is a contingency plan, one for which we must all be prepared, when its resolutions are not complied with.

130. By taking the law into own hands and setting itself up as a counter-legitimacy to create its own law based on the new definition that might is right, Israel is attempting to violate and exploit a situation in

Lebanon in order to continue to play havoc not only with the destiny of that country and with the policy of the Palestinian people, but also with the chances for peace and stability in the region as a whole. Needless to say, the attack and the insults heaped upon the PLO today—a usual and habitual attempt to discredit that organization—are answered by many factors. They include the international recognition of the legitimacy of the PLO, not only as the sole representative of the Palestinian people, not only as the leader of its liberation and resistance struggle, but also as the symbol of its unity and as the framework of its peoplehood and national unity.

131. The representative of the United Kingdom yesterday spelt out in unequivocal terms that the representative of the PLO in London was equally targeted by those groups which have attempted to assassinate the Israeli Ambassador. It would have been a matter of elementary courtesy to allow the judicial system of the United Kingdom to be seized of the problem before prejudging the issue and circulating this prejudgement in the Council itself.

132. Furthermore, there have been attempts at semantic acrobatics, efforts to slip in half-truths and untruths and distortions as a pattern by saying that the PLO undertakes to kill Israelis and Jews. First of all, let me state emphatically that the attempt by Israel to assume the responsibility for protecting, and its claim to represent, Jews throughout the world is one of the greatest ideological distortions in contemporary history. The attempt to insinuate that it is protecting Israelis and Jews everywhere is an attempt to plant the seeds of Jewish alienation in the respective national societies to which they belong and of which they are citizens. It is predicated on the assumption that Israel has the right to protect and to speak for Jews throughout the world. I should like to state, on behalf of the Arab States, that Jews who are Arabs refuse protection of their rights except by their own Governments and States. And I am sure that the Jews of the United States, of the United Kingdom, of France, of the Soviet Union, of all the countries in the world reject Israel's claim to be the spokesman for all the Jews in the world and the protector of their rights. It is this dangerous ideological pattern that the Israeli representatives seek to introduce in order to create an equivocation and a distortion through which Israel seeks to make its own terrorism protective of its own policies. In this way, any criticism of Israel becomes an act of anti-semitism. Any questioning of its policies becomes subject to an attack, as if Jews have been attacked. Thus Israel is seeking through identification with world Jewry and a sense of belonging to create protective shields for its terrorism against the Arab people and the Palestinian people. I think that the world community has now realized and most certainly many Jews have realized not only that Israel cannot speak for them, but that Israel distorts their spiritual, religious and cultural values.

133. We have witnessed today an attempt in this resolution to interpret the situation so as to divert attention from the central issue. The central issue today is that Lebanon has been invaded under the pretext of dispersing the Palestinian people. In this respect we must come back to the essence. What is taking place in the south of Lebanon and in the occupied territories of Palestine are two parts of the same issue. The attempt by Israel to liquidate the Palestinian people physically in Lebanon is the other component of liquidating them politically in occupied Palestine. It is this genocidal dimension of Israeli policies that is unravelled and unfolded in the invasion of Lebanon and the insult to the Council. It is time that we focused on the central issues and realized that the invasion of Lebanon is only the latest genocidal manifestation of a policy of racism that has gone totally mad.

134. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Egypt in which he asks to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity 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. Zaki (Egypt) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

135. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

136. Mr. ZAKI (Egypt): I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council at a crucial juncture in world events. I should like also to pay a high tribute to the friendly country which you represent.

137. Similarly I cannot fail on this occasion to express my delegation's appreciation to your predecessor, Mr. Ling Qing of China, who carried out his mandate last month as President of the Council in an excellent manner.

138. The Council meets tonight in the grim mood befitting this tragic occasion. Once again the tension-ravaged Middle East has received another set-back through Israel's invasion of southern Lebanon. Indeed, there is cause for grave concern about the very serious fall-out of this unwarranted action.

139. The Israeli invasion of southern Lebanon is indeed a serious development with far-reaching implications. It runs counter to Israel's declared intention of seeking a comprehensive peace and stability in the area, threatens world peace and subjects the Middle East to a new wave of instability and chaos.

140. The Egyptian Government and people join the rest of the Arab world and all peace-loving countries in strongly condemning the Israeli invasion. The Egyptian Government and people are profoundly shocked and angered by an act so contrary to all the prerequisites for establishing a solid basis for a just and lasting peace in the region. The Israeli Government is fully responsible for all the negative consequences of its totally unacceptable behaviour. Egypt cannot afford to overlook the inherent dangerous threat to the security of the region and to the cause of peace, which have been seriously affected by Israel's invasion of a sovereign State. This act, committed on a hollow excuse, portends dreadful consequences for the region and can lead only to the further isolation of Israel. No peace-loving State can tolerate or acquiesce in such an unjustified act.

141. The Council is called upon to prevent a return to all the concepts and doctrines which should have been abandoned after the initiation of the peace process in the Middle East. It is indeed regrettable that hundreds of innocent people have fallen victim to the Israeli invasion. The killing of unarmed civilians, women and children, is a serious escalation of tension and instability in the region and a violation of the Charter of the United Nations.

142. The Egyptian Government and people express their profound sympathy with the brave people of Lebanon and the Palestinians.

143. In the light of these regrettable events, the Egyptian Government today issued a statement expressing Egypt's condemnation of the Israeli invasion of south Lebanon and called for the immediate withdrawal of Israel forces. That stand emanates from Egypt's conviction, its support for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and the right of the Palestinian people to live in peace and enjoy their legitimate rights.

144. The Egyptian Government would like to reiterate the following requirements: first, an urgent, immediate cease-fire in Lebanon; secondly, the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries; thirdly, the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon. That is Egypt's position. I hope that I have made it clear.

145. Once again, Egypt calls upon Israel to respect the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon and strictly to abide by Council resolution 509 (1982), which has just been unanimously adopted.

146. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Israel has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply and I call on him.

147. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I should like first to thank the representative of Guyana for his expressions of

sympathy in connection with the assassination attempt against the Ambassador of Israel in London.

148. I have duly taken note of the standards of dignity that the representative of Poland deems applicable to himself. I fully understand, as we all do, the constraints and parameters within which he operates. It is against that background that we also understand the expressions of solidarity with the terrorist PLO, or—to use his language—the expressions of *solidar-nosć* with the PLO.

149. The representative of the Soviet Union made a very predictable statement—predictable, that is, for a State that is the main protector and supplier of the terrorist PLO and that uses that organization as its stooge in the Middle East. So I shall not reply to him in detail, but I shall make one remark. He referred to my Government as the “ruling circles of Israel” [*para. 110 above*]. It is probably difficult for a Soviet representative to understand that there are countries that do not have ruling circles, democracies where the Government is democratically elected by the people. The Soviet Union may have ruling circles and, as we all know, those circles are rather narrow, but I think it is wrong for the Soviet representative to draw comparisons between the narrowness of the ruling circles of his country, on the one hand, and the democratic régimes of other countries, on the other.

150. Our scholar-in-residence, Mr. Maksoud, has again delivered one of his customary sermons. I do not wish to reply to him either. However, I must draw the Council’s attention to one particular attempt in his statement to incite various States against their Jewish citizens—because that is what the latter part of his statement amounted to [*para. 132 above*]. It has been widely reported in recent days that the hit list discovered by the British police in the possession of the PLO terrorists who perpetrated the assassination attempt against Mr. Argov included a number of prominent Jewish personalities in Britain and other European countries. We also know, of course, that on a number of occasions in recent years, the PLO did perpetrate such crimes against Jews, including Jewish schoolchildren, in various countries in Europe. If Mr. Maksoud had only listened to the list of those crimes—though a selected list—that I included in my statement, which you described as long, Mr. President, he would certainly have seen fit to refrain from making those remarks.

151. I now come to the statement made by our colleague from Lebanon. As I have had occasion to point out before, Israel has profound sympathy with Lebanon and all its people in their agony. I personally can also sympathize with Mr. Tuéni in his plight and his need to please in his statements not only his Syrian overlords but also the warring factions in Beirut. It is difficult for me to believe that Mr. Tuéni is not aware of the realities in his own country, but in the unlikely even that he is not, I should like to refer him to the

statement made in the General Assembly on 14 October 1976¹ by his predecessor, Mr. Emile Ghorra, whom we are happy to welcome here in this chamber.

152. Mr. Tuéni once again gave us his interpretation of Council resolution 425 (1978). When that resolution was adopted, the Council was well aware of the problem of Lebanon in its entirety, fully recognizing that the presence of Syrian troops and of the PLO terrorists on Lebanese soil constituted a major obstacle to the restoration of international peace and security and to the re-establishment of Lebanon’s authority over its own territory. It was with that in mind that the Council entrusted UNIFIL with a three-fold mandate: first, to confirm the withdrawal of Israel forces; secondly, to restore international peace and security; and thirdly, to assist the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area.

153. In co-operation with the Israel Defence Forces, UNIFIL in June 1978 successfully carried out the first part of its mandate. Regrettably, the remaining two parts of the UNIFIL mandate have not yet been implemented, due to the continuing presence of the Syrian army of occupation and of the massive presence of PLO terrorists on Lebanese soil.

154. Mr. Tuéni in his statement also referred to the casualties suffered by UNIFIL over the years. What he conveniently forgot to mention is the well-known fact that the vast majority of those UNIFIL casualties were brought about by the PLO terrorists in southern Lebanon.

155. The representative of Lebanon also made reference once again to the Israeli-Lebanese General Armistice Agreement of 1949.² He referred to black humour. It is really difficult to compete with his black humour. For surely Mr. Tuéni knows that it was his country that destroyed the Israeli-Lebanese General Armistice Agreement, almost 15 years ago to the day—on 5 June 1967. I might add that subsequent to June 1967 the Government of Lebanon also repeatedly demonstrated that it no longer considered the Agreement in force, by concluding a series of agreements with the terrorist PLO that were totally incompatible with its basic obligations under the Armistice Agreement. Most specifically, I would like to refer him to article III, paragraph 3, of that now defunct Agreement, which provided that “no warlike act or act of hostility shall be conducted from territory controlled by one of the Parties to this Agreement against the other Party”.

156. I do not think I have to repeat that provision. Mr. Tuéni knows full well how that particular provision of the Israeli-Lebanese General Armistice Agreement has been carried out by his country ever since 1967. Let me therefore tell you plainly, Mr. Tuéni: had Lebanon been prepared, over the years, to face its problems honestly and fulfill its national and international commitments, it might not have come to the sorry pass it has reached.

157. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization has asked to make a statement in reply, and I now call upon him.

158. Mr. ABDEL RAHMAN (Palestine Liberation Organization): The representative of Begin made two points that I should like to comment on.

159. First, he spoke of the question of solidarity with the PLO and with the Palestinian people. Definitely, the living conscience of the world will have to express solidarity with the Palestinian people. He will not be very happy about it, because he lives in one of the most isolated régimes in the international community. In fact, I do not envy him at this table—he may have one friend at the United Nations—or anywhere else, because of the justice of the Palestinian cause and because of the nature of the régime that he represents. He represents a régime that has alliances with the most oppressive and suppressive régimes that exist in this world. It has a strategic alliance with the *apartheid* régime of South Africa. It used to support Rhodesia, Portuguese colonialism in Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique. It continues to have relations only with those régimes that are outcasts from the international community, yet it may look around and see that the cause of the Palestinian people is being adopted by the overwhelming majority of the international community.

160. This must be a source of concern to him. He lives in a ghetto that has no relations with the people around it and which depends for its survival on outside charity. In order to survive, Israel has to receive an average of \$5 billion from the United States of America every year. Imagine, every Israeli receives an average of \$2,000 of American money every year. In spite of this amount of charity that is received by the Zionist Government in Palestine, Israel has one of the most difficult economic situations with a 113 per cent rate of inflation. Crime, drug taking, prostitution are the trademarks of the society that he and his colleagues declare that they want to establish for the Jewish people. In fact, he may be surprised to know that there are a growing number of Jews, decent honest Jews like the late Fred Sparks, who have expressed solidarity with the Palestinian people and their struggle. Many Jewish organizations have expressed solidarity with the Palestinian people. In fact, there are Jews who refuse to have any dealings with the Zionist State of Israel and prefer to deal with the PLO. He knows that, but he would like to distort those facts.

161. The second point he spoke of was the killing of schoolchildren. I am sure that everyone around this table has seen on American television Israeli soldiers pointing their machine guns at schoolchildren in the streets of the occupied West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Everyone has seen them pointing machine guns, in cold blood, at seven-year-old children and killing

them, yet he speaks of attacks on schoolchildren. The two incidents that took place at Kiryat Shmona and Ma'alot, where schoolchildren were involved, were massacres by Israeli soldiers. Even Israeli settlers went into the streets to protest against Moshe Dayan, who was then Defence Minister of Israel, who had ordered the storming of the school.

162. The Israelis have never had any respect for human life, whether Palestinian or otherwise. His chief, Menachem Begin himself, ordered the destruction of the ship *Patria* in 1942—400 Jews were killed in that attack—in order to make a political point. We know what kind of respect they have for human life. Only yesterday, in the attack on the Palestine Red Crescent Society's hospital, a hospital for children, four newly-born children and four nurses were killed—and he speaks of respect for human life.

163. In the attack of July last year on the heart of Beirut, 500 civilians were killed. I visited people in Beirut hospital who were maimed; children without limbs, traumatized for the rest of their lives. I do not think any other State or régime has so ruthlessly and indiscriminately destroyed human life as the Zionist régime. It has no respect for human life, whether Jewish or other. In fact, the memoirs of Moshe Sharett indicate without any doubt that the Zionists used to send their agents to the Jewish quarters in Arab countries and bomb synagogues in order to induce Jews to leave their respective countries and emigrate to Palestine. Everybody knows that the leaders of the Zionist movement in Germany instructed the Jewish community not to resist the Nazi occupation and traded Jews with the Nazis to allow them to emigrate to Palestine.

164. I was reading an article the other day in the *Jerusalem Post* that said that now they are going from house to house in Paris, in so-called poor quarters, to persuade Jews to emigrate to Palestine, under what they call "Aleya". They are collecting people from all over the world and lately we have been receiving in Palestine the most criminal elements, who are coming to terrorize our people in their villages and towns, to destroy their crops, their cars, their houses and their property, in order to increase the number of Jews in Palestine under the banners of zionism.

165. That is the situation with the Zionists and that is the danger that is being caused to peace in our region, because for every Jew who is recruited to come to Palestine there must be a Palestinian being evicted from Palestine in order to create a place for the Jew who comes from another part of the world. This is the danger of zionism. It isolates the Jew from his own environment, from his natural habitat and inflicts damage on the Palestinian by expelling him in order to create a place for the Jew.

166. This is the problem that we are facing in our part of the world and it is a very serious problem.

We have no choice but to fight against this trend of madness that has dominated our occupied land for over 35 years.

167. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Mr. Maksoud wishes to make another statement. With the consent of the Council, I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

168. Mr. MAKSOUDE: It seems that I was targeted, on the hit list, by innuendo. I condemn the attempt to distort what I said and to link it, by use of innuendo, to the suggestion that there were people of Jewish persuasion on the so-called hit list of the alleged assassins in London. Well, I did not know, for example, that Mr. Nabil Ramlawi was a Jewish citizen of any country.

169. Furthermore, this use of innuendo and untruth—because I do not want to dignify the statement by calling it a half-truth—saying that the hit list included Jews as targets of the PLO is another attempt at a smear campaign, through which the lie, by repetition, is supposed to become a substitute for the truth. The representative of the United Kingdom yesterday stated very frankly that the hit list included the representative of the PLO in London [2374th meeting, para. 30], and that meant that the judicial system of the United Kingdom was in operation to check on the allegations. Yet Israel, in order to suit its own preconceived notions, instantly declared that this was the PLO, not taking into consideration either the British statement or the British judicial system.

170. It is now clear and evident that the vengeance with which Israel attacks Lebanon and the vengeance with which it seeks to cause haemorrhage to the Palestinians not only stems from its own conception of the Lebanese and Palestinian people as the human obstacles to its unfolding transgression and expansion, but reflects its view of the Lebanese society, which has been and continues to be, despite the ravages of Israel's onslaughts, a resilient expression of a pluralistic society, while the Palestinian national constituency refuses to mirror the Zionist ideology, becoming inclusive of people of diverse religious affiliations.

171. It is now evident that Israel's targeting of Lebanon for its barbaric invasions and its attacks on the Palestinian community, pre-empting its emergence as an independent Palestinian State, is designed not only to suit and accommodate the expansion of the Zionist State into Palestinian and Lebanese territory, but also to prevent these societies from generating their own democratic pluralism, which Israel rejects by its own definition.

172. The Council should note that we are witnessing not only the Zionist targeting of Lebanese territory and an attempt to establish military and strategic hegemony over Lebanon, more particularly southern

Lebanon; not only attempts to prevent cohesion by the establishment of settlements and colonial establishments in the occupied territories, distorting the cultural identity of the Palestinian people and pre-empting their right of self-determination; not only an attempt at territorial expansion and an addiction to aggression, which has been a characteristic of this racist régime; but also the clear Israeli intention to reject any civilized answer to its exclusivist, theocratic, racist régime in the Middle East.

173. Furthermore, in speaking as Arabs, as Arab peoples, as an Arab civilization, we have stated repeatedly—before the attempted assassination of the Israeli Ambassador in London—since the time of the inception of our political consciousness, that Judaism is part of our spiritual heritage. We will not allow either Israel or any Zionist to claim that it can tear Judaism away from that heritage. We have declared repeatedly that the Arabs respect Judaism as part and parcel of the spiritual heritage of mankind. We do not accept, we reject, we categorically dissociate ourselves from the Zionist attempt to encourage zionism and its *alter ego* and other component, anti-semitism. For both anti-semitism and zionism are predicated on an identical philosophical assumption: the inevitable alienation of the Jew in society. We in the Arab world believe in the integration of the human being, irrespective of ethnic, religious or cultural affiliation. That is the civilized answer to zionism, the answer the Palestinian constituency and Lebanese society represent.

174. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Lebanon has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I call on him now.

175. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon) (*interpretation from French*): Soon we shall be discussing the sex of angels, while people perish on Saturday, the sabbath, and on Sunday, the Christian sabbath, in my country.

(*spoken in English*)

176. I should like very briefly to make one point for the record: Mr. Blum keeps quoting—or rather misquoting—my very distinguished predecessor and teacher, Mr. Edouard Ghorra, not Mr. Emile Ghorra. He is present here and I have known him for the better part of my life.

177. In 1979 I had the pleasure and honour of writing a letter to the President of the Security Council—I do not recall the precise date: I do not have the memory or the machinery of Mr. Blum, and I am sorry I did not think to note it down—with which I enclosed a letter from Mr. Ghorra stating that he was constantly being misquoted by Mr. Blum's predecessor and by Mr. Blum himself. I will be pleased to place a copy of that letter at the disposal of the President, should Mr. Blum be interested in reading it. Maybe he can find something else there. I should like to add that I was a member

of the Cabinet when Mr. Ghorra spoke, and I have no reason to dissociate myself from what he said.

178. One other point, just for the record: the representative of Israel says—and has repeated—that he holds Lebanon fully responsible for the actions of the PLO. I would remind him that this body holds his country responsible for the very presence of the PLO in my country. Indeed, when he speaks of the plight of my country he seems to think that we forget—and we shall not forget—that what started the destabilization of Lebanon were the repeated attacks by Israel on Lebanon since 1968, in violation of the General Armistice Agreement of 1949,² long before previous Governments of my country had signed any of the agreements he referred to.

179. I should like also to refer you, Mr. Blum, to the very unique articles of the Armistice Agreement, which state very clearly and unequivocally that the Security Council alone can annul that Agreement, even if both parties, my friend, should want to rescind the Agreement. Once again: I do not have your memory and I do not have the text in front of me, but it may easily be obtained from the Secretariat.

180. But beyond legalism, does it not strike the Council as odd that, whilst the Israeli representative invites us to conclude peace with his country, he rejects as defunct an armistice agreement which we insist should be implemented?

181. We may accept Mr. Blum's variations on the principle of vicarious responsibility in international law. However, we have no lessons in patriotism to learn from anybody. Lebanon's determination to keep Lebanon for the Lebanese and the Lebanese alone needs no proof, and I shall not accept that it should be challenged.

182. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Israel has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply, and I call on him.

183. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I wish to thank the representative of Lebanon for having corrected the mistake which I made with regard to the first name of Mr. Ghorra. I stand corrected.

The meeting rose at 10.55 p.m.

NOTES

¹ L. F. L. Oppenheim, *International Law: A Treatise*, 8th ed., H. Lauterpacht, ed. (London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1955).

² *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 4.*

³ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Plenary Meetings*, 32nd meeting, paras. 52 to 94.