

UNITED NATIONS



**SECURITY COUNCIL**  
**OFFICIAL RECORDS**

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR

**2377<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 8 JUNE 1982

NEW YORK

---

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2377) .....	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.

## 2377th MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 8 June 1982, at 10 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/2377)

#### 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 10.10 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 previous meetings on this item [2374th and 2375th meetings], I invite the representatives of Lebanon and Israel to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representative of Egypt to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

*At the invitation of the President Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon) and Mr. Blum (Israel) took places at the Council table; Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.*

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Members of the Council have before them document S/15185, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Spain.

3. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On 4 June, the President of the Council, on behalf of the entire Council, upon learning of the events in Lebanon, the loss of human life and the destruction that had been wrought, made an urgent appeal for the parties to abide by the cease-fire that had been in effect since 24 July 1981 and to abstain from any hostile act that might lead to an aggravation of the situation [S/15163].

4. Unfortunately, that urgent appeal has been totally ignored by one of the parties, Israel, which in recent days has stepped up its air attacks and its army's penetration into the territory of the sovereign State of Lebanon. These acts of aggression violate the provisions of resolution 425 (1978) and of a long series of resolutions adopted by the Council with a view to achieving peace in the region and strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon, within its internationally-recognized borders. That demand, spelled out in resolution 425 (1978) and reiterated in resolution 501 (1982), is being deliberately and persistently violated by an act of aggression that has most serious implications for world peace.

5. Hence, on 5 June, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 508 (1982), in which, in paragraph 1, after recalling the relevant resolutions and reaffirming the statement made by the President of the Council on 4 June, as well as the urgent appeal issued by the Secretary-General on the same date, it 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 not later than 0600 hours, local time, on Sunday, 6 June 1982”.

6. However, ignoring that urgent appeal by the Council, Israeli troops have continued to penetrate Lebanese territory in an action that now deserves universal condemnation, as it also violates the General Armistice Agreement of 1949.<sup>1</sup>

7. It is useless for the Israeli authorities to attempt to justify this true act of aggression by the recent assassination attempt against the Israeli Ambassador to London, which we repudiate. Contemptible as all acts of terrorism are, particularly those which are directed against diplomatic representatives, they can in no way provide a pretext or justification for perpe-

trating an act of armed aggression of such magnitude against the territory of a sovereign State.

8. It is difficult for the representative of Israel, in an equivocal attempt to turn the accused into the accuser, to convince the Council by citing a long list of acts of violence, when the most serious violence is that of depriving a people of the right to its homeland, its territory and to a free life. It is not easy for us to accept a justification for a large-scale invasion which, according to all indications, had been carefully planned and calculated to take place at the precise moment when a conflict elsewhere in the world was occupying the concern of world opinion.

9. It is rather ironic, if not indeed tragic, that the representative of Israel should venture to point an accusing finger and attempt to undermine the prestige and prerogatives of the Council at the very time when his country is launching an armed invasion against a sovereign State, ignoring both the calls of the Council and the requests and appeals for peace made by numerous heads of State, representing peoples of diverse persuasions and backgrounds.

10. As the representative of the PLO said at a recent meeting of the Council in this connection, quoting the great Mexican leader, Benito Juárez: "respect for the rights of others is peace" [2375th meeting, para. 83]. This grave act of belligerency represents a regrettable breach of the peace and a violation of the most fundamental principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

11. That is why, when the cease-fire was violated in July 1981, the Spanish delegation, together with those of Ireland and Japan, submitted a draft resolution which was adopted by the Council as resolution 490 (1981), which called for an immediate cessation of all armed attacks and reaffirmed the Council's commitment to the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon. That is also why my delegation lent its support to resolution 509 (1982), adopted last Sunday, 6 June, which in paragraph 1 demands that Israel withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon.

12. On taking cognizance of the Council's action, my Government issued the following communiqué on the day following our meeting of 6 June:

"In accordance with the terms of the resolution unanimously adopted by the Security Council of the United Nations, the Spanish Government expresses its concern at the serious events that have occurred in Lebanon which endanger the territorial integrity of that country.

"This act of force constitutes a violation of the sovereignty of Lebanon and a threat to peace which the Government of Spain strongly condemns."

13. In the face of Israel's stubborn refusal to comply with the resolutions of the Council and the discouraging news of the intensification of military action and the penetration of its armed forces further and further northwards in the territory of Lebanon, my country demands in the strongest terms the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli forces, in accordance with the provisions of that resolution, which was adopted unanimously.

14. Israel's reply to resolution 509 (1982) of the Council, contained in document S/15178, which states in paragraph 2 that "any withdrawal of Israeli military forces . . . is inconceivable" and making this conditional on the conclusion of concrete arrangements which are in fact anything but specific is simply inconceivable to us.

15. As a result of the foregoing and in view of the need for the Council to take urgent action in keeping with the seriousness of the situation, my delegation has decided to present, after consultation with other members of the Council, a draft resolution [S/15185] which calls for an immediate cease-fire and which reiterates other provisions set forth in resolutions which the Council has adopted in recent days, in particular the appeal to the parties to cease immediately and simultaneously all military activities within Lebanon and across the Lebanese-Israeli border.

16. In the preamble of the draft resolution, the Council recalls its resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), takes note of the report of the Secretary-General of 7 June [S/15178] and also takes note of the positive replies received by the Secretary-General from the Government of Lebanon and the PLO [*ibid.*].

17. In operative paragraph 1, the Council condemns the non-compliance with the resolutions I have just mentioned.

18. In paragraph 2, the Council urges the parties to comply strictly with the regulations attached to the Hague Convention of 1907.

19. In paragraph 3, the Council reiterates the demand, already contained in paragraph 1 of resolution 509 (1982), that Israel withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon.

20. In paragraph 4, the Council reiterates the demand that all parties observe the terms of resolution 508 (1982)—specifically, paragraph 1 of that resolution, which calls on them to cease immediately and simultaneously all military activities within Lebanon and across the Lebanese-Israeli border.

21. Finally, in paragraph 5, the Council demands that within six hours all hostilities must be stopped. I hope that this measure will be supported by the members of the Council, especially taking into account

the fact that in that same paragraph it is stipulated that, in the event of non-compliance, the Security Council will meet again to consider practical ways and means in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

22. It is the wish of my delegation—and it hopes that the Council is in agreement—that the draft resolution submitted to it for its consideration and which we all have before us will be put to the vote immediately without discussion.

23. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I understand that the Council is prepared to vote on the draft resolution contained in document S/15185. If there is no objection, I shall now put the draft resolution to the vote.

*A vote was taken by show of hands.*

*In favour:* China, France, Guyana, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Panama, Poland, Spain, Togo, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire

*Against:* United States of America

*The result of the vote was 14 votes in favour and 1 against.*

*The draft resolution was not adopted, the negative vote being that of a permanent member of the Council.*

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

25. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): I desire to offer an explanation of vote on behalf of my Government. The objective of my Government is to end the bloodshed and the cycle of violence in Lebanon and to restore full respect and sovereignty and territorial integrity and independence to that troubled land.

26. Two previous resolutions of the Council, resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), contained balancing language that took account of the fact that the conflict in Lebanon and across the Lebanese-Israeli border is complex in its origin and that its resolution will require compliance in deed as well as in word with the resolutions of the Security Council.

27. Unfortunately, the resolution now before us is not sufficiently balanced to accomplish the objectives of ending the cycle of violence and establishing the conditions for a just and lasting peace in Lebanon. For that reason, the United States voted against this resolution.

28. My Government is currently engaged in every possible effort to bring the violence to an end. We shall continue those efforts.

29. Mr. DORR (Ireland): We all know that the present situation in Lebanon is extremely serious. On Sunday last, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 509 (1982) which Ireland sponsored. In our view, that resolution was balanced and clear in its terms. It demanded that Israel withdraw its military forces forthwith and unconditionally, and that all parties observe strictly the cease-fire which the Council had called for on the previous day in resolution 508 (1982). Resolution 509 (1982) further called on all parties to inform the Secretary-General of their acceptance of its terms within 24 hours.

30. We now know from the Secretary-General's report [S/15178] that two of the parties, Lebanon and the PLO, accepted resolution 509 (1982) as the Council directed. The third did not. Israel made four points in reply and the second of these four points stated clearly that Israel regarded a withdrawal of its forces from Lebanon as inconceivable except on certain conditions. Since resolution 509 (1982) specifically demanded an unconditional withdrawal, it is clear that Israel is not prepared to accept the Council's explicit demand. That, I believe, is a simple statement of the present position.

31. It appears from news reports that the fighting and the Israeli advance through Lebanon are continuing. The situation is therefore extremely grave. It is easy now to look back on earlier conflicts in the region—in 1978, 1973, 1967 and so on—and to see in retrospect their limits and their context, fixed now in history. Past conflict is always limited precisely because it is past. But present conflict, as one lives through it, is open-ended and dangerous. In the tinder-box which is the Middle East, who can talk now with confidence of any fire as limited?

32. There are, of course, other wars under way in the world at present. All are tragic; all are dangerous. For our part, we deplore every human life lost, every casualty and every refugee created by such conflicts. Our concern and our human sympathy are not selective.

33. But if all wars are dangerous, it is plain common sense to see that some are more dangerous than others because they take place at the meeting point of deep and powerful political currents. The war in Lebanon is such a war.

34. Israel justifies its attack on Lebanon and its massive invasion by arguing that its own people have been under attack for some time, from across the frontier. Mr. Blum, the representative of Israel, speaking here on Sunday [2375th meeting], listed many examples. When I spoke here on Saturday, I emphasized that Ireland's concern extends to each and every

life lost and to each and every casualty—Lebanese, Palestinian and Israeli [2374th meeting, para. 33]. But each new effort by either side to exact revenge and retribution for a previous attack gives the spiral of violence another upward twist and takes us farther and farther from any hope of a comprehensive peace settlement in the region. If this is true of "tit for tat" retribution, how much more is it true of a major war? Where is the correspondence, where is the sense of proportion?

35. I do not know exactly the total number of lives lost in attacks on Israel across its borders, or in attacks on Israeli citizens elsewhere over recent years. But I am very sure that the total of lives lost and casualties suffered in all such attacks over recent years is less than the deaths and injuries caused by the recent major Israeli air attacks on Beirut. Yet we are talking now about a war in which these air raids in turn are merely one aspect of a larger attack on Lebanon.

36. In our view, it is vital in this situation that the Council should act. We adopted here on Sunday [2375th meeting] in resolution 509 (1982) a clear position and we did so unanimously, which, granted the many political tendencies on the Council and the existence among its members of five with veto rights, must be accounted most unusual. We had hoped that Israel would take heed of this unanimity among the permanent members and on the Council as a whole. We believe that it would be in Israel's own interests to do so. The security which it seeks through invasion of Lebanon, with the aim of pushing its buffer frontier farther north, must be illusory. The long-term damage—and not least the damage to the United Nations as a peace-keeping instrument which could result—must far outweigh whatever benefits it thought it might gain from its actions.

37. My delegation therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution. We did so because we wanted to see an end to the bloodshed; because we are deeply concerned about the dangers of the conflict spreading; because we fear the damage done to the concept of United Nations peace-keeping; and because we thought that nothing less as this stage would discharge the clear responsibility of the Council to uphold its own unanimous resolution 509 (1982) and to act in accordance with its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

38. We deeply regret that the draft resolution has not been adopted.

39. Mr. NISIBORI (Japan): The Government of Japan has been following with profound concern the serious developments which have been taking place in Lebanon in the past few days.

40. As the Secretary-General reported to the Council [2374th meeting], on 4 June Israeli forces began large-scale air strikes and artillery, mortar and rocket

attacks on various parts of Lebanon. On 5 June, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 508 (1982), calling upon all the parties to the conflict to cease all military activities by 6 o'clock, local time, on 6 June, but within hours of this deadline Israeli ground forces launched an invasion of South Lebanon. The Israeli military operations are continuing and further intensifying, in open defiance of the Council's second resolution, that is, resolution 509 (1982), demanding an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all Israeli forces to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon. Furthermore, Israel's advancing of its forces, violating the areas where UNIFIL troops are deployed for peace-keeping operations, constitutes a serious challenge to the United Nations. We condemn Israel's actions.

41. The current military conflict has seriously imperilled the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Lebanon. My Government wishes to express deep sympathy to the Government of Lebanon, which is now confronted with this grave situation. It also regrets deeply the tragic loss of a great number of civilian lives and the heavy destruction of property in Lebanon. We are truly concerned that the stability not only of Lebanon itself but of the entire region may be seriously jeopardized if this massive invasion by Israel is prolonged and the counter-attacks continue. My Government therefore demands that all the parties concerned cease hostilities at once, and further strongly demands that Israel withdraw its forces immediately and unconditionally.

42. Before concluding, I should like to express my Government's sincere condolences to the Government of Norway and the bereaved family of a Norwegian soldier who was killed serving in UNIFIL.

43. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): We all know what the situation is. Israeli forces are penetrating further and further into the territory of Lebanon, bringing death and destruction to the peaceful inhabitants, the Lebanese and the Palestinians. Challenging the United Nations, the Israeli aggressor has now gone into areas in which United Nations forces, sent there by Council resolutions after Israeli acts of aggression in 1978, are deployed. Israel is totally ignoring the resolutions adopted by the Council, which should have been binding on it as a Member of the United Nations.

44. The facts bear witness that the leadership of Israel has unleashed a broad, massive act of aggression against neighbouring Lebanon and is attempting to drown the Palestinian resistance movement in a bloodbath. At the same time, through such bandit-like acts of aggression, Tel Aviv would like to frighten the Palestinian Arabs on the West Bank of the Jordan River and in the Gaza Strip, who are struggling so hard against Israeli occupation for their liberation and independence.

45. The Soviet Union firmly condemns the acts of aggression by Israel against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples. Its attempt to impose on the Arabs its diktat, to force them to renounce their legitimate rights and to submit to the military, strategic plans of imperialism in the Middle East, is an adventure that can cost Israel itself and its people dear.

46. The Council, which bears major responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, should immediately take measures to ensure that the aggression ceases, to force Israel to respect the Charter of the United Nations and the resolutions of the Organization, and to protect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and the legitimate rights and interests of the Arab peoples.

47. However, that has not happened, because of the disgraceful vote of the United States of America. This shows yet again that Israeli acts of aggression—doubtless undertaken with the agreement and support of Washington, which has armed Israel to the teeth through its policy—are pushing it to the commission of criminal anti-Arab acts. The attack on Lebanon is a direct consequence of American-Israeli strategic co-operation. Today the whole world sees even more clearly the fruits of that conspiracy between Washington and Tel Aviv.

48. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

49. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Once again the United States has chosen to be in a minority of one in support of aggression, mass murder, the invasion of territory and a campaign of annihilation of a people.

50. The representative of the United States described the draft resolution on which the Council has just voted as unbalanced. I fully agree with her. The draft resolution tells us that there were two positive replies to the Secretary-General—one from the Government of Lebanon and the other from the PLO. On the other hand, there was non-compliance by Israel. That is definitely not balance. For that reason we can understand that the United States, maintaining the balance, would veto such a draft resolution. But is that the real reason? We would think that the United States Government is party to the invasion of Lebanon and to the criminal acts committed against the Lebanese people and the Palestinians in Lebanon.

51. Mr. Alan Romberg, a State Department spokesman, declared on 7 June that "Israel could hardly have been in the dark about what our attitudes are about an invasion". Mr. Romberg told us very clearly that Israel knew how the United States would react. In his statement he assured Israel that \$1 billion-worth of armaments were still in the pipeline, going to Israel. So he has told Israel that it can proceed with its crim-

inal attack and its brutalities and that it has nothing to fear; from the military aspect it will receive \$1 billion-worth of weapons and politically it will receive support in the Council through the veto that has just been cast.

52. A statement by the State Department on 7 June included the following words:

"The United States has been doing its very best, not only in recent days, but also as far back as last year, to forestall the terrible tragedy that is now unfolding."

Of course, the United States knew very well what would happen. Did the United States try in any way to stop that aggression? Mr. Alan Romberg told us that the \$1 billion-worth of weapons were still in the pipeline. So what was the United States doing? Instead of forestalling what it describes as a tragedy, it fed into that campaign and gave Israel all the arms that it might need, in addition to moral—or, rather, immoral—support, as well as the diplomatic and political support that has just been demonstrated.

53. A few matters need to be called to the Council's attention. Secretary of State Haig was quoted on 7 June as having said: "We have no signs of an escalation" in the fighting going on. Apparently Secretary of State Haig was not informed by his representatives at the United Nations of a report published by the Secretary-General on 6 June [S/15174], paragraph 5 of which speaks of "intensive air-attacks . . . launched by Israel, with approximately 110 strikes being recorded by UNIFIL". It also speaks about "exchanges of fire" and "ground forces—including a very large number of tanks and armoured personnel carriers" that "had begun to move into Lebanese territory in strength". If that is not an escalation, what could an escalation be, unless the Secretary of State was not informed of that report of the Secretary-General, or there was again a fault with the communications system?

54. But why should we be surprised? Secretary of State Haig, talking on 7 June about the events in the region, said:

"We not only lost an aircraft and a helicopter yesterday. There is a claim a second aircraft has been shot down, a second helicopter and a number of army vehicles."

55. What I would like to stress here is that Secretary of State Haig has used the word "we". "We" in this case means, I presume, the United States of America. So if "we"—that is, the United States—have lost an aircraft and a helicopter, then we, the PLO and the Palestinian people, know exactly who is attacking us: it is the United States of America in collusion with Israel. We can therefore see that the United States Government was not unaware of what was happening.

It had not tried in any way to stop that invasion and that attack. The United States Government has had a concrete part in what has happened and in what is still happening.

56. There is a duty to be fulfilled here. The Council is entrusted with the duty of maintaining international peace and security. The United States has just vetoed a draft resolution that would have helped to maintain international peace and security. That action, in other words, means the following: that the United States is determined to maintain war, to maintain aggression and to maintain bloodshed in the area.

57. The representative of the United States spoke of a cycle of violence. There is no cycle of violence. There is an escalation of violence with a starting point, and the starting point is the invasion of Palestine, the expulsion of the Palestinian people, the methods, including the brutality, used to prevent and prohibit the Palestinians from returning to their homes and living in peace in their own homes. That is where the violence started. It started with the massacre—unfortunately one has to recall these events—of hundreds of Palestinians in Deir Yassin and other places. It is an irony that the present Prime Minister and the present Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel were involved personally and directly in the crimes against Deir Yassin, which is where more than 250 young, innocent Palestinians were butchered. One was involved in the assassination of an envoy of peace—I am referring to the assassination of Count Folke Bernadotte, the first envoy of peace in the Middle East.

58. The Israelis do not seem to be satisfied with what they have done so far. We learn that they are preventing the International Red Cross from bringing in medicine and from evacuating wounded civilians from Sidon and from Tyre. That is another example of the brutality that we are witnessing.

59. I feel that the United States is happy about all this, because it has known about it for at least one year and has permitted it to take place. That is what we are noting at the moment.

60. But let me assure the Council that there is one thing that the Palestinian people love, and that is peace; and there is one thing the Palestinian people will continue to do, and that is to fight for peace. But the Palestinians, under the leadership of the PLO, can conceive of peace only when they are back in their homes and when they are able to exercise their rights. That is when peace can prevail in Palestine again, as it had always prevailed.

61. 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 [2374th meeting].

With the consent of the Council, I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

62. Mr. MAKSOUD: I do not know how history will judge the last few days. We are not involved in anticipating the work of future historians. But at least we can record a judgement on present-day politicians and diplomats. The country of Lebanon is being ravaged not by a war in Lebanon but by a war on Lebanon, a country that has demonstrated throughout history a unity and a resilience for survival and a belief in itself as a refuge for all those who have been disenfranchised, for all those who have been evicted and for all those who have been persecuted. Lebanon has had with the United States a particular relationship—not a strategic relationship, but one built on the level of intellectual and human values. Most of the leadership of Lebanon studied in American schools and universities and many persons from the United States established their homes in Lebanon. Many Lebanese living in the United States have become American citizens and have contributed to the vital body politic of the country. In the villages of Lebanon which are today being destroyed by the strategic ally of the United States the word "America" evoked notions of hope, spiritual values and ability to succeed among the elderly and the young.

63. The ties that existed in Lebanon with the melting pot of the United States constituted an example of a pluralistic society where people of different ethnic backgrounds, different colour, different religious and ethnic affiliations could blend into a common citizenship. That constituted for the Lebanese an example and a replica of their own experience.

64. The love that the Lebanese had for the United States as a country described by many as a super-Power, but which to the Lebanese and to many Arabs was a great Power, has been eliminated, along with the distinction between greatness and super-Power status by the veto that has been exercised.

65. Perhaps I speak on behalf of the League of Arab States, but I am also a Lebanese and I want to express a sense of sadness that the whole input of those Americans who have experienced Lebanon and loved it, who have lived in Lebanon and have known it, who have sought to insert as a factor in the American decision-making process compassion for a Lebanon that is living a tragedy, should have been incapable of withstanding that factor of a strategic ally that seeks to play havoc not only with the destiny of Lebanon, but with the chances of peace in the region. That element of compassion, which many people in Lebanon expected would at least transform the veto into an abstention, was not forthcoming; and that will make many Lebanese, whose affection and love for the United States was great, transform their tears into Lebanese blood. The sadness of which I speak is that of Gibran Khalil Gibran, who has lived in the United States, and that of many of the Lebanese intellectuals whose heritage



has today been ignored and who could not have an impact on the decision-making process; it is the sadness, the agony of this rupture that the American veto has brought.

66. Furthermore, the Palestinian people, which has also cherished many common values, finds itself today subject to a two-pronged attack. One prong is an attempt by Israel at physical liquidation in order to liquidate it politically in the occupied territories. The second prong of the attack is an attempt to satisfy the sense of historical vengeance that Zionism feels against the people of Palestine and to eliminate that people's body politic, in order to foreclose on its right to self-determination.

67. The Palestinians today are resisting with whatever they have inside the refugee camps and with stones in the cities of Nablus, Al-Khalil, Al-Bireh, Ramallah and Jerusalem. But this resilient Palestine body politic finds itself in a state of confrontation with the United States, which could have been avoided and which should, historically, have been avoided. Yet the Palestinian constituency perceives from growing evidence that the United States is in collusion with Israel. This perception could have been corrected tonight if the United States had not exercised its veto. Today, when the Palestinians are experiencing the threat of extermination, they are exhibiting the resilience of the will to survive. And that is why I say that tonight could be recorded in the annals of history as a night of missed opportunities for the super-Power to exhibit its greatness. It could have been an opportunity to heal not only the wounds that Lebanon is experiencing and suffering but also the agonies and the wounds that the Palestinian people is experiencing and suffering. It could have helped to control at least the damage of the blood-bath that is being inflicted by the bombs and the aircraft and the vessels that are being supplied by the United States. Yet this opportunity has been missed, which is a matter of regret to the millions of friends that United States society has throughout the Arab world. It is regrettable that the perception will grow in the next few days throughout the Arab world that the United States has to be in collusion with Israel, otherwise Israel will consider the United States in collision with it.

68. It is this weakness on the part of a super-Power that paralyses our capacity to perceive the greatness of the United States. We do not want to go into the whole question of the merits of the case. But if politics interrupts policies, how can global responsibility to world peace be ensured? It is very sad for all of us who have studied in American universities, who have learned in the United States, many of the values that we cherish, to see Lebanese villages and towns being ravaged today. This is a sad experience for the Palestinians, who have seen in the United States anti-colonial experience an example that could be very healthy for their own ambitions in building their own secular and democratic States.

69. This opportunity has been missed. Our hope is that it will be retrieved as soon as possible.

70. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Lebanon has asked to speak and I call upon him.

71. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): We do not have a resolution. We cannot but regret the fact that we do not have one, but even though we do not have a resolution I think we have had a unanimous expression, and I want to stress the positive rather than the negative side of support for resolution 509 (1982) and for my country and its fate.

72. I say unanimous support because I cannot fail to take note of the fact that the representative of the United States expressed herself, as has her Government at the highest level, positively in essence in favour of the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from Lebanon.

73. I trust that the Council will take note of the fact that there is here a serious commitment and that the United States will continue its efforts in response to the appeal. I want to reiterate my Government's appeal of this morning to every single State that is in a position to help us in these days of tragedy.

74. I should like to take this opportunity to address my very particular thanks to the representative of Spain for having sponsored the draft resolution, which will go down in the annals as a draft resolution only. Maybe some day it will be a full resolution, when withdrawal has taken place and the cease-fire has been established. I should also like to thank the representative of Ireland—something which has become a daily tradition—and the representative of Japan.

75. Mr. President, I should like to thank you very much personally for the tremendous patience you have displayed.

76. My final words should be for the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, who has on more than one occasion—even though sometimes he has had to abstain—supported my country and defended its territorial integrity and independence.

77. May I conclude by saying in very simple terms that we still have resolution 509 (1982), and we hope that the Secretary-General and the President and other members of the Council will continue their efforts by virtue of resolution 509 (1982).

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

79. Mr. BLUM (Israel): We were deeply moved in listening to the representative of the Soviet Union. The respect of his country for international law and for the rights of other nations is common knowledge. That

respect has been abundantly demonstrated over the years throughout the world, more particularly in recent years through the ongoing Soviet genocide of the people of Afghanistan.

80. Not for the first time, the representative of the Soviet Union has seen fit to accompany his remarks with thinly veiled threats against my country. We reject these threats and I wish to tell the representative of the Soviet Union that no amount of bullying on the part of his country will intimidate the people of Israel.

81. We reject the bizarre bookkeeping attempts undertaken here by the representative of Ireland. In case he is interested—as I hope he is—he may wish to remember that the people I have the honour and privilege to represent here has been decimated throughout history, including most recent history. Then perhaps he will be better able to understand our sensitivity to the loss of every human life.

82. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): If no other member wishes to speak, I should like now to speak as the representative of FRANCE.

83. Everything has already been said regarding the non-compliance with the Council's appeals for a ceasefire and with the resolutions unanimously adopted by

the Council. There is no need for me to explain here why France has no hesitation in condemning Israel's intervention, just as it had no hesitation in condemning the other military interventions in Lebanese territory as soon as they were carried out against the will of the legitimate rulers of Lebanon. Nor do I need to explain why France has given its full support to the draft resolution submitted today by Spain [S/15/85].

84. I am speaking now because, in the face of the attacks on Lebanon and its inhabitants and the losses and devastation they are suffering, I am compelled to express France's emotion and anguish. Above all I should like to tell Lebanon and the Lebanese people that today more than ever we are with them in our hearts and I therefore express the hope that, although the draft resolution has not been adopted by the Council, its appeal will be heeded by the parties to the conflict.

*The meeting rose at 11.15 p.m.*

---

NOTE

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 4.

---

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

#### 如何购取联合国出版物

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

#### HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

#### COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

#### КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

#### COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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

---