



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-THIRD YEAR

2071st MEETING: 17 MARCH 1978

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2071)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 17 March 1978 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12606);	
Letter dated 17 March 1978 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12607) .	1

✓191553

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.

2071st MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 17 March 1978, at 4.45 p.m.

President: Mr. Ivor RICHARD

(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Bolivia, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Kuwait, Mauritius, Nigeria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2071)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 17 March 1978 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12606);

Letter dated 17 March 1978 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12607)

The meeting was called to order at 5.45 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 17 March 1978 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12606);

Letter dated 17 March 1978 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12607)

1. The PRESIDENT: The representatives of Lebanon, Israel, Egypt, Jordan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yemen have addressed letters to the President of the Security Council in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion. I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in conformity with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

2. The Security Council has before it document S/12608, which contains the text of a letter dated 17 March 1978 from the representative of Kuwait in which he requests that the representatives of the Palestine Liberation Organization

(PLO) should be invited to participate in the debate. This proposal is not made pursuant to rule 37 or rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure but, if approved by the Council, the invitation to participate in the debate would confer on the PLO the same rights of participation as those conferred on a Member State when invited to participate under rule 37.

3. Does any member of the Security Council wish to speak on this proposal?

4. Mr. YOUNG (United States of America): The United States Government is not able to agree to the proposal to invite the representatives of the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the debate with the same rights of participation as those conferred on a Member State. We thought the terms of the Council's invitation were inappropriate on past occasions, and we wish to repeat our opinion. For this reason we want the proposed invitation put to the vote.

5. The PRESIDENT: As no other member wishes to speak at this stage, I take it the Council is ready to vote on the proposed invitation.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Bolivia, China, Czechoslovakia, Gabon, India, Kuwait, Mauritius, Nigeria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The proposal was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon) and Mr. Herzog (Israel) took places at the Council table.

6. The PRESIDENT: In the course of consultations, a proposal was made that the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization should be seated at the Council table for the duration of the deliberations on the agenda item. I intend to put that proposal to the vote now. Does any member of the Council wish to speak before the vote?

7. Mr. YOUNG (United States of America): Having opposed representation of the Palestine Liberation Organization in the Council on the ground that only States should be so represented, my Government would like also to oppose the seating of the PLO.

8. The PRESIDENT: Since no other member of the Council wishes to speak at this stage, I shall put to the vote the proposal that the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization should be seated at the Council table for the duration of the deliberations on the agenda item.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Bolivia, China, Czechoslovakia, Gabon, India, Kuwait, Mauritius, Nigeria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The proposal was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan), Mr. Kikhia (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Al-Hussamy (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Al-Haddad (Yemen) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

9. The PRESIDENT: In addition to the documents listed in the agenda, I wish to draw the attention of members of the Council to the following other documents: S/12598, S/12600, S/12602 and S/12604.

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

11. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): These are particularly tragic days for a country that for the past three years has been struck by unprecedented tragedy: cities destroyed, tens of thousands dead, a society disrupted and long, deep bleeding scars in that most ancient and most pacific land.

12. Lebanon, my country, lies bleeding again, the object of an aggression whereby we are made to pay for having been so committed to the ideals of peace, liberty and the international rule of law and order. Indeed, rarely has the world community shown so little concern over the fate of a country the world had so much loved, for rarely, if ever, has such a small country given so much to the world and to the history of mankind. But enough of this for the present.

13. The Council is now convened to put an end to one of the most savage acts of aggression, and I should like to emphasize that our main concern is that the United Nations should be enabled to uphold the spirit and letter of the Charter and prevent Israel from according itself the licence to take international law into its hands and act as a judge, jury and executioner at one and the same time, while the community of nations here assembled watches idly the agony of a Member State.

14. I shall not indulge in any useless rhetoric, for the facts of the case are known to all of us. Images have been

displayed, often with great shamelessness, images of death and destruction spread systematically and with grave arrogance; and we are made to pay for the crimes committed over almost 30 years by each and all of us—each and all of us except Lebanon, the only country in the shattered Middle East that has consistently believed in the rights of nations.

15. Now, Mr. President, members of the Council, what do we ask from you? I shall be very brief, reserving my right to come forward again with proposals and answers; but now what we are asking is that we should be permitted to live in peace and unity, that our sovereignty over our territory should be restored to us, over all our territory, and that our people should be protected against international murder.

16. The immediate cessation of hostilities and withdrawal of the invaders should be the unanimous demand of the Security Council and of the world community, as much as it is ours in Lebanon. So, let my people live. Let us reconstruct not only Lebanon, this ancient land of love, but let us also re-establish peace and an acceptable international order in the Middle East whereby every nation will be entitled to exercise its basic human and national rights, including the right freely to defend its own borders, to enforce its own laws and to protect its own citizens and its own institutions. And let us not allow any party, under any false pretense, to prevent the Government of the land from using its own forces and the forces that are or may be at its disposal in the legitimate defence of its national integrity and security, and then to make the pretext of an abnormal situation to destroy and kill and violate the most elementary principles of national and international law.

17. Once more, in the name of Lebanon I say here to the world: let my people live. Let us have peace, security, a restoration of confidence in humanity and a better world order. Let us allow the United Nations to assume hereby its responsibilities.

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

19. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): I should like first of all to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. It is fitting that you, in your own right and as the representative of a country that has been the leading standard-bearer of the principles of law, justice and parliamentary procedure, should preside over the Council.

20. I am sincerely convinced that this is an unnecessary debate. Two parties alone are involved in the issue. Both of us want exactly the same thing—namely, the complete restoration of Lebanese sovereignty in the area in question. It is a sobering reflection on the state of international affairs and the way the Organization runs its business that, if left alone without the interference of those who will no doubt participate in this debate, we—Israel and Lebanon—could probably solve this problem without any difficulty at all.

21. Israel has asked to participate in this debate without any expectation that the Council as represented by the

majority here will evaluate the issue on its merits. Having failed for 30 years to adopt a single resolution condemning the murder of innocent Israeli civilians, the Council long ago forfeited its right to pass judgement on actions stemming from terrorist outrages.

22. But it is not merely the Organization's blatant partiality that has cast doubts on its credibility. For we are now witnessing a process far more ominous and far more sinister than any previous double standard—the actual betrayal by the Security Council of its own principles and purpose. According to Articles 24 and 26 of the Charter, delineating the “functions and powers” of the Security Council, this body exists in order to “promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security”.

23. As far as that statement applies to the Middle East, we have witnessed in the last four months the beginnings of the first real dialogue towards peace, on the one hand, and an avowed and open attempt to sabotage and destroy that process, on the other. Never has the choice been clearer and it has been for each country to declare itself—for or against the peace talks. The world Organization showed where it stood last November when, ignoring President Sadat's momentous visit to Jerusalem, it chose instead to continue indulging in sterile condemnations of Israel. Indeed, neither the General Assembly nor the Security Council has yet issued one statement encouraging the peace talks and urging their extension to Israel's other neighbours.

24. After all, what can one expect if one recalls that in the General Assembly hall a gun-toting leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization, a terrorist organization, was given a standing ovation by the representatives of the nations? And this a short while after these so-called freedom fighters, the only such “liberators” in the world whose leadership does not have the courage to live amongst the people it purports to liberate, had displayed such gallantry in killing 12 schoolchildren and their teachers in a school bus near Avivim in 1970, and in shooting down 11 Israeli athletes in cold blood at the Munich Olympic Games in 1972. This reception occurred one year after that self-same terrorist had, according to President Nimeiri of the Sudan, personally given the order to execute in cold blood the United States Ambassador and his aide and the Belgian chargé d'affaires, bound hand and foot to chairs in the cellar of the Saudi Arabian Embassy at Khartoum. This, after a sombre and horrifying record of assassination, death and destruction which have plagued the world and in which women and children have been victims time and time again. This, after he had given the lead to the spread of indiscriminate international terror, affecting innocent people wherever they may be, in all parts of the world.

25. The Organization has not been able, in six long years of discussion, prevarication and double-talk, to agree on a single resolution condemning terrorism, condemning the brutal murderers of unsuspecting women and children—yes, of babes in arms. But it has at the same time seen fit to seat at this table the observer of the organization which openly and proudly proclaimed its responsibility for the cold-blooded assassinations and meticulously planned murder of small children—three years old, five years old; of a young

boy clarinetist of 14; of their parents and brothers and sisters, doing what millions of families do at the week-end, bent on nothing more sinister than a happy family week-end together; of a young girl photographer from a far-off land who had come to do nothing more than observe and photograph wildlife.

26. How can the Organization expect to retain any prestige or moral standing after inviting to its councils the observer of an organization which announced that these horrible acts of inhumanity could be continued every day and after seating him in a manner which, I submit, is a violation of the Charter and the rules of procedure? On the senseless and indiscriminate murder of little children, women, innocent wayfarers, the observer the Council has seated had this to say on NBC News last Sunday: “These operations . . . have been something almost normal. . . . It happens every now and then. . . . These operations will continue . . .”.

27. This betrayal by the Security Council of its very mandate and function has not been confined to Israel alone. When tens of thousands—some 50,000 dead and 100,000 wounded—were being slaughtered in the bloody civil war in Lebanon, the Council, as the representative of Lebanon has just pointed out, did not meet, or even once during two years of bloodshed address itself to the issue. As a full-scale war has raged in the Horn of Africa, the Council has remained silent, not apparently considering large-scale troop crossings from Somalia into Ethiopia a threat to peace. In the Western Sahara an ongoing war involving Mauritania, Morocco and Algeria has not attracted the attention of the Council despite hundreds of casualties.

28. Israel does not expect the United Nations to change its spots overnight. But, as one of the staunchest combatants against international terrorism, Israel has come to this forum today to reaffirm its refusal to bow to terrorist demands and its determination to fight that evil until ordinary men, women and children can live safe from the fear of indiscriminate attack and murder. It is for that reason that the Israeli Defence Forces crossed into Lebanon—and for that reason alone. And it is to accuse those criminals who slaughtered our citizens and those who were accessories to the crime that Israel has come to the Security Council today.

29. Since 1968 we have witnessed some 1,500 separate acts of international terrorism throughout the world. Not once has the Security Council been jarred into response. An attempt by the Secretary-General to bring the issue of terrorism to a resolution in the General Assembly after the 1972 massacre of Israeli athletes at the Olympic Games has been sabotaged by the supporters of the PLO for some six years now. An attempt by the Federal Republic of Germany in 1976 to introduce a convention prohibiting the taking of hostages has been allowed to sink into the quicksands of General Assembly committees, from which it has yet to emerge. In October of last year, some hopeful expectations arose in the wake of the Mogadiscio hijacking, when the International Federation of Air Line Pilots Associations threatened a 48-hour strike unless the United Nations acted to prevent airborne terrorism. But even this exercise ended in an inconclusive compromise, and the

President of the United States Airline Pilots Association told the United States Senate Governmental Affairs Committee just a few weeks ago:

"We are totally convinced that the United Nations has neither the will nor the means to effect any meaningful solution. . . . We have consequently arrived at the inescapable conclusion that strong unilateral and bilateral action by a few powerful nations is the only practical path to follow."

Israel long ago arrived at a similar conclusion about the Organization's ability and inclination to deal with terror and terrorists, and it is for that reason that we have crossed into Lebanon.

30. Israel has fought against terrorism in the past—at Entebbe and elsewhere—and we shall not cease to do so until this cancerous growth that preys on innocent men, women and children is eliminated. The cynical attitude of the United Nations up to now is a stab in the back not only of Israel but of all countries that have chosen resistance over cowardly submission—the Netherlands, which just this week brought about the release of innocent hostages; Egypt, whose commandos were shot in the back only a few weeks ago at Larnaca by, amongst others, 16 members of a PLO squad dispatched especially from Beirut to Cyprus by Arafat—those Egyptian soldiers were shot by the same people who killed Israeli children last week; the Federal Republic of Germany, whose forces freed hijacked passengers at Mogadiscio; and a handful of other nations.

31. Even as I speak, at this very moment, a terrifying drama is unfolding at Rome, as a terrorist organization, a member of the same Terror International as the PLO, kidnapped one of the distinguished leaders of Italy in order to force the Government of Italy to submit to a rule of anarchy. Some of these terrorists, together with terrorists from West Germany, Turkey, Iran, Japan and elsewhere, all of them committed to the overthrow of the lawful Governments of their countries, acquired their ugly and sinister skills in that centre of international terror, the PLO camps in Lebanon. It is noteworthy that, of the \$45 million granted annually by the Arab League to the PLO terrorist organization, \$34.6 million was made available by Saudi Arabia. With this money, and money supplied by the paymaster of international terror, Libya, terrorists from all over the world are being trained in these camps in order to spread the scourge of terror everywhere, to strike at the heart of law and order, to bring chaos and anarchy to the world and to destroy orderly societies, some of which are represented here in this chamber.

32. Indeed, as I look around the Council table, I see representatives of countries which have suffered from this curse of international terror and murder, whose security forces have been shot down and blown up with the weapons and ammunition paid for by the purveyors of murder in the world today. As I survey this scene, the incongruity of it all is brought home to me even more vividly by the fact that I have before me reports broadcast by the Lebanese Government and by the Lebanese Broadcasting Service and press to the effect that 12 ships from the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc recently unloaded

large quantities of arms at Tyre, despite incessant and urgent requests by the Lebanese authorities that such shipments should cease.

33. The area we are talking about, namely Southern Lebanon, includes the largest concentration of terrorists in the world, a force bent on terror, indiscriminate murder, provocation and assassination with the publicly avowed intention of fighting any move towards peace in our war-torn area. We are talking about an area which is a focus and centre for international terrorist operations against leaders and moderate Governments in the Middle East and in the free world. From this centre, let it be recalled, went forth the assassins who gunned down those Palestinian Arab leaders in the West Bank who had expressed support for President Sadat's moves. From this centre went forth the assassins of the editor of *Al-Ahram*, who was murdered in cold blood for the crime of endorsing President Sadat's initiative and of publishing favourable comments on what he had seen in Israel. From this centre went forth the PLO threats to assassinate President Sadat.

34. Perhaps, however, it is misleading to put too much blame on United Nations inaction. The world Organization is, after all, no more than the intentions, actions and will power of the nations that comprise it. And if we see the United Nations engaged in craven submission, cynical hypocrisy and even outright support of international terrorism, then it behoves us to examine the conduct of the individual nations engaged in the same activity.

35. Libya, the principal international sponsor of terrorism, predictably praised last Saturday's barbaric outrage as "a brave raid". Radio Damascus called the slaughter of 34 innocents, including 13 children and 6 women, "a daring operation" and "a legendary action [which] opens a new sphere of Palestinian action". Echoing the remarks of the PLO observer to the United Nations, the broadcast stated that "this act can be repeated daily". The so-called moderates responded equally enthusiastically, with Saudi Arabian radio announcing from Riyadh "the greatest fedayeen act in the occupied land". According to this Saudi Arabian definition, the more innocent civilians murdered, the "greater", apparently, the terrorist act. With such support, backed, incidentally, by lavish Saudi Arabian financing, the assassins need feel no restraint.

36. Of special interest was the reaction of Kuwait, at present a member of the Security Council "to promote international peace and security". A Kuwaiti Government spokesman stated on Sunday:

"It is natural that the Palestinian revolution will conduct such operations which will prove its existence and effectiveness. Kuwait sides with [this] revolution."

How quickly the Government of Kuwait seems to have forgotten its own reaction only last July when Palestinian terrorists seized a Kuwaiti plane. Let me quote briefly from the Kuwaiti newspaper *Al-Rai al-Amm* of 10 July 1977:

"Kuwait will be excused if it reacts violently against such a reckless movement. . . . The world will excuse us if we strike a painful blow in defence of ourselves and our security and stability. . . ."

"Is it enough for the PLO and the Fatah movement to denounce the operation without finding an immediate way out of this farce? How would you then expect the Kuwaiti people to sympathize with the Palestinian problem? Would you blame Kuwait if it turned its back on this problem, if it continued to be the target of such shocks? "

37. How well the people of Kuwait seemed to understand the sentiments of the people of Israel. And such an indignant reaction followed but one minor incident in which there were no casualties. How many nations assembled here today would be expected to respond quiescently when made the target of hundreds of such attacks involving scores of civilian casualties—blown up, shot down, hijacked and terrorized? The solution adopted by Israel is that suggested by the above-mentioned Kuwaiti article, which concluded: "The solution should be in the hands of Kuwait alone—in the use of an iron fist". Therefore, Israel has struck against the terrorists, and, in the words of the Kuwaiti newspaper: "The world will excuse us if we strike a painful blow in defence of ourselves and our security and stability".

38. The PLO came in force to Lebanon and proceeded to use it as a base for operations against Israel after it had failed to overthrow King Hussein of Jordan and his régime in September 1970—the so-called Black September—and after it had been finally banished from Jordan in 1971. The Israel-Lebanon border had been quiet and peaceful for years, with the farmers on both sides living side by side in amity and with nothing more untoward disturbing the peace than some quiet smuggling, which has been a time-honoured tradition along that border. The advent of the PLO brought misery, murder and disruption to the area both for the Lebanese and for the Israelis. Since the end of 1973, there have been 1,548 individual acts of aggression arising out of artillery, Katyusha, mortar and terrorist attacks mounted against Israel from Lebanon by those terrorists. In those attacks, 108 Israeli citizens, mostly women and children, were killed and 221 wounded. These figures alone—1,548 attacks in four years—surely vindicate Israel's action in recent days and testify to the incontrovertible fact that Israel has for years exercised a forbearance and patience which has, alas, produced no results. Last Saturday's senseless and brutal massacre on the Haifa-Tel Aviv road, which only emphasized in lurid and tragic detail the levels of bestiality to which these murderers have sunk, was but a further savage link in a diabolical chain of carnage and death. The Government of Israel has therefore been faced with the problem of doing its duty, the inherent duty of every Government to exercise its right of self-defence in the protection of the inviolability of its territory and its people.

39. Following the inter-Arab blood-bath in Lebanon, which literally tore apart a sovereign State Member of the United Nations, a blood-bath which the Organization chose in its inimitable logic to ignore, a state of total chaos developed in the southern part of Lebanon. The PLO has been acting just as it did in Jordan in 1970 until it was thrown out, bringing chaos and destruction and committing the most bestial atrocities against the Christian community in Southern Lebanon. That community of 50,000 souls—men, women and children—would have been completely

annihilated, if we are to judge by what happened in villages such as Aichieh, which the PLO captured, had it not been for the support and protection of Israel and the creation of the so-called "good fence" along the Israel-Lebanon border.

40. The utter chaos reigning in the area can be attested to by the United Nations observers who have suffered considerably from the absence of law and order in the area and the fact that hold-ups and banditry have become the order of the day.

41. Last summer Israel tried to impress the Lebanese Government with the seriousness of the situation, and negotiations were afoot for the introduction of the reconstituted Lebanese Army into the area, but the situation was such that senior officers of the Lebanese Army were unable, for fear of their lives, to travel through the PLO-held areas in order to reach the border and negotiate with Israel. Eventually they had to fly to Haifa, in Israel, and from there be taken to the border for negotiations. That is the measure of control that the Lebanese central Government had or has over Southern Lebanon. Nothing emerged from those negotiations as we waited for a Lebanese army to move into the area and take rightful and lawful control.

42. A measure of the unhappy situation in which the Lebanese Government finds itself was provided by the peremptory demand only a few weeks ago of the Syrian occupying force, otherwise known as the Arab Peace-keeping Force, that a Lebanese colonel should be handed over to it for execution because he had dared to assert Lebanese authority over a Lebanese army barracks in the face of Syrian troops. That unfortunate officer, who had defended the honour and integrity of his flag and country, was in the end summarily dismissed together with some of his colleagues from the Lebanese Army for the crime of behaving as any officer would and should.

43. It is vital to put the events of the last week into a larger perspective.

44. On 20 November 1977 a great and imaginative event took place in the Middle East when President Sadat made his historic visit to Jerusalem. The Government of Israel reacted to that momentous initiative in a manner commensurate with the greatness of the move, and for the first time the process of direct negotiations towards peace—a process which I believe is now irreversible, despite the set-backs—was set in motion. At the same time, it should not be forgotten that, on the day of President Sadat's historic arrival in Israel in the cause of peace and to achieve an end to war and bloodshed in the area, Syria declared a day of national mourning, Libya severed relations with Egypt, Iraq branded President Sadat a traitor and certain leaders of the PLO threatened openly to assassinate the Egyptian President. Two weeks later, at Tripoli, Libya, the capital of international terror, the rejectionists cemented their alliance by harsh condemnations of the peace process and vows to continue their struggle against Israel. The hysterical reaction of those States merely confirms Israel's legitimate concern for its security and the security of its citizens.

45. Even more ominous, running parallel to the development of the peace negotiations between Egypt and Israel,

has been the sudden massive infusion of arms and weapons of war into the area by the Soviet Union, which openly condemned the process of peace taking root in our region. Huge quantities of arms flowed into Syria and Iraq and, most sinister of all, there were definite signs of a major build-up of PLO forces in Southern Lebanon. Within less than two months, 12 ships loaded with arms from the Soviet Union coming either directly from that country or via Libya unloaded at the port of Tyre. For months now the Lebanese spokesmen and media have been reporting these ominous developments and issuing warnings about the dangers inherent in them for Lebanese sovereignty and the peace of the country. There has been an incessant demand in Lebanon by various leaders for the closure of the port of Tyre to the terrorists.

46. But the PLO build-up in Southern Lebanon went on relentlessly, and their presence was recently reinforced by the arrival of units from As Saiqa, the terrorist group controlled by Syria. The number of terrorists close to the Israeli border grew to some 5,000. They took over villages inhabited by Muslim Shi'ites in the region, exhibiting marked brutality in the process, and on 22 February—last month—Yasser Arafat inspected their positions amid considerable fanfare.

47. The PLO's complete freedom of action is a function of its total disregard for Lebanese sovereignty and of the inability of the Government of Lebanon to control part of its own territory. Which of us has forgotten the heart-rending speech made in October 1976 by Ambassador Ghorra, the former Permanent Representative of Lebanon? Addressing the General Assembly, he described in detail the "constant Palestinian intervention in the internal affairs of Lebanon and [the] intolerable encroachment on its sovereignty".¹ He reminded us that, in 1973, President Suleiman Franjeh had "denounced the illegal occupation of parts of Lebanese territory by Palestinian elements".² He recalled that the PLO did not respect the many accords that had been concluded with them over the years to limit their presence and military activities in Lebanon. And he continued:

"The Palestinians acted as if they were a 'State' or 'States' within the State of Lebanon and flagrantly defied the laws of the land and abused the hospitality of its people."³

And, still worse,

"For years, they steadily increased the influx of arms into Lebanon—arms of all calibres and from various sources. They transformed most—if not all—of the refugee camps into military bastions around our major cities, in the heart of our commercial and industrial centres, and in the vicinity of large civilian conglomerations."⁴

48. On 1 March 1977—that is, about three months after the civil war in Lebanon was brought to an end—Fouad

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Plenary Meetings, 32nd meeting, para. 61.*

² *Ibid.*, para. 62.

³ *Ibid.*, para. 63.

⁴ *Ibid.*, para. 64.

Boutros, then Deputy Prime Minister of Lebanon, admitted to the Foreign Affairs and Defence Committees of the Lebanese Parliament that his Government no longer had any control over the situation in the south of the country. That was exactly a year ago. A few days ago, on 14 March, it was reported by the Associated Press that Boutros, now Foreign Minister of Lebanon, had spoken to the United States Ambassador at Beirut and had again explained that the Government of Lebanon had no control over the south of the country.

49. The evidence has been painfully clear. In the early summer of last year, the Lebanese Government tried to introduce units of the rehabilitated Lebanese Army into the area, but to no avail, because of the refusal of the PLO forces to withdraw. During the summer there were serious outbreaks of violence between the PLO and Christian villagers in the area. The latter were able to hold their own and save themselves from annihilation only because of the help which Israel extended to them. In September negotiations were once again set in train for the withdrawal of PLO forces from the area and the re-entry of the reconstituted Lebanese Army. These moves were openly welcomed in an official Israeli statement issued on 26 September, but once again various elements within the PLO declared themselves opposed to the cease-fire that had been announced and indicated that they would take steps to sabotage it. Those elements, which apparently included El Fatah, the principal organization in the PLO, and George Habash's Popular Front, which is part of the so-called Rejectionist Front, sought to reactivate military action in the area not only to prevent the Lebanese Army from re-establishing itself over sovereign Lebanese territory but also to prejudice the negotiations then in hand aimed at reconvening the Geneva Peace Conference.

50. For months now, United Nations observers on the spot have been aware of the realities of the situation even if they have not been too keen to admit it. The Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) has treated us to reports, referring somewhat quaintly to the "*de facto* forces" in the area. Since that periphrastic language was obviously wearing a bit thin, the UNTSO report for February actually went so far as to refer to "areas assumed to be controlled by Palestinian elements" and even to "Palestinian-controlled areas" [*S/11663/Add.52, para. 5*].

51. We have no need to exhibit such delicacy, for we all know precisely what the prevailing situation in Southern Lebanon has been for several years. It is one in which the Government of Lebanon has lost control and, I dare say, sovereignty over a significant part of its own territory.

52. In the light of this situation, in the light of the unmistakable increase in PLO presence and weaponry in the area, in the light of the build-up which we have observed in the past few months, in the light of the PLO's declared intention to repeat atrocities like the one carried out in Israel last Saturday, the Government of Israel was compelled to act. The Government of Israel was left with no alternative. It acted in accordance with its legitimate national right of self-defence, that inherent right to defend its territory and population and to ensure that no more barbaric attacks will be launched against it in the future.

53. What Israel did is what any self-respecting sovereign State would do in the circumstances. What Israel did is fully in accordance with the norms of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. International law is quite clear on this subject. Thus Bowett states:

“Action undertaken for the purpose of, and limited to, the defence of a state’s political independence, territorial integrity, the lives and property of its nationals . . . cannot by definition involve a threat or use of force ‘against the territorial integrity or political independence’ of any other state.”⁵

Again, the subject is clearly dealt with by Fawcett:

“where incursion of armed bands is a precursor to an armed attack, or itself constitutes an attack, and the authorities in the territory, from which the armed bands came, are either unable or unwilling to control and restrain them, then armed intervention, having as its sole object the removal or destruction of their bases, would—it is believed—be justifiable under Article 51”.⁶

54. I do not wish to presume upon the time of the Council by going into a lengthy legal discussion on the issue except to say that the aforementioned legal passages reflect international law on the subject and support Israel’s legal position.

55. The United States position on such a case was clearly reflected in a statement issued by the United States Secretary of State on 20 June 1916:

“. . . In view of this increasing menace, of the inactivity . . . of the lack of cooperation in the apprehension of the . . . bands, and of the known encouragement and aid given to bandit leaders, it is unreasonable to expect the United States to withdraw its forces [across the border] or to prevent their entry again when their presence is the only check upon further bandit outrages and the only efficient means of protecting American lives and homes.

. . . .

“. . . The United States Government cannot and will not allow bands of lawless men to establish themselves upon its borders with liberty to invade and plunder American territory with impunity and, when pursued, to seek safety across the Rio Grande, relying upon the plea of their Government that the integrity of the soil of the Mexican Republic must not be violated.”⁷

56. And to prove that I am not basing myself on the position of just one of the super-Powers seated at the Council table, let me assure my Soviet colleague that international law as interpreted by Soviet legal authority entirely justifies Israel’s act. This emerges from a perusal of the draft act based on a Soviet proposal for the definition of aggression submitted to the General Commission of the

⁵ D. W. Bowett, *Self-Defence in International Law*, New York, Frederick A. Praeger, 1958, p. 185-186.

⁶ J. E. S. Fawcett, “Intervention in international law, a study of some recent cases”, *Académie de droit international, Recueil des cours*, 1961, vol. II, p. 363.

⁷ Green Haywood Hackworth, *Digest of International Law*, vol. II (United States Government Printing Office, 1941), p. 296-297.

Disarmament Conference on 6 February 1933. The Soviet draft resolution on the definition of aggression submitted to the Sixth Committee on 18 October 1954 read:

“The General Assembly,

. . .

“Declares that:

“1. In an international conflict that State shall be declared the attacker which first commits one of the following acts:

. . .

“(f) Support of armed bands organized in its own territory which invade the territory of another State, or refusal, on being requested by the invaded State, to take in its own territory any action within its power to deny such bands any aid or protection.”⁸

Similar language is contained in other USSR documents too numerous to quote.

57. Finally, the aim of the Israeli Defence Forces’ operation was not revenge or retaliation, for there is no way of avenging the lives of Israeli civilians which were so pointlessly taken last Saturday. Moreover the aim was not and is not to seize territory. It was and is to clear the PLO once and for all from the area bordering on Israel, which it used mercilessly for repeated aggression against my country.

58. We seek no Lebanese territory. We honour and respect the international border with Lebanon. We do not wish to acquire one inch of Lebanese soil. Our purpose is solely to remove the terrorist forces which have brought chaos, misery and destruction to Southern Lebanon. We wish to see the official central Lebanese authorities, backed by adequate force, return to the area and take over control in such a manner that the terrorist forces will not be allowed to return to the area now held by Israeli forces. My Government has made it quite clear that it has no intention of holding on to or annexing the area now held by the Israeli forces in Lebanon, but that it wishes to receive adequate guarantees that the *status quo ante* will not be restored.

59. We have created conditions in which the Government of Lebanon can restore control over that territory and in the process re-establish its sovereign right in the area. This is no small thing, for we shall have brought about a situation wherein the ordinary people, of all faiths, living both in southern Lebanon and in northern Israel need know fear no more, and in which they can live in harmony, with the border between them open, as it has been ever since the height of the civil war in Lebanon. This, surely, is a situation which men of reason and goodwill can only look upon with favour. For the Security Council to criticize it would only discredit the Council.

60. But there is another, wider aspect to what we have done which goes far beyond the local consideration which I

⁸ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 51, document A/C.6/L.332/Rev.1.

have just described. The PLO is totally and irrevocably opposed to any peace with Israel. This position is deeply rooted in the PLO's destructive ideology. It has been reaffirmed time and again: in the 10-point programme adopted by the so-called National Council at Cairo in 1974; in the 15-point programme adopted by the National Council at Cairo in 1977; and again in the statement by the PLO Central Council at Damascus in August 1977. All this in addition to the Palestinian National Covenant which commits the PLO to the destruction of the State of Israel. That organization is largely discredited in the Middle East. Indeed, its position in the Middle East, I would say, is in inverse proportion to the consideration accorded it here at the United Nations.

61. President Sadat has made his views about that organization very clear of late. As he pointed out only a few weeks ago: "The Palestinians should know that Egypt will retaliate one blow with 10 blows." Or, as was rightly pointed out in *Al-Ahram* only last month: "Political terror is a cancer that must be eradicated".

62. The PLO is not permitted to exist in Jordan or to operate from that country. King Hussein has referred to it on various occasions as "a bunch of criminals" and only a few months ago in the United States, in Atlanta, Georgia, he stated that "the PLO imposes itself on the Palestinian people". Syria does not allow the PLO to operate from its territory either and exercises the tightest control on the PLO within Syria. The Syrian representative will doubtless shed crocodile tears here and wax indignant about the recent events in Lebanon, conveniently forgetting the slaughter of Palestinians by Syrian troops in the Lebanese civil war and the massacre of Tel el-Zaatar. As the Syrian Defence Minister General Mustafa Tlass pointed out not so long ago in the Syrian Army newspaper *Tishrin*:

"My Palestinian comrades, the Muslims of Lebanon have begun to hate you because you are interfering in their daily life and their personal liberty. What then is the aim of your liberation? Is your sublime target the massacre of the Lebanese? Or perhaps your grand design was to slaughter the residents of the Semiramis Hotel at Damascus? You are mistaken, Palestinian comrades, because you arouse nothing but disgust among all honest Arab citizens.

"The PLO sacrificed hundreds of people in vain at Tel el-Zaatar. What do these revolutionaries know of liberation, after having brought such evil to Jordan and Lebanon?"

63. And what shall I say about the behaviour of the PLO in Lebanon? Perhaps President Franjeh's remarks in a farewell broadcast on Radio Beirut in September a year ago best expressed the situation:

"Lebanon is suffering today from a war launched against it by the Palestinians and their supporters—Arabs and foreigners.

"The Palestinians tried to rule Lebanon from behind the scenes, through puppet leaders. When their plot failed, they changed their tactics and worked to establish their own State in Southern Lebanon.

"The Palestinians brought about an escalation of murder, pillage, kidnapping and looting, leading to the outbreak of civil war—which actually is a war between Lebanon and the Palestinians.

"The Palestinians have deceived Lebanon, and today they are deceiving the other Arab States, which will suffer the evils of the Palestinians as Lebanon itself has suffered.

"Syria is now cognizant of Palestinian duplicity, as is Kuwait. Jordan had preceded both of them, but Lebanon awoke too late. The rest of the Arab States are still unaware of the danger."

64. As the Arab representatives make the inevitable impassioned speeches on the issue, the members of the Council would do well to bear in mind what they and their leaders really think about the PLO.

65. The Israeli action in Southern Lebanon has to be seen in its twin aspects. The first is as part of the war against international terror which besets the world—a terror that knows no bounds, a terror that is a danger to orderly society in every single country in the world. Today the Italian nation is face to face with the grim expression of terror at work. No country here can guarantee that it will not suffer. One cannot be selective about terror; it cannot be bad for some and excusable for others. It is either a wicked, dastardly, dangerous menace which threatens society and must be eradicated by all, or it is something to be encouraged until it turns on those who encourage it. No nation is safe from it.

66. This wicked, cowardly, bloodthirsty coalition of terrorists poses today one of the greatest dangers for human society in the world. Neither the Security Council nor the United Nations have done anything to discourage it. Let them at least not stand in the way of those forces which have committed themselves to struggle against this international scourge and which are not prepared to bow their heads to terrorism.

67. I repeat again that we have no designs whatsoever on Lebanese territory. We want Lebanon to be controlled by the Lebanese, and by nobody else. In this representatives may be aware that we have very considerable support for our action from a large section of the Lebanese population. I have here cables of support which I have received from prominent Lebanese, including the 24,000 Lebanese Christians of Damur in Lebanon whose brothers and sisters were brutally massacred by the PLO in the civil war and from which town the PLO operation last Saturday was mounted.

68. It is noteworthy that the representative of Lebanon, in his letter to the Security Council, explicitly links the evacuation of Israeli forces with the ability of the Lebanese authorities themselves to "exercise their functions fully" in Southern Lebanon [S/12600]. Why, then, does he now peremptorily demand the unilateral withdrawal of Israeli troops knowing that this would merely plunge the southern part of his country once again into utter chaos and would seriously prejudice any move towards achieving the goal of full Lebanese sovereignty over Southern Lebanon. In the

final analysis, as I said at the outset, the aims of Israel and Lebanon are identical. The only issue is how those aims are to be achieved.

69. Furthermore, let us not for one moment forget that in struggling against the terrorist forces we are struggling against an element that is sworn and committed to destroying the peace process in the Middle East. It is no coincidence that, as Egypt and Israel face up to the very difficult problems of negotiating a peaceful future in the Middle East, Egyptian and Israeli blood has been spilled by the cowardly attacks of those terrorists and Egyptian and Israeli soldiers have laid down their lives in the past weeks in this struggle against terrorism.

70. Let the Council at least ensure by its behaviour and reaction to those events that the forces of terror will not receive encouragement and that the sacrifices made by Israel in the last few weeks will not have been in vain.

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

72. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): Allow me, at mid-term, to congratulate you, Mr. President, for presiding most ably over a burdened Security Council this month and to wish you every success for the duration and beyond.

73. The toys of mass and indiscriminate destruction with which Israel has been flooded over the past five years have once again surfaced and a pretext has been found to demonstrate their prowess, primarily against hapless civilians and refugees who have died or suffered grievous injuries in their hundreds. Congratulations for that act of perverted heroism! And, as if that were not enough, a lengthy shopping list of even more lethal weapons for the destruction of people, property and the good earth of Southern Lebanon is being passionately solicited in the masquerade of security—that is the security of the grave in which their victims are laid to rest.

74. If the F4s do not kill enough people or destroy more effectively the simple little huts in which their victims and adversaries dwell, then why not the F15s—I was told today that F15s are already being deployed—and the F16s and whatever sophisticated technology is able to innovate. All that in the name of security.

75. It is a pattern of violence, destruction and a further swelling of the refugee ranks—Lebanese, Palestinians, Syrians, Egyptians and Jordanians—which we have had to endure for more than three decades; and the end is by no means in sight. It is a pattern which is by no means surprising and can never be daunting or capable of achieving its alleged claim of security.

76. All that, and much more to come, in a vicious circle masquerading under the name of security. The occupation of territories of three, now four, sovereign independent States. There is always a cause and an effect. The cause is Israel's refusal to pay the slightest heed to the Charter of the United Nations and innumerable resolutions of the General Assembly, as well as Security Council resolutions,

with what amounts to total impunity. The denial of the most elemental rights of the Palestinians who the Israeli leaders claim, with callous indifference, do not exist and have never existed.

77. Without indulging in an argument over fundamental issues which are still unresolved after 30 years of inaction amounting to tacit acquiescence, I feel constrained to confine myself to commenting on a present and continuing conflagration, namely, a massive Israeli armed aggression against the territorial integrity and independence of a contiguous sovereign independent State, Lebanon, one of the earliest States Members of the United Nations. I would also comment on the indiscriminate and cold-blooded slaughter of its civilian inhabitants and the Palestinian refugees residing there and awaiting repatriation and redemption without even a ray of hope.

78. My delegation demands that the Security Council should take immediate action to ensure a cessation of the armed aggression by regular Israeli troops by land, sea and air. My delegation, likewise, urges the Council to order the prompt withdrawal of the Israeli forces which are at present in occupation of sizeable territories in Southern Lebanon.

79. I have strained myself to find a substitute word for "immediate", in the light of our sordid experience that the term "immediate" might be construed by the Israeli aggressors as permitting 11 years of occupation, or even indefinite occupation, as is the case in other occupied Arab territories. Perhaps the Security Council might be more specific, by saying "within 12 hours", for example. If the Council fails to act decisively, we should soon be hearing about the establishment of settlements, and then additional settlements to provide security for the earlier ones, with the whole process culminating in a claim that an Israeli or a group of Israelis had, some 3,000 years ago, made a visit to Tyre or Sidon and therefore established those cities as part of their Biblical homeland. We know that as far back as 50 years ago, if not more, the Zionist leadership cast covetous eyes on the waters of the Litani river, upon which hundreds of thousands of Lebanese citizens depend for sheer survival. But the lives of those people, not fortunate enough by the accident of birth to belong to the "chosen race", are of little importance to insatiable Israel or its supporters. After all, beauty is in the eye of the beholder, and it cannot be stretched to encompass the irrelevant constituency of humankind, regardless of race, colour or creed. We believe that all men are created equal, but unfortunately the Israelis do not.

80. This will be a very brief statement, because the situation is so serious and so urgent that I should not wish to waste the Council's time by going into it at length. However, I do wish to state that what really is at stake is the role of the Security Council, the highest law-enforcement organ of the United Nations system. Its authority has, over the years, been gradually and systematically eroded by permissiveness and a tolerance of international illegality. There are enough organs, such as the Economic and Social Council, the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund and many others, that are doing a very fine and effective job in their fields. But we have only one Security Council, whose

sacred duty it is to safeguard peace and security in the world and the integrity of Member States as defined in the Charter. Will it permit its duty to go down the drain through ill-advised, indecisive action? That is the question—it is the crux of the question—an answer to which the whole world is anxiously awaiting. Let us hope that the world will not be let down again.

81. Internal security within every country is the prerogative of the security forces within every State. If they are delinquent or clumsy, it is hardly a green light for violation of the inherent inviolability of neighbouring independent States. After all, as Ambassador Herzog has mentioned, there are situations all over the world where we do witness incursions into other territories. But that does not give a green light to the Dutch to invade Indonesian or Moluccan territory.

82. Finally, Israel should at long last realize that the enslavement or dispersal of peoples, or aggression against their territories, is not the answer to security. Israel might wish to expand *ad infinitum*, but such expansion will ultimately be counter-productive and result merely in an augmentation of the area of insecurity. Security can only be achieved by a just, comprehensive and real peace in which all peoples in the area can participate and which all can enjoy in freedom and dignity. There can be no discrimination when it comes to the survival of nations and people.

83. The most important and immediate step for the Council is to draw the line between legality and illegality, to act decisively and prove that organized violence and aggression do not pay. That can only be expressed by action to end the aggression and ensure the immediate withdrawal of the occupation forces from Lebanon.

84. I reserve the right to make further comments at some later meeting, but because of the urgency of the situation, as I have said, I shall stop right here.

85. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

86. Mr. AL-HUSSAMY (Syrian Arab Republic): Mr. President, first of all I should like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of this august body. I am sure that thanks to your esteemed personality and your great experience in international affairs, the Council will be able to express itself as the guardian of peace and security in the world.

87. This is not the time to indulge in lengthy speeches and elaborate statements about the origins of the Middle East conflict or the roots of the tragedy of the Palestinian people, for at this very moment and as a result of a new act of naked Israeli aggression that conflict of more than 30 years is taking a new turn for the worse and that same Palestinian people is being further subjected, together with their courageous Lebanese brethren, to the ugliest forms of aggression, destruction and mass killing.

88. Once again the tiny peace-loving country of Lebanon is the target of a premeditated Israeli aggression. The whole of the southern part of Lebanese territory has been invaded

and scores of Lebanese villages and towns, as well as Palestinian refugee camps, have been systematically destroyed. Hundreds of thousands of new refugees have been uprooted from their homes and villages and hundreds of women and children, innocent civilian inhabitants, have been killed or wounded.

89. Israel shamelessly unleashed its military might, using six mechanized brigades and more than 25,000 soldiers to conquer the territory of a State Member of the United Nations on the pretext of a response to the fedayeen operation carried out a few days before in Palestine. Yet the scope of their invasion of Lebanese territory and the manner in which the Zionists carried it out, using land, sea and air forces, prove beyond any doubt the premeditated nature of the Israeli aggression and show that the real objective of the Zionist regime is to expand and to occupy more Arab territory.

90. The Israeli pretext cannot fool the international community or world public opinion. Israel cannot ensure its security by occupying more territories belonging to others, creating additional masses of desperate refugees and destroying the towns and villages of other peoples. No country has the right to take the law into its own hands or to resort to the use of brutal force in order to fulfil its political and military objectives.

91. The new Israeli act of aggression is taking place at a time when the international community is still endeavouring to liquidate the sequels of previous Israeli acts of aggression and to ensure the withdrawal of Israel from previously occupied Arab territories in Sinai, the Golan Heights, the West Bank and Gaza. Now, by its new act of aggression Israel has created, in fact, a fifth occupied Arab territory and has proceeded one step further in its policy of expansion and occupation of Arab territories.

92. Israel declares shamelessly that the objectives of its aggression are to establish a "security belt" and to eliminate "terrorist strongholds". Yet, it is clear that 99 per cent of the victims who fell as the result of the brutal Israeli bombardments, raids and attacks were innocent and helpless women, children and other civilians. We do not need to refute the theory of a "security belt" because it has been proved beyond any doubt that security cannot be based on the usurpation of more territory. As a matter of fact, the incident that Israel has this time used in order to justify its aggression did not emanate from the territory that Israel is attacking.

93. No pretext can justify aggression against and occupation of the territory of others, and the only means of ensuring one's own security is by respecting the security and sovereignty of others. It is Israel itself which bears the greatest responsibility for the tragedy and hardships through which Lebanon has lived in recent years. Lebanon has been the target of repeated acts of Israeli aggression—air and commando raids—during the last nine years, and it is not the first time that Israel has violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon, although this is the gravest violation.

94. The Israeli aggression against Lebanon would not have been possible without the huge arsenal of sophisticated

weaponry and war machinery with which the United States has flooded Israel in recent years. It is most unfortunate that the amount of United States military supplies to Israel has increased in parallel to the increase of Israeli aggressions against Arab countries and to the Zionist expansion into and settlement of Arab territories. According to recent reports, the United States has supplied Israel with what amounts to \$4.2 billion in arms, the bulk of which was granted to Israel over the last four years. It is clear that it would have been very difficult for Israel to continue its policy of expansion and aggression on this scale were it not for this huge and unprecedented amount of military and financial aid granted to Israel by the United States. This clearly constitutes an encouragement by the United States Government of the Israeli policy of expansion and aggression.

95. As I said at the beginning of my statement, this is not the time to elaborate on the details of the Middle East tragedy. But what I should like to stress now is that, by its latest act of aggression, Israel has proved that it does not deserve peace, because by that action it has destroyed whatever chances remained to establish a just and lasting peace in the region.

96. In the face of this new deterioration, the United Nations and its organ most responsible for the preservation of international peace and security, namely, the Security Council, must take urgent measures in order to stop the Israeli aggression against Lebanon and the Palestinian people and to ensure the immediate and total withdrawal of the Israeli forces of invasion.

97. The aggressor must not be permitted to reap the fruit of its aggression, for if Israel were permitted to gain any advantage or profit from its naked aggression and invasion of the territory of others it would be a clear encouragement to the aggressors and would constitute a very dangerous precedent after which other aggressors might find it profitable to resort to the use of force and aggression in order to obtain concessions or to secure political and military interests. If we were to permit the Zionist régime to impose conditions for its withdrawal from the territory that it has invaded and occupied in flagrant violation of the Charter and the principles of international law, what would prevent a similar régime, such as, for example, the illegal Rhodesian régime, from tomorrow occupying a part of Zambian territory and refusing to withdraw unless Zambia accepted prior conditions affecting its sovereignty and integrity?

98. The Security Council is therefore called upon speedily to adopt a resolution affirming the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and ensuring the immediate and total withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory. Such respect for Lebanon's sovereignty and such a call for the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli forces of aggression must not be linked or subjected to any preconditions or so-called "arrangements", because that would amount to a flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter itself.

99. In his statement on 15 March, following the Israeli aggression, the Secretary-General stated:

"Whatever the motivations for this [Israeli] action may have been, I can only deplore the violation of the

boundaries of a sovereign State and the massive use of force."

My delegation supports that statement and wishes to express its gratitude for the concern which the Secretary-General has shown in this respect, as well as for the efforts he has continuously been making, since the beginning of the Israeli aggression, to contain the situation. The Secretary-General's concern is manifested once again—and perhaps more urgently—in his letter of yesterday to the President of the Security Council issued as document S/12604.

100. The Syrian Arab Government stated its position clearly during the very first hours of the Israeli aggression. It called on all the members of the Security Council, and in particular the five permanent members, to shoulder their responsibilities under the Charter. The Syrian statement is published in full in annex II of the above-mentioned letter from the Secretary-General. I wish to quote only the last paragraph of the statement:

"In view of the foregoing, the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic is deeply concerned at events in Southern Lebanon and calls on States members of the Security Council to shoulder their responsibilities as laid down in the Charter and to intervene promptly to halt the aggression against a State Member of the United Nations and take immediately the necessary steps for the immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory."

101. The situation in the Middle East was explosive enough before this latest Israeli act of aggression. The countries and the peoples of the region look to the Council today in the hope that it will put an immediate end to the Israeli aggression and ensure the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli forces.

102. The Syrian Arab Republic pledges its unconditional solidarity with brother Lebanon and with the Palestinian people, and we are convinced that we are joined in this by the overwhelming majority of the Member States.

103. It is about time that the Security Council fulfilled its responsibilities; it is about time that this body said halt to the aggression and the aggressor.

104. In conclusion, I should like to say a few words concerning the allegations made just now by the Zionist representative. We have become very used to the Zionist representative's attempts to divert the attention of international bodies from the questions under consideration. In his statement today, the Israeli representative made allegations concerning the relationship between Syria and the Palestine Liberation Organization, and the role of the Syrian forces in Lebanon. I need hardly say that the facts refute those allegations. It is well known that the Syrian forces constitute a part of the Arab peace force, which is acting legally on Lebanese territory.

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

106. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to extend my congratulations and those of the Libyan delegation to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of March. I am sure that a man of your calibre and experience will be able to guide the discussions in the Council to a successful conclusion. I should like also to express to you and to the members of the Council my delegation's thanks for the opportunity to participate in this very important debate.

107. We have listened attentively to representatives who have spoken here, including our brothers the representatives of Lebanon, Syria and Jordan. The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization—the representative of the Palestinian people—will certainly speak also. He and the representative of Lebanon are, of course, more qualified than I to provide the Council with details. Hence, I shall not speak at length.

108. We have listened, too, to the representative of the Zionist entity. We have heard his repetitions. We are accustomed to this language of falsehoods and lies spoken by the Zionist entity and its representative at the United Nations.

109. Indeed, it is not a question merely of falsehoods and lies; it is a question also of arrogance, this language of arrogance which has been typical of Israeli leaders, especially in recent times. We have heard Menachem Begin, we have heard Mr. Herzog, and they use the same language that we heard in Europe some 40 years ago. It is a language of threats and arrogance, it is the language of force, it is nazism. Nazism has been born again and has been installed in our region by persons who say that they were persecuted, that they were the victims of the Nazis. If indeed these persons were victims of the Nazis, then they have certainly learnt from the Nazis. They are followers of the school of European nazism.

110. This extraordinary arrogance has already begun to disturb everyone, even their friends and supporters, even the forces which created Israel, which have supported the Zionist entity and which imposed it on the region, in the very heart of the Arab nation, even the forces which have given this group of adventurers the financial, economic and political means to impose themselves on the region and to massacre and assassinate the Palestinian people, to continue their policy of genocide.

111. The representative of the Zionist entity said that Israel had not committed aggression, that this was an act of defence against an aggression—allegedly a terrorist aggression.

112. We know, and everyone knows, that the aim of the Zionists in the area is territorial expansion. They have sought and, indeed, they will continue to seek excuses. This time the incident of 11 March was used as an excuse to continue that policy of genocide and expansionism. It is clear that preparations were already under way in Israel well before 11 March. They know perfectly well that such incidents can occur, that the Palestinian people are fighting for their independence, for their survival, and that an

incident can indeed occur at any time. In order to prepare the international and local atmosphere for the elimination of the Palestinian cause, they know that they have to put an end to the Palestinian struggle, to eliminate the Palestinian people. The Israelis had indeed been preparing for this for some time, and, as I said, the incident of 11 March was but an excuse. But, even so, it was not a valid excuse.

113. Mr. Herzog spoke of international law. He spoke of theories that would be dangerous were they to be adopted in international law. We all know full well that pretexts of this kind have long been used in wars of aggression throughout the world.

114. Mr. President, your country could make use of similar excuses to invade Ireland. Indeed, there are organizations in Northern Ireland that are having difficulties with your Government. There are situations throughout the world which could justify the invasion of a country, infiltration for example. But, in this particular case, even if infiltration did occur, it did not come across frontiers but from the sea. The problem is that the Zionist entity wishes to hide a scandal, in view of the fact that their alleged security has been revealed to the whole world as a bluff. There is no security for Israel in the region. I am not speaking of the incident itself; in this kind of war a good many things can happen. But the fact that small rubber craft were able to get through and to land on the Israeli coast—in spite of all the mysterious talk about the potential effectiveness of Israeli security and Israeli forces—was too much for the group ruling at Tel Aviv.

115. That could have the effect of encouraging the Arabs, because for 30 years the Arab countries have not been able to put an end to Zionist aggression, not because we have been powerless but, unfortunately, because we have in a sense been brainwashed by Israeli propaganda that it cannot be vanquished, that Israeli security is in the realm of the superhuman. Mr. Begin, who has tried to pose as a tough individual and a hawk, was shown up and he tried to do what he could to cover up the incident. Everybody knows that even if there had been just any incident—not necessarily this one—they would have gone to Lebanon anyway because that was part and parcel of their plans and strategy. But perhaps they did not know that they would come by sea and that it would occur along the Haifa-Tel Aviv highway.

116. Mr. Herzog spoke of international law, but even in international law there are rules that have been established. There is the inalienable right of peoples to fight for their independence and to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination. When he speaks of international law, where are the rights of the Palestinian people? He says that the Palestinian people are terrorists, but can an entire people be a gang of terrorists? And now he wishes to attack terrorism throughout the world. And he blames the United Nations for not doing anything against terrorism while knowing full well that the original sin of the United Nations was that it created the State of Israel out of a group of terrorists who imposed their will on the Palestinian people through terrorism. Now that racist terrorist entity is being led by a terrorist, who, as you, Mr. President, know, was once sought by the British police. So, please,

Mr. Herzog, do not come here to complain about terrorism and say that the United Nations is not doing anything against terrorism when your terrorist entity was created by the United Nations and when, as I said, the original sin of the United Nations was having made it possible for that racist, colonialist entity to impose its will on the Arab and Palestinian people.

117. I shall not speak much longer for I shall have another chance to address the Council. But Mr. Herzog devoted a good portion of his statement to my country, Libya, and I shall reply briefly.

118. He said something about our being a paradise for terrorists or the world capital of terrorism. If in his language terrorism and movements of national liberation are identical, well, perhaps it is true that we are the "capital of terrorism". We have never hidden the fact that we support national liberation movements in Africa and Palestine. We support the national liberation movements fighting against racism in black Africa and those fighting against Zionist racism in Palestine, because we are a people who have experienced racism; our people fought fascism for 40 years and we lost 45 per cent of our population in the struggle against fascism and racism. We have never concealed the fact that we provide national liberation movements with our support, and we stand firm with them both in Africa and in the Middle East. We know that for two or three years now, especially in the United States, there has been a campaign against Libya in the pro-Zionist mass media, in the American Senate and among the representatives of the Zionist entity. It is the same old tune, but we are not going to be intimidated. We shall not change our views. We know it is a matter of life and death. Our solidarity with the Palestinian people will continue forever.

119. There is one more point. As usual, Mr. Herzog referred to Arab problems, and he quoted an Arab president and used that authority against another Arab authority. Well, such problems can arise in an Arab nation of 150 million people which extends from the Atlantic to the Gulf, a nation of 22 or 23 States occupying a very strategic part of the world. It is true; we do have problems—social and economic problems. We have had to suffer the after-effects of foreign occupation. We have been occupied by various forces. We have been the victims of French, Italian and British occupation. Yes, we have problems, and we have not had a civil war. If you compare all that is taking place in the Arab world with, for instance, what happened in France before it became a united nation, you will see that it is not much; and if you compare it with the civil war in the United States, it is nothing at all. The struggles in the Arab world are fratricidal struggles between forces which hold power in certain Arab countries but are not necessarily the real representatives of the Arab masses. On television, members have seen how the Arab masses have responded: the young Lebanese or Palestinian may have been very nearly dead, but his fingers were raised in the victory sign, thus showing the real spirit of the Arab masses. An old Arab woman in a Beirut hospital, who had seen her son killed, torn apart by the Zionist bombs, turned to representatives of the press and said "Tell them?"—meaning the whole world—"that I still have two sons left". That is the kind of spirit we find among the Arab masses.

120. Why come here and quote Arab presidents and leaders? We have our conflicts, we even exchange insults at times. But we never lose sight of the fact that the fight between us and the Zionists is a matter of life and death. The fight of the Palestinian people will continue. The Zionists can strike at the Palestinian bases in Lebanon; they can attack part of the Palestine Liberation Organization. But there are 3 million Palestinians left who are prepared to die and they will fight on against the Zionist occupation and colonization. And they will be supported by the Arab people. There is no other way out. There will be no peace, no salvation for the area if a solution is not produced to the problem of the Palestinian people. And such a solution cannot be brought about by the use of force for, in the long run, the Zionists will lose. They cannot exterminate a nation of 150 million people. At the end of this century, Syria alone will have 20 million inhabitants and Egypt 75 million, so logic and historical evolution are not on the side of the Zionists. The Zionists can continue with their cynical policies and go on creating problems for Jews everywhere in the world, all the way to Argentina now; they can help to finance Nazi parties to intimidate the Jews so that they will come and pledge allegiance to their flag, as they already have done. The Zionists persecuted Jews in Iraq to get them to leave their country; they killed some of them; they can do that sort of thing. Even here, in the United States, they are playing with fire, for it is a proven fact that the Zionists wish to create problems here for the Jews, in the hope that an American Hitler may be born in 10 or 15 years, in order that millions of Jews will emigrate to Palestine and that it will be we again who pay the price just as we had to pay the price for the Nazi policies. But those tactics will not work. It is a very dangerous game.

121. As for us, we have nothing against the Jews. We respect Judaism. We are even prepared to welcome the 17 or 18 million Jews into the Arab nation. We want the Jews to have peace, here or elsewhere. We do not want anti-Semites to drive them out so that they come to us. Since the events of 11 March there has been nothing but propaganda; all the mass media here have talked about that "Arab atrocity", with photographs of children. As if the people here knew nothing about atrocities and terrorism! But the memory of the Viet-Nam war is still fresh.

122. And after the attack on Lebanon everything goes on as though nothing had happened there. There are prayers for one or two people, but thousands have been exterminated in Lebanon and nobody prays for them. Yesterday, on television, the mayor of New York and Mr. Carey, the governor of the State of New York, put on the yarmulka—that is an electoral tradition, we know that—and began to weep over the fate of the Jews as though they had become an oppressed minority in Palestine.

123. Mr. Koch said that the Jews had gone into Lebanon to help to save the Christian community there. I would ask Mr. Koch what the Israelis, the Zionists, have done with the Christian Arabs in Palestine. A Christian Arab refugee, Mr. Terzi, is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization here. He is a refugee. Let the Zionists tell the world what they have done for the Christians in Palestine, what they have done to Jerusalem, the cradle of Christianity. They are liars, and the world knows it, but unfor-

tunately they have power, particularly here in this great country.

124. I shall not be much longer, I have nearly finished. I would only say that I reserve my right to speak again if necessary. My country asks the Security Council to discharge its responsibilities by ordering the immediate withdrawal from Lebanon of the Zionist occupation forces.

125. The PRESIDENT: The final speaker is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, on whom I now call.

126. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Once again the Security Council meets to consider the situation in the Middle East, a situation that threatens world peace and security. Owing to the gravity of the situation in the area and the escalation of the fighting, I shall be very concise and precise.

127. We trust that under your prudent and experienced guidance, Mr. President, the Council will take adequate measures to ensure the immediate cessation of the Israeli aggression and to put an end to continuing bloodshed.

128. Hundreds of innocent civilians, both Lebanese and Palestinian, are being killed by Israeli air strikes against civilian villages and towns. Israel, equipped with the most sophisticated weaponry supplied gratis by the Government of the United States, is only trying to realize a dream of many years. It is our sincere hope and aspiration that the Council will order the immediate and complete withdrawal of the invasion troops from the territory of a Member State.

129. The Palestinians happen to be in Lebanon; it is because they were driven there. They did not go there by their own choice. They were expelled at bayonet point and as a result of a criminally conceived campaign of terror. I am referring to the criminal acts committed in 1947 and 1948 by the so-called Jewish armed gangs. In particular, I recall—and that was during the British Mandate—the massacre at Deir Yassin in April 1948, the massacre in cold blood of 254 Arab children and women. It is ironic that the racist criminal who planned the Deir Yassin massacre should be none other than the current Prime Minister of Israel, Menachem Begin.

130. On 13 March of this year, Begin told the Knesset: "Innocent blood will not be shed with impunity". We say, let there be no shedding of innocent blood. Menachem Begin said on the same occasion: "We will root out the prospect of an evil hand being raised against our children". I must assure the members of the Council that we, too, have children who are dear to us, we, too, could no longer see our children die when they picked up those dolls that were in reality booby-traps dropped by Israeli aircraft—aircraft, I repeat, supplied by the United States.

131. Ezer Weizmann and Mordechai Gur took pride the other day in saying that the mission of the operation was to annihilate and root out terrorist concentrations in Southern Lebanon—mark that, annihilate. And what are the terrorist concentrations? They are the camps where Palestinian

refugees live. But the uprooting of the Palestinians is nothing new. It was planned by Herzl all the way back in 1895. Herzl wrote on 12 June 1895:

"When we occupy the land, we shall bring immediate benefits to the State that receives us. We must expropriate gently the private property on the estates assigned to us. We shall try to spirit the penniless population across the border by procuring employment for it in the transit countries, while denying it any employment in our own country."

One of those "transit countries" happens to be Lebanon. But transit to where? To extermination and annihilation.

132. As for the real aim of that operation, it is the occupation and annexation of the territory south of the Litani. I have just a few remarks to make on this. In 1919 the Zionist organization drew up its future aim for this Jewish homeland, and said that in the north the border of the Jewish homeland would be "at a point on the Mediterranean Sea in the vicinity of Sidon and following the watersheds of the foothills of the Lebanon as far as Jisr El Karaon, thence to El Bire, . . .", and so on. That is exactly the territory where Israeli operations have been conducted during the last few days. Or perhaps I should show representatives a map that was designed in 1916 and presented to the Peace Conference. This map shows exactly the declared frontiers where the Zionist ambition may end temporarily.

133. On 9 November 1977, Israeli aircraft—and again I say supplied and provided gratis or almost gratis by the United States—struck and levelled a village. The result was more than 100 children killed—and nobody seems then to have raised a voice.

134. We have been told in the Council that the Palestine Liberation Organization is a group of terrorists and gangsters opposed to peace. We have said before, and we repeat here, that the Palestine National Council, in positive response to the plan approved by the General Assembly to hold a peace conference with all the parties concerned on an equal footing, endorsed that Assembly plan. But who is obstructing peace? I think the disgraceful *coup de grâce* for the peace efforts and for a resolution drawn up and adopted in this body—I am referring to resolution 242 (1967)—a resolution that has suffered in a labyrinth of misinterpretations, came when the final misinterpretation was made of it and Menachem Begin gave his own interpretation, saying of Jerusalem, Nablus, Hebron and that area that it was "liberated" land, not "occupied" land. Could anything be more drastic and more fatal to the prospects of peace? It is Begin and what he represents that is obstructing peace.

135. It is odd that in the Council we are told that the Zionist régime is out there in the defence of Christianity. I do not want to speak as a Christian, nor as an Arab nor as a Palestinian, but as a human being. I shall read from a draft law passed by the Knesset, No. 1313:

"He who gives or promises to give money, an equivalent of money or another benefit in order to entice a person

to change his religion or in order to entice a person to bring about the change of another's religion, his sentence will be five years' imprisonment or a fine of £1 50,000.

"He who receives . . . the sentence due to him is three years' imprisonment, or a fine of £1 30,000."

And someone comes here and speaks about "defending Christians in Lebanon". That is one of the greatest insults to the intelligence of the Council.

136. This afternoon the non-aligned countries made known their position on the Israeli criminal attack as follows:

"The Co-ordinating Bureau unanimously condemned this latest act of blatant aggression by Israel against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon, as well as its expansionist policy. The aggression has caused a considerable number of deaths in Lebanese territory and enormous damage to property, as well as large-scale refugee migrations from the southern Lebanese region.

"The Co-ordinating Bureau considers that the latest brutal armed Israeli attack also aims at bringing into jeopardy the very existence of the Palestinian people who live in the territory of Lebanon and eliminating the Palestinians and the Palestine Liberation Organization as one of the key factors in the settlement of the question of Palestine and the conflict in the Middle East." [S/12609, annex.]

137. My brother from Lebanon said: "Let my people live". I say: let my people live; let them return to their homes and feel human again.

138. In conclusion, I can only repeat the words of my brother from Lebanon. The immediate cessation of hostilities and the immediate withdrawal of the invaders should be the unanimous demand of the Council and of the world community, as much as it is ours in Lebanon.

139. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Kuwait, who wishes to speak at this point.

140. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): I wish the representative of Israel were here; he was here earlier but has left. I have some observations to make on his statement. He made some references to my country and to the Security Council. In fact, he invited me to give him an answer and I am doing so very willingly.

141. First of all, I note with satisfaction that the Kuwaiti press interests him and that he and his Government are avid readers of the Kuwaiti press. We are proud of our press; it is a free press and everybody is entitled to his opinion. Quoting from the Kuwaiti press does not help; it detracts from his statement rather than the contrary. Really, I find great pleasure in listening to some quotations from the Kuwaiti press.

142. My second remark is that from his lengthy statement it was obvious that the barrage of insults, the pile of abuses

and the provocative remarks hurled at the Security Council could not be allowed to pass without comment.

143. I have read the letter that the representative of Israel has addressed to the President of the Council in document S/12607 in which he said "I . . . request you to convene a meeting of the Security Council". I cannot reconcile the fact of insulting the Council, undermining its authority and casting slurs on its integrity with the request to convene a meeting urgently to consider the question that we are now debating.

144. There is a huge gulf which logic cannot really bridge: the incompatibility of insults with the request for a meeting of the Council to consider the issue. I share with him the view that there is a decline in the moral authority of the United Nations. Yes, it is true, but why? Because of countries like Israel and South Africa. Israel is enjoying a Roman holiday in the territories it occupied forcibly in 1967—and more than a Roman holiday: it is, rather, enjoying a feast in the West Bank and in Gaza, building Jewish settlements in contravention of the Charter of the United Nations, United Nations resolutions and international law. This, of course, adds a great deal of strength to the argument about the decline of United Nations moral authority. However, the decline stems from the presence of countries like his, which has flouted the Charter and trampled its principles underfoot.

145. My third point is about terrorism. That was a macabre section of his statement, in which there was a lot of hot air about terrorism. Israel is the only country in the world in which the premierships and an unblemished, impeccable terrorist record are combined; it is the only country which is directed and governed by a Prime Minister who prides himself on an impeccable record of terrorism. So I find it rather incongruous, laughable and unacceptable that he should have dwelt at such length on the issue of terrorism, representing, as he does, a country governed by none other than Prime Minister Begin, who takes great satisfaction and pride in his terrorist past.

146. My final point is about the role of Kuwait in supporting the Palestinians, as mentioned by the representative of Israel. Yes, we do support the Palestinians, it is no secret. He must have thought that he was "spilling the beans", as the Americans say, by bringing up this issue. We do support the right of the people of Palestine to self-determination; we do so in accordance with the Charter and in accordance with piles of United Nations resolutions that point to that right. We are promoting the Charter and complying with the injunctions and directives of the United Nations by supporting the Palestinians. We will not run away from our responsibility: it is a responsibility in which we take pride and satisfaction.

147. Those are only my preliminary remarks for this evening; they were in fact provoked by the statement of the representative of Israel.

The meeting rose at 8.05 p.m.

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 الى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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