



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-THIRD YEAR

2074th MEETING: 19 MARCH 1978

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

| | <i>Page</i> |
|---|-------------|
| Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2074) | 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 |

✓ 191556

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.

2074th MEETING

Held in New York on Sunday, 19 March 1978, at 11 a.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/2074)

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 11.55 a.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: I invite those representatives who, with the consent of the Council, have been participating in this debate so far to resume the places reserved for them at the Council table or at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon), Mr. Herzog (Israel) and Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took places at the Security Council table and Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan), Mr. Kikhia (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Medani (Sudan), Mr. Al-Hussamy (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Cu Dinh Ba (Viet Nam) and Mr. Al-Haddad (Yemen) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Iraq, Mongolia, Pakistan and Qatar in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion. In accordance with the usual practice, 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.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Al-Sahhaf (Iraq), Mr. Puntsagnorov (Mongolia), Mr. Akhund (Pakistan) and Mr. Al-Obaidly (Qatar) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Lebanon has asked to be allowed to speak at the outset of this morning's meeting and I therefore call on him.

4. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): You have been very patient with me, Mr. President, but human lives are involved and, as I said yesterday, people still die on Sundays. My news is very bad and I wish to urge the Chair and the members of the Council to agree that, if it is not contrary to the rules, we should proceed immediately to the vote on the draft resolution. I plead with members who have asked to be allowed to speak to reserve their statements until after the vote, if that is in order. I am doing this because human lives are involved and because operations on the terrain are still following a very bad course. So, I request that if you agree, Sir, we should go immediately to the vote so that we can move towards implementation.

5. The PRESIDENT: I am afraid I have to inform the representative of Lebanon that this is not a matter for the Chair to rule upon. At the moment I have a list of 13 speakers before the vote. If those 13 delegations were to indicate to me that they were prepared to speak, not before the vote, but after the vote, we could indeed proceed in that way, but I have had no such indication so far.

6. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): I should like to ask you, Mr. President, to associate yourself with my plea and, if this is acceptable to those who have asked to be allowed to speak, I again urge that we should proceed to the vote, because human lives are involved. I ask that representatives should speak after the vote.

7. The PRESIDENT: The President is perfectly prepared to ask the representative of the United Kingdom whether he is prepared to speak after the vote, and the answer is "Yes".

8. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): I should like to echo the sentiments of the representative of Lebanon. I am not really interested in having leisure to speak at the moment, while blood is being spilled. It is very important for the Council to take action, and, in the light of the blood-bath going on in Lebanon, it is imperative for the Council to act now. Those who wish to explain their votes can do so before or after the vote, but statements could be made afterwards, or disposed of.

9. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): My colleague from Kuwait has already said what I was about to say. I believe that there would be no harm in consulting members of the Council and, if those who are inscribed on the list of speakers would be willing to postpone their statements to a later time and vote now, I would support that. Perhaps we could put this to a vote, or consult members individually.

10. Mr. FUENTES IBAÑEZ (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation had its name down to explain its vote before the vote, but in view of what has just been said we have no objection to speaking afterwards.

11. The PRESIDENT: It may assist members of the Council and those other delegations which are concerned in this matter to know that I have been told by those sitting behind me, who know more about these things than I, that there are precedents for representatives invited under rule 37 to participate in the Council's deliberations speaking after the vote as well as before the voting procedure commences. So, if those whose names are inscribed on the list under rule 37 were to take the view that they could reserve the statements they wish to make until after the vote has been taken, it would indeed be possible for us to move on to the voting procedure now. Those concerned are the Sudan, Mongolia, Pakistan, Qatar, the Palestine Liberation Organization and Israel. Two other members of the Council who wish to speak before the vote are China and Czechoslovakia. Again, it is a matter of those countries indicating to me whether or not they wish to proceed in this way.

12. Mr. LAI Ya-li (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): In view of the appeal made by the representative of Lebanon, we are prepared to speak after the vote. However, I should like to reserve my right to speak also before the vote.

13. The PRESIDENT: I think perhaps I should make the distinction clear. There is a distinction between participating in the debate and participating in the voting procedure. As far as the voting procedure is concerned, of course members of the Council have the right, if they so wish, to explain their vote immediately before they cast it, just as they have the right to explain it immediately after they have cast it. But, as I see it, the problem is not so much now with the members of the Council; the problem is with the rule 37 participants in the debate who have requested to take part in the debate before we move on to the voting procedure. As I have said, those are the Sudan, Mongolia, Pakistan, Qatar, the Palestine Liberation Organization and Israel. I am told that Pakistan, Qatar and Mongolia have agreed to reserve their right to speak until after the vote.

14. I call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization who has asked to be allowed to speak.

15. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): In compliance with the wishes of the representative of Lebanon, we shall reserve our right to make a statement until after the vote.

16. The PRESIDENT: I believe that the Sudan and Israel also are now going to speak after the vote. I think that leaves only the representative of Czechoslovakia, who apparently still wishes to take part in the debate.

17. Mr. HULINSKÝ (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): In view of the statement made by the representative of Lebanon, I shall not insist on speaking before the vote but shall speak after, if you wish, Sir.

18. The PRESIDENT: I am much obliged to the members of the Council for their co-operation. It would now seem that no member of the Council and none of those participating under rule 37 wish to take part in the debate before the Council moves on to the voting procedure. I take it, therefore, that the Council agrees that we may now move on to the voting procedure on the draft resolution before it contained in document S/12610. A number of members have inscribed their names to speak in explanation of vote before the vote and I shall now call on them.

19. Mr. LAI Ya-li (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has studied the draft resolution submitted by the United States contained in document S/12610. We deem it necessary to point out that in the first place the draft fails to condemn the Israeli armed aggression against Lebanon and to support the just struggle of the Arab and Palestinian people. China has always held a different position in principle on the question of sending United Nations forces, because such a practice may pave the way for super-Power interference. China therefore expresses its reservation and has decided not to participate in the voting on the draft.

20. Finally, the Chinese delegation reaffirms that the Chinese Government and people firmly condemn the Israeli Zionists for their atrocities of aggression against Lebanon and other Arab countries. We will, as always, firmly support the Palestinian and Lebanese people and the people of other Arab countries in their struggle to resist aggression, regain their lost territories and restore their national rights.

21. Mr. N'DONG (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): The present situation in Southern Lebanon is the direct consequence of the distressing problem of the Middle East. It is not my intention to go into the problem as a whole, but I should like to recall that my delegation believes that no lasting settlement can be reached in that part of the world so long as the profound aspirations of the Palestinian people, represented by the Palestine Liberation Organization, are not fulfilled. Those aspirations are for recognition of its inalienable right to self-determination, independence and national sovereignty in a State of its own.

22. My delegation sincerely deplores the bloody events taking place in Southern Lebanon, events which are

considerably complicating and delaying the search for a solution of the Middle East problem as a whole and which might have serious repercussions on all the ongoing efforts to arrive at a just and lasting settlement of this problem. Furthermore, these events have led to the occupation of part of Lebanese territory by Israeli armed forces. That occupation contravenes the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations and we condemn it.

23. For all those reasons, my delegation cannot but support the Council's decisions, calling for immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanese soil and leading to full respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution before us.

24. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): In connexion with the draft resolution in document S/12610, the Soviet delegation would like to make the following statement.

25. During the discussion in the Council, the representatives of many States both members of the Council and others who participated in the debate spoke in favour of the Council's firmly condemning this open aggression by Israel against Lebanon as a blatant violation of international peace and security. This has to be done in order to put an end to the aggressive policy of Israel towards the neighbouring Arab States. It is a matter which is of fundamental significance, and yesterday the Soviet delegation, during the consultations held by the members of the Council, made certain proposals. However, the sponsor of the draft resolution stated that he did not consider it possible to accept them.

26. The delegation of the Soviet Union would also like to state that the sending of United Nations troops to the territory of Lebanon in accordance with the request made by the Government of that country should by no means infringe in any way the sovereign rights of the Government of Lebanon and should fully take account of the responsibility borne by Israel as the aggressor for the actions which it has perpetrated. The draft resolution establishing a United Nations force should contain provisions to the effect that the task of such troops should be to observe the cease-fire and the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon and to separate the sides. We cannot agree to the United Nations troops being given functions that are not proper to them in regard to the transfer of effective authority in that region to the Government of Lebanon. We also consider it extremely important that the text of the draft resolution should contain provisions limiting the stay of the United Nations troops in Lebanon to a short period of time and also indicating that they should be withdrawn when the Lebanese Government so requests.

27. During consultations held with all the members of the Council as well as with the delegation of the United States, the sponsor of the draft resolution, the Soviet delegation proposed certain amendments. Unfortunately, however, those proposals were not taken into account by the United States delegation. We consider them, however, to be essential both in order to protect the interests of the victims of Israel's aggression and in order to comply with

the principles of the Charter governing the use of United Nations troops for maintaining peace and international security.

28. In these circumstances, the Soviet delegation cannot agree with the draft resolution contained in document S/12610. However, in view of the request made by the Government of Lebanon in this regard, the Soviet delegation will not impede its adoption and will abstain when it is put to the vote.

29. My delegation considers it necessary also to emphasize that all the expenses arising out of the consequences of Israel's aggression against Lebanon, including the expense of sending United Nations troops to Southern Lebanon, should be borne by the aggressor itself, that is, Israel.

30. Mr. FUENTES IBÁÑEZ (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, although I had already indicated that I was prepared to speak later, I shall gladly do so now, since you have been good enough to call on me.

31. My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution introduced by the delegation of the United States, contained in document S/12610. My Government's decision is based on two fundamental principles: one is legal and the other of a humanitarian character. The legal consideration deals with basic implications which my Government has rejected at all times and in all circumstances. They have to do mainly with the occupation of territories by force, no matter what the reasons invoked. The second consideration concerns the need to put an immediate end to the suffering of the population in the invaded territories and to respond in this way to the dramatic call of the Lebanese people who, according to their representative, only aspire to be left alone to live in peace.

32. With regard to the other aspects of the item on the agenda, "The situation in the Middle East", my delegation believes that this is not the most appropriate time to refer to them, because what we are now trying to do is to put an end to a situation of utmost gravity which requires immediate and decisive measures.

33. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): The Council has been meeting since last Friday to discuss the question of Lebanon and Israel, or, to use the precise wording of the item, the situation in the Middle East.

34. Not being a Moslem, I did not have to go to the mosque on Friday. Not being Jewish, I did not have to go to the synagogue on Saturday. Not being a Christian, I did not have to go to church this morning. I do, however, wish a very happy Palm Sunday to all my Christian friends. I understand that Soviet people too go to their church—the Russian word is, I believe, *tserkov*. I understand they usually go on Sunday, for mass. I am told that the Chinese people go to the pagoda or the shrine whenever they feel like it.

35. Being a Brahman, I consider God to be within me, and I pray wherever and whenever I feel like it—just as my Chinese colleagues do. I do not have to go to a temple to

pray. So let me pray in the Council: O Lord, Lebanon is a crossroads of cultures, and, to use the words of the representative of Lebanon, Ambassador Tuéni, "rarely, if ever, has such a small country given so much to the world and to the history of mankind". And yet Lebanon is today suffering aggression and is bleeding, through no fault of its own. Please help Lebanon, O Lord.

36. I listened very attentively to Ambassador Tuéni's speech. It moved me deeply. I express to him my condolences.

37. I heard the speech of Ambassador Herzog of Israel, but I experienced some difficulty in listening to him. I prefer to say that I did not hear him; I did not hear his insults to the Security Council and to the United Nations as a whole. I say this particularly because Israel is after all a child of the United Nations.

38. I subscribe to the views that have been expressed in the Council over the past few days by friends and supporters of and sympathizers with Lebanon. I and indeed my country pride ourselves on being on the side of Lebanon on this issue. In order not to prolong unduly the consideration of this question, I shall only associate myself with the views expressed by Lebanon's friends during this debate.

39. It is a credit to you, Mr. President, that you have been able, with your unique diplomatic talents and through your indefatigable efforts, to bring the members of the Council together in reaching agreement on the draft resolution contained in document S/12610, which I feel certain will command the support of all delegations. The United States delegation, led by Ambassador Young, deserves a special tribute for its remarkable efforts that led to unanimous agreement in such a short time on this draft resolution, sponsored by the United States. I cannot remember the last time that such a miracle occurred.

40. It is without hesitancy that I shall vote in favour of the draft resolution which the negotiators have put together. Let it not be said that the Security Council cannot act quickly in an emergency. Let the people of Lebanon live!

41. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/12610.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Bolivia, Canada, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Kuwait, Mauritius, Nigeria, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Czechoslovakia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The draft resolution was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.¹

One member (China) did not participate in the voting.

42. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote after the voting.

43. Mr. HULINSKÝ (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic severely condemned the new premeditated act of aggression by Israel against Lebanon and expressed its genuine sympathy for the Lebanese and Palestinian people who were its victims. At the same time, we supported the demand that the Security Council should condemn this act of aggression and call upon the Israeli Government to withdraw its armed units from the territory of Lebanon immediately and unconditionally.

44. In defining its position on the draft resolution which has just been adopted, my delegation stated that it took very seriously the views of the fraternal country of Lebanon. The representative of Lebanon clearly stated that his country desired the presence of United Nations troops in the territory of Lebanon, and we were sympathetic to that request. In view, however, of the fact that the functions of the force in question are not clearly set out in the resolution just adopted, we had to abstain.

45. At the same time, we should like decisively to emphasize that the responsibility for any further deterioration of the political situation in the Middle East region and for the dangerous consequences that could flow from this latest act of aggression must be borne by the Government of Israel. It goes without saying that we also wish to emphasize Israel's material responsibility for the financial implications of the resolution just adopted, in accordance with the Charter.

46. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): Kuwait cast an affirmative vote on the draft resolution sponsored by the United States, notwithstanding its reservations on many of the provisions of that text. The primary goal of Kuwait in casting that affirmative vote was to secure forthwith the cessation of military operations by Israel inside Lebanon and the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Lebanese territory.

47. Kuwait would have liked to see a paragraph in the resolution strongly condemning Israel for its heinous crime and blatant aggression. Paragraph 1 avoids mentioning Israel by name. Is this a deliberate omission or is it the best outcome in the present circumstances? Our understanding is that this paragraph is addressed solely to Israel, because it is Israel alone that violated the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon. Paragraph 2 is couched in weak terms, as it merely calls on the aggressor to cease its military action. The Council should have demanded an unconditional and immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Lebanese territory.

48. Paragraph 3 states that the purpose of the establishment of a United Nations force is not merely to confirm the withdrawal of Israeli forces, but also to assist the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area. This is a dangerous precedent. Aggressors must not be allowed to dictate terms of withdrawal. The choice of the word "interim" is not the

¹ See resolution 425 (1978).

best. It gives the impression that United Nations forces may be stationed in Lebanon indefinitely. The presence of United Nations forces should not detract from Lebanese sovereignty. It is my delegation's understanding that Lebanon is free to terminate the presence of United Nations forces on its territory whenever it chooses. It is the only Power competent to make such a decision. The United Nations forces' primary goal is to secure the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon and to prevent a recurrence of the encroachment by Israel on the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon.

49. There are also serious implications in the resolution which make us apprehensive about the prospects for peace and security in our region. The Council's response to Israel's challenge calls for serious consideration. Shall States be allowed in the future to occupy neighbouring territories if they feel that their neighbour's authority is ineffective? Should the aggressor refuse to withdraw unless United Nations forces are sent to perform duties on terms dictated by the aggressor? We pose these questions because much more is involved than the national and human rights of the Palestinian people or the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

50. As the representative of a small country I must say that the package deal in paragraph 3 of the resolution is disturbing. There can be no compromise with aggression or genocide. Those who perpetrate atrocities must reckon with the authority of the Security Council, which is the supreme international body for the maintenance of peace and security.

51. In conclusion, we should like to point out that this resolution will not put an end to the conflict in the Middle East. How can the suffering of the Palestinians and the Lebanese be alleviated? Only a comprehensive settlement based on the United Nations resolutions that call for Israeli withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories and the restoration of the national rights of the Palestinian people will guarantee the termination of the conflict from which our region has suffered for so long.

52. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (*interpretation from French*): First of all I should like to perform a pleasant duty which thus far circumstances have prevented me from performing. I should like to bid welcome to our new colleague from Venezuela, Ambassador Rubén Carpio Castillo. We are sure that his ability and his great experience will be of valuable assistance to all of us. We have very fine memories of how Miss María Lopez represented her country in the Council until Ambassador Carpio Castillo arrived. She did so in a manner that was a credit to Venezuelan diplomacy.

53. The French delegation wishes briefly to explain why it voted in favour of draft resolution S/12610. As we said in an earlier statement [*2072nd meeting*], we could not fail to support the request addressed to Israel immediately to cease its military actions against Lebanon and to withdraw its forces from the territory of that country without delay. Only such a step can ensure respect for the essential provisions of the Charter, which do not tolerate in any circumstances violations of the territorial integrity or sovereignty of another State.

54. I turn now to the subject of the stationing of a United Nations force in Southern Lebanon. Yesterday we said that the French authorities had made their agreement subject to the agreement of the Lebanese Government. Today we have that agreement. My Government would, however, remind the Council that the stationing of a United Nations force in a given particularly dangerous and threatening situation must first and foremost contribute to the search for and the maintenance of peace. Such forces should not be diverted from their genuine purpose and their presence must not be used as a pretext for postponing the search for a final settlement to the crisis that led to their creation. That is why the mandate of such forces is generally set for a limited period. In the case of Southern Lebanon, the resolution we have adopted clearly states that the force will not be required after the Lebanese Government has established its effective authority over the area. In passing, I would point out that the *raison d'être* of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) will not thereby be removed.

55. It was in the firm hope that the situation would develop towards a search for peace in the Middle East by all the parties concerned that we voted in favour of the draft resolution today. France is quite prepared to discharge its full responsibility and to participate directly in the force to be placed in Southern Lebanon.

56. Mr. YOUNG (United States of America): I want to thank all the members of the Council for their co-operation in making possible such rapid action on the adoption of this resolution. I especially want to thank you, Mr. President, for your tireless consultations and negotiations, which made it possible for us to bring together very quickly a response to the plea by the representative of Lebanon. I think the Council demonstrated a kind of political restraint which produced this result—the result asked for very simply and powerfully by the representative of Lebanon: "Let my people live."

57. The current situation in Southern Lebanon, however, is the result of an unending cycle of violence. The tragic pattern of action in the Middle East and the reaction to the conflict have been repeatedly deplored by my Government. The senseless violence against unarmed civilians, whether in the name of liberation or security, must be brought to an end. We must do all in our power to put a stop to the fighting in Southern Lebanon and once and for all provide an alternative to this recurrent pattern.

58. As the representative of Lebanon so eloquently stated, while the fighting is going on people are dying in Southern Lebanon. I want to urge the members of the Council to proceed immediately to further consultations that would lead to the adoption, if possible this afternoon, of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force. In our view we should be able to get the first contingents of this force into place at the earliest possible moment.

59. Mr. CARPIO CASTILLO (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Venezuela voted in favour of the draft resolution introduced by the delegation of the United States because of the humanitarian aspects of the problem which are occupying the Council's attention. But

we did not have enough time to consider the other very delicate and serious aspects of the problem some of which are overlooked and some of which are included in the text.

60. The PRESIDENT: I should now like to make a statement in my capacity as representative of the UNITED KINGDOM.

61. Once again the Council is meeting against the background of hostilities and human tragedy in the Middle East. Both Lebanon and Israel have experienced more than their fair share of the horrors of war. One cannot but be moved by the reports coming out of the region of innocent families bereaved, of people uprooted from their homes and forced to flee. It is impossible to justify the atrocious terrorist attack on the road to Tel Aviv last Saturday. It is also impossible to accept that any Government has the right to take the law into its own hands in the way that Israel has done.

62. For a long time now, my Government has expressed its deep concern at the situation in Southern Lebanon. Only last September, in a statement to the General Assembly, the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Mr. Owen, pointed to the fighting there as

“a sad reminder both of the urgency of finding a solution to the Middle East conflict as a whole and of the difficulties which the Lebanese Government faces in restoring peace and security in that country”.²

He has regularly emphasized the need for a United Nations force in the area. The events of the last eight days serve to underline that view. My Government's attitude to violence in the Middle East, from whatever quarter, is clearly on record. We deplore acts of terror resulting in loss of life and limb, often to innocent civilians. Nor do we accept that retaliation in kind provides the solution.

63. It is particularly regrettable, in my view, that the events of the last eight days should have taken place at a time when the region's most urgent requirement is to maintain the momentum of the peace talks prompted by President Sadat's historic journey to Jerusalem. In the shorter term a way must be found to enable the Lebanese Government to re-establish its authority in the south of its territory. Immediate Israeli withdrawal is, in my Government's view, a clear prerequisite to progress in this respect. I was pleased to note the repeated assurances given to the Council by the representative of Israel that they do intend to withdraw from Lebanon. We regard those assurances as serious and binding. The implementation of paragraph 3 of the resolution which the Council has just adopted and which we firmly support should lead to a rapid re-establishment of stability in the area.

64. It is particularly gratifying that the plea so eloquently voiced by the representative of Lebanon in his first statement before the Council [2071st meeting] should have been answered so speedily and efficiently. This has been due in large measure to the forbearance and the persever-

ance of the members of the Council, of those participating in the debate and of the United Nations Secretariat.

65. I shall now resume my role as PRESIDENT of the Council. We have thus concluded the explanations of vote after the vote.

66. The Secretary-General has asked to be allowed to make a statement and I now call on him.

67. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I have noted carefully the terms of the resolution which the Council has just adopted and shall be circulating the report called for in that resolution in a very short time. In fact, my report will be available to the Council right after the end of this meeting. I hope that the Council will be able to consider my recommendations at the earliest possible date so that we may proceed without delay with all the necessary arrangements for the establishment of the United Nations force in Lebanon.

68. In order that no time should be lost in implementing paragraph 2 of the resolution, I propose to instruct Major-General Erskine, the Chief of Staff of UNTSO, to establish close contact with the parties concerned and to deploy UNTSO observers with a view to confirming the cessation of military action in the area. It is clear that the cessation of military action on all sides is a fundamental prerequisite for the implementation of the other parts of the resolution. I therefore appeal to all concerned to take all possible measures to put an immediate end to the hostilities in the area and to give the fullest co-operation to United Nations personnel in the area, and in particular to the unarmed military observers in Southern Lebanon.

69. My report will, I hope, provide the Council with the basis for further expeditious action in this very serious situation.

70. The PRESIDENT: The Council will now resume the general debate, if I may call it that.

71. Mr. LAI Ya-li (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has listened attentively to the statements made by the representatives of Lebanon and other Arab countries and of the Palestine Liberation Organization. We fully support the complaints and condemnation they have expressed in categorical terms against the aggression committed by the Israeli Zionists. The irrefutable fact is that, since midnight on 14 March, the Israeli Zionists have dispatched large numbers of aircraft, warships and armoured vehicles to effectuate a flagrant invasion of Southern Lebanon, launched attacks on the camps of the Palestinian armed forces, ravaged villages, massacred inhabitants, savagely trampled upon the sovereignty of Lebanon and committed a new unforgivable crime, thus arousing the indignation of the Lebanese and Palestinian people, the entire Arab people and peoples throughout the world.

72. The Chinese delegation expresses profound sympathy and solicitude to the Lebanese and Palestinian people. We express our utmost indignation at and strong condemnation of the aggression and brutal crimes committed by the Israeli Zionists.

² Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, Plenary Meetings, 9th meeting, para. 116.

73. Over a long period of time, the Israeli authorities have stubbornly clung to their policy of aggression, arrogantly refused to recognize the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people and to pull out from the Arab territories they occupied, and continued to set up illegal settlements. All this has already met with resolute opposition from the Arab and Palestinian people, thus plunging Israel into increasing isolation.

74. The Israeli Zionists always use the protection of "Israel's security" as a pretext for launching aggression and expansion. The Israeli Defence Minister haughtily declared that Israel had decided to "clean up once and for all" the Palestinian armed forces in Southern Lebanon so as to form a "security belt". He asserted: "We will control the area as long as necessary". These extremely insolent assertions have laid bare the expansionist nature of Begin and his like who have committed aggression behind the smokescreen of "defence" and "security".

75. The two super-Powers have long been engaging in overt and covert struggle over the Middle East question with the same purpose of controlling the Middle East and impairing the national rights of the Arab and Palestinian people. Their only difference lies in the fact that while one super-Power supports Israel openly, the other super-Power does so under the cloak of being the "natural ally" of the Arab people and under the signboard of "supporting national liberation movements". It is with the connivance and support of the two super-Powers that Israel has for years committed evil acts and run rampant, and time and again launched wars of aggression against the Arab countries, occupied vast tracts of Arab territories and made large numbers of Palestinians homeless, thus reducing the situation in the Middle East to a state of prolonged flux and great tension.

76. The Arab and Palestinian people are heroic people. Confronted with the ferocious enemy, they have been carrying on courageous and tenacious struggles for the cause of national liberation. The Israeli Zionists' intransigence can only run wild for a time, because it is not the Israeli Zionists and the super-Powers but the hundreds of millions of Arab people who will eventually determine the destiny of the Middle East.

77. The Chinese Government and people always stand four-square behind the people of the Arab countries and the Palestinian people in their just struggle to recover lost territories and regain national rights. We are firmly against Israeli aggression and against the contention between the two super-Powers in the Middle East.

78. The Chinese delegation still considers that the Security Council should uphold justice and explicitly adopt a resolution strongly condemning the Israeli atrocities of aggression and demanding an immediate end to all Israel's acts of aggression and an immediate withdrawal of all its aggressor troops from Lebanon's territory. At the same time, the Council should call on the people of the world to give firm support to the Government and people of Lebanon, as well as to the Palestinian and other Arab peoples, in their just struggle against Israeli aggression. We are convinced that ultimate victory will go to the people of

the Arab countries and the Palestinian people, who are uniting more closely and persevering in struggle.

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

80. Mr. MEDANI (Sudan): Once again the international community is confronted with a flagrant violation—one of the most flagrant—of the territorial sovereignty of a Member State. We are witnessing wide-scale military aggression by Israel against Lebanon in what is a clear attempt to further its Zionist expansionist policy. It is not my intention, Mr. President, to tax your patience and that of your colleagues by engaging in a lengthy discussion. A resolution has already been adopted. The Sudan delegation hopes for its immediate implementation, particularly as regards the immediate cessation of the military operation by Israel inside Lebanon, and the complete withdrawal of the Israeli forces from Lebanese territory, as well as a halting of the killing of civilians and innocent people.

81. However, I must say that this act of open aggression against Lebanon is no surprise to any of us here. Israeli aggression has become the rule rather than the exception. Israel has committed many such acts in large- and small-scale military incursions, equipped with the most advanced tanks and planes. Yet Israel tries to convince world public opinion that those blatant acts of aggression are justified in terms of Israel's rules for the protection of its security. But peace and security can by no means be brought about by blind revenge. On the other hand, the escalation of the already existing tension in the Middle East could inevitably lead to a larger confrontation and, subsequently, more bloodshed.

82. The regrettable sharp attack by the representative of Israel on the members of this august body—part of the very Organization which created the State of Israel—shows the fallacy of his argument, as well as his usual disregard and disdain for any just resolution adopted by the Security Council in favour of justice. As early as this morning, Mr. Begin was casting doubt on the validity of any Council resolution.

83. This open Israeli invasion of Lebanon, a peaceful country which is precious to the hearts of the whole world, with the possible exception of Israel, this aggression to which Lebanon is now being subjected and the cruel attempt of Israel's so-called defence army to exterminate the Palestinian people by killing hundreds of children in the refugee camps, could never go without being seriously challenged, as it also sets a most grave and threatening precedent: for under precisely such masks do other racist régimes—in South Africa and Rhodesia—launch their flagrant attacks on Zambia and other front-line African States.

84. This Israeli act of terrorism cannot bring that country peace or security. The Palestinian people are struggling for their inalienable rights and the restoration of their homeland, as recognized by the whole of the international community, and the denial of these rights by Israel is the real cause of the tension in the Middle East. My delegation believes that, to reach a just and permanent settlement,

Israel should immediately withdraw from Lebanon and from all other occupied Arab lands and recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to establish their own State in Palestine.

85. In his statement on 17 March [2071st meeting], the Israeli representative also referred to the President of the Sudan in regard to the tragic incident that took place at Khartoum in 1973. Without going into detail, I wish to record here that the statement of the Israeli representative is absolutely false: the President of the Sudan did not state that the Chairman of the PLO had given the order to kill. As a matter of fact, the President of the Sudan was in very close contact at that time with Yasser Arafat at Beirut throughout the ordeal, and both were trying to find a peaceful solution of the difficulties which such cases usually entail.

86. I thank you, Mr. President, for inviting me to participate in the debate.

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

88. Mr. PUNTSAGNOROV (Mongolia) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, first I should like to express my appreciation to you and to all the other members of the Council for having given me the opportunity to speak on the item now before the Council. Our delegation would like to congratulate you on your fulfilment of the important responsibilities of the presidency of the Council for this month.

89. The matter which is now being considered by the Council cannot, by its very nature, fail to disquiet all those who aspire to peace and security for all peoples. Once again we have witnessed a sudden deterioration of the situation in the Middle East, as a result of armed aggression undertaken by Israel against a Member of our Organization, the State of Lebanon. As a result of this large-scale military invasion in which land, air and naval forces were used, the direct occupation of Southern Lebanon has in effect begun. During the military operations, hundreds of people have already perished, primarily Palestinian refugees who, having been expelled from their native land by Israel, had sought shelter in neighbouring Lebanon.

90. It is quite obvious that the aggression of Israel is aimed at weakening the national liberation struggle of the Arab peoples and primarily at striking a blow at the Palestinian resistance movement headed by the PLO and preventing a comprehensive political settlement of the Middle East crisis.

91. The new act of aggression carried out by Israel against Lebanon is not only an overt challenge to the provisions of the Charter and to the elementary rules of international law, but also represents a direct threat to international peace and security. Israel's act of aggression demonstrates quite clearly that the manoeuvres involving the so-called separate transactions with Israel not only are hampering a speedy and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem but also have resulted in encouraging Israel's aggressive actions against neighbouring countries and

against the people of Palestine. However, we are convinced that those actions of the aggressor will not break the will of the Arab people in the struggle for their just cause.

92. The Mongolian delegation firmly condemns Israel's encroachment on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Lebanon and its barbaric actions against the Palestinian people. In his statement made on 19 March, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Mongolian People's Republic said the following with regard to the new aggression committed by Israel against Lebanon:

"The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic and the Mongolian people as a whole, together with all progressive forces throughout the world, severely condemn the new act of aggression committed by Israel against Lebanon and demand an immediate cessation of military action and the withdrawal of Israel's troops from that territory.

"The Mongolian people and its Government would like to express their full support of and solidarity with the Arab peoples in their just struggle to eliminate the consequences of Israeli aggression, establish a lasting peace in the Middle East and guarantee the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to create their own State."

93. My delegation hopes that the Security Council will display a sense of its lofty political responsibility so as to put an immediate end to Israel's aggression and ensure conditions of peace and security in that part of the world.

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

95. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): First of all I should like to observe that, as regards the urgency of the matter before us, I cannot recall that the representative of Lebanon saw any urgency in the debate when his country was being ripped apart by the PLO, when Syria and other Arab States sent in troops, when the blood of 50,000 Lebanese was being shed, when up to a hundred thousand people were being wounded and up to a million Lebanese were being turned into refugees, and when the whole fabric of life in his country was being destroyed.

96. In this connexion, I have before me here a sheaf of telegrams addressed to me by citizens of Lebanon that I considered submitting as official documents. The two I shall read out reflect their spirit. The first reads:

"We, the Christian refugees of Damur, Lebanon, who number 24,000, repudiate the position of the Lebanese Permanent Representative to the United Nations. We fully support the policy of Israel."

The second reads as follows:

"Lebanese Christians in Lebanon back Israel's position and stand ready to assist the Israeli forces in all ways against the Palestinian murderers."

These are just two examples from a number of telegrams that I have received from citizens of Lebanon.

97. In agreeing to defer my statement until after the vote, I did so, Mr. President, out of deference to you, and I should like to make that perfectly clear.

98. It must surely be apparent to all who have listened to the statements of the leaders and representatives of Israel and of Lebanon that both countries are demanding the same thing, namely, the establishment of full Lebanese authority and sovereignty in Southern Lebanon. What many representatives here have apparently forgotten, however—as is obvious from their remarks—is that, prior to this week, the effective authority in the area in Lebanon under discussion was not, by its own admission, the Lebanese Government but the terrorist organization called the PLO. That organization has brutally imposed itself on the villagers of Southern Lebanon and has used the area for the specific purpose of launching murderous attacks on Israeli civilians. It was against the terrorists of that organization that Israel acted this past week, and it is to prevent their return that Israel now seeks appropriate arrangements.

99. Two cynical distortions have been perpetrated in the course of this debate. The first distortion, insinuated by the Soviet Union and by almost every Arab representative, is that Israel has territorial designs on Southern Lebanon. That is a blatant lie. Israel has stated repeatedly, and now solemnly reaffirms, that it wants not one inch of Lebanese territory. We did not enter Lebanon with the intention of staying, and we do not now intend to stay. We entered the area with one purpose, and one purpose alone: to clear the region of the murderers who have terrorized both Lebanese villagers and Israeli civilians for far too long, to destroy their bases and to ensure that they do not return.

100. The second lie is an even crueller distortion. To assert, as some representatives have done, that Israel's aim is to annihilate Palestinians is a brutal denial of facts. If that were Israel's aim, how is it that the Arab population of Israel itself has grown and prospered, increasing in numbers from 150,000 in 1948 to over half a million today? How is it that, unlike many of our neighbours, Israel has granted full citizenship to its Palestinian Arab population and not kept them languishing in refugee camps? How is it that Israel has offered, within the framework of peace proposals submitted to Egypt, self-rule to the Palestinian Arabs in the areas under its control while Jordan and Egypt—let me remind their representatives—did not see fit even to offer them that during 19 years of Jordanian and Egyptian occupation? How is it that the number of Palestinian Arabs killed over the past few years by Syria and by Jordan far exceeds the number of PLO terrorists killed in clashes with Israel?

101. Israel's action was most emphatically not directed against Palestinian Arabs as such but only against terrorists such as those who staged last Saturday's barbaric attack against Israeli civilians, who have assassinated West Bank Arab leaders, who shot down the editor of *Al-Ahram* and who have dispatched their assassins to all parts of the world to hijack planes, murder women and children and terrorize innocent people.

102. On that count, may I express my sorrow that the representative of Egypt saw fit yesterday to cite a long list

of previous one-sided resolutions passed by the Security Council on Israeli actions in Lebanon, none of which mentioned the problem of terrorism that gave rise to those actions. In so doing, I submit that the Egyptian representative has done a grave disservice not only to the hundreds of civilian victims of terrorism but also to those of his own countrymen who so recently gave their lives in the struggle against that scourge of mankind. Indeed, by refusing to address themselves directly to the problem of terrorism, many representatives here continue to give implicit approval to the Council's previous silent sanction of the terrorism that has afflicted Egypt, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Britain, Yugoslavia and many other countries. This is not the time for a citation of such one-sided resolutions but rather for a frontal attack on a problem that both Lebanon and Israel would like to see resolved, namely, the usurpation of Lebanese authority by the PLO.

103. I shall ignore the usual inevitable and repetitive diatribe that my delegation is treated to on such occasions by the Arab delegations and their satellites. It is, after all, first and foremost a useful device for avoiding the main issues—that of restoring Lebanese sovereignty which has been undermined by the Arab enemies of Lebanon, and that of the menace of international terror.

104. But when those who live in glasshouses proceed to throw stones, I am constrained to reply. The representative of India did not approve of my characterization of the United Nations handling, or rather ignoring, of the problem of terror or of the tragedy of Lebanon and other major problems in the world. He took exception to my reference to hypocrisy. I can appreciate his concern since apparently the shoe fits. By what right does he lecture us? By right of the fact that in 1975 his Government's forces chose to cross the border of the Kingdom of Sikkim—remember, Ambassador, we are discussing the sanctity of national sovereignty here—and annex, no more and no less, that kingdom, and the Council did not even blink an eyelid? Hypocrisy, Sir, let me remind you, is the only tribute which vice pays to virtue.

105. An even more telling illustration of what I had in mind when I described the record of the Organization in such disparaging terms as to make some members uncomfortable was provided by the vicious, unbridled and obnoxious remarks made by the representative of the Soviet Union, remarks which betrayed the innate anti-Semitic sentiments which colour the Soviet attitude to our people wherever they may be. Has not your Government, Sir, engaged in sufficient mischief without adding insult to very considerable injury?

106. You talk today about the territories held by Israel since the 1967 war, while ignoring the fact that the late President Nasser indicated in his resignation speech on 9 June 1967 that it was Soviet intrigue that had forced Egypt to move as it did, resulting in a war which brought Israel to those territories. You have poured billions and billions of dollars worth of arms into the Middle East, sparked off a calamitous arms race and been a major element in fomenting war and tragedy in the Middle East. In the past few months alone, fearful lest Egypt and Israel

might move towards peace, the Soviet Union undertook massive infusions of arms and weapons of war into the area, particularly to Syria and Iraq. Your ally, to whom you recently shipped in the course of two months 12 shiploads of arms for the purpose of destroying the Lebanese State, mounting terrorist attacks against Israel, subverting moderate Arab States and assassinating their leadership, is the PLO, a terrorist organization that specializes in murdering women and little children.

107. You talk of national sovereignty and territorial integrity. Well you may, since you are so familiar with the subject, as in Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Hungary in 1956, Czechoslovakia in 1968 and the Kurile Islands. I have a feeling that my Chinese colleague could elaborate on this subject. It seems to me that you are the least qualified of all nations to pontificate on a subject such as respect for territorial integrity.

108. It is noteworthy in this debate how few representatives have seen fit to express concern for the fate of the villagers in Southern Lebanon. The anti-Israel obsession of many of those delegations apparently overshadowed their determination to ensure Lebanese sovereignty. Indeed, it might be asked how many of those representatives who have raised their voices in self-righteous indignation over the past few days even expressed concern about Lebanese sovereignty when it was consistently violated by the PLO; and, when that hapless nation was torn apart in a bloody civil war, how many representatives then raised their voices in defence of Lebanese sovereignty?

109. I would remind the Council that Israel's position on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon has been and is a consistent one. We were for a year and a half the only country in the Organization that consistently raised its voice in the Security Council and in the General Assembly on Lebanon's behalf until the Lebanese representative himself accused the PLO of waging war against his country. By its services at the "good fence" Israel literally saved tens of thousands of Lebanese lives. Many of those countries that today shed crocodile tears over Israel's actions were themselves engaged in tearing apart Lebanon or in financing those forces that were doing so. Israel wished then, as it wishes now, to see Lebanon united, independent and sovereign over all its territory, including the south. That unity, independence and sovereignty have been threatened and undermined by the PLO since 1970, and they cannot be restored unless the terrorists are removed from the border region.

110. In our view, the resolution just adopted is inadequate and sorely lacking. In keeping with the time-honoured tradition of the Organization, there is not one word of condemnation of terrorism and the horrible terrorist outrages committed against Israel. There is not one word of condemnation of the terrorist forces that usurped Lebanese authority in Southern Lebanon and brought death, chaos and anarchy to Lebanon: not one word.

111. Truth is violated by falsehood, but it is outraged by silence.

112. The resolution calls for confirming the withdrawal of Israeli forces, but omits to insist on barring the entry to the area of those terrorist elements which have usurped effective Lebanese authority in the area and brought this tragedy on the Lebanese people.

113. Israel understands the spirit of the resolution as indicating a clear link between the withdrawal of our troops and the establishment of an effective deterrent force against future terrorist attacks. Israel has created conditions in which the Government of Lebanon can establish full control and sovereignty over this territory and, in the words of the Lebanese representative on Friday, enable his people to live and to reconstruct.

114. A large segment of the Lebanese population has recognized that this possibility now exists for the first time in years and has consequently given open support to our action. Indeed, the residents of a large number of Southern Lebanese villages have welcomed the expulsion of the terrorists who have been using their towns and villages as bases, and have asked the Israeli Defence Forces for protection against the PLO. The establishment of effective Lebanese authority, prepared and able to protect them from the ravages of the PLO, will be further welcomed by those villagers, as it will by Israel itself.

115. In sum, the Council will do the cause of peace no service unless it ensures that arrangements will be made of such a nature as to guarantee that after the withdrawal of Israeli forces the *status quo ante* will not be restored. Whatever the arrangements agreed upon, they must not produce the kind of political and military vacuum that prevailed before this week and that would constitute an open invitation to the terrorists to return and resume their murderous activities. The anarchy of recent years and the reign of terror inflicted by the PLO on Southern Lebanon is, we trust, over. Whatever arrangements may be negotiated and concluded with Israel and Lebanon, they must prevent renewed strife, vengeance and terrorism once and for all, either against Israel or against any element of the population in Southern Lebanon.

116. To this end, Israel is prepared to begin immediate discussions to achieve appropriate arrangements for the return of the area at present under our control to full Lebanese sovereignty and effective control.

117. In conclusion, we wish no more of Lebanon than that we should return to being as we were for over 20 years, until the advent of the terrorists: peaceful neighbours along a common border, farming side by side and living in harmony. We wish the Lebanese peace and a chance to rebuild their beautiful country after the ravages of an inter-Arab war, free from foreign domination, Arab or otherwise, and free from the ominous shadows of terror and fear. We trust that our action this week will enable the Government of Lebanon to assert effective authority and control in the region and to maintain peace and tranquillity for the benefit of all the inhabitants of Southern Lebanon.

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

119. Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan): Mr. President, I should like to express to you my admiration for the distinction with which you have presided over the difficult debates in the Council this month. I should also like to express my delegation's thanks to the members of the Council for enabling it to participate in this debate on a question in which my country is interested by virtue of its proximity to the region, the affinities and sympathies which we have for the people of Lebanon and the Middle East and, above all, the principles which are at stake.

120. The Council is witness once again to a familiar pattern—a massive assault by Israel's armed forces equipped with modern machines of war on the territory of one of its neighbours. Once again we witness indiscriminate bombardment of civilians in towns and villages and of refugees of previous acts of aggression in their camps. Once again this blatant act of official terror is eulogized as a heroic feat of Israeli arms and the destruction, killing, maiming and uprooting of people and occupation of territory declared necessary to ensure the security of Israel.

121. The truth is, as the representative of Lebanon told us, that his country is the victim of an act of aggression at the hands of a country and neighbour to which it has done no ill. Israel has seized the pretext of an attack on a civilian bus near Tel Aviv to occupy a large area of Southern Lebanon and to unleash terror against the Palestinian refugees and other civilians residing there and is continuing these attacks.

122. The territorial integrity and political independence of all States is one of the most important principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. Its violation cannot be condoned in any circumstances. Article 51 of the Charter was not designed to give licence to any State to violate the territorial integrity of its neighbours. Any other interpretation of these principles is a perversion and would seriously undermine the whole system of security which the United Nations and the Charter are seeking to establish.

123. In the circumstances, the Security Council has done the right thing in calling for an end to the aggression and violence in Lebanon and for the withdrawal of all Israeli forces from all of the territory they have occupied there.

124. The measures just decided on need to be enforced unconditionally and implemented without delay. In the situation which prevails, Lebanon will remain vulnerable to aggression and violence. We support, therefore, the induction of a United Nations force in Southern Lebanon to assist the Government in preventing the recurrence of attacks and protecting the territorial integrity of the country.

125. The overriding objective of the Security Council remains the achievement of a just and lasting settlement of the central issues which have been the cause of the conflict and so much suffering in the Middle East. At the heart of the conflict is the persistent violation by Israel of the basic principles of the Charter and its defiance of the decisions of the United Nations and, specifically, its effort to deny the legitimate rights of the disinherited people of Palestine.

126. The security of Israel does not lie in denying the Palestinian people—who number in the millions—the right to exist as a nation or in the occupation of the territory of its neighbours by force. It does not lie in the assumption that the force of arms will forever give Israel the upper hand over its neighbours. The security of Israel lies in a comprehensive settlement honourably arrived at and acceptable to all the parties. These include the recognized representatives of the Palestinian people, who are with us today at this table.

127. The representative of Israel spoke with much eloquence here of the peace initiative launched by President Sadat's visit to Jerusalem. Four months have gone by since then, and the Israeli Government has done little or nothing in this period to seize the chance for peace but has appeared, instead, to do everything to obstruct and undermine it. The opportunity to reach a just and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict exists today. The Israeli Government must realize that peace and security cannot be obtained by attempts to annihilate the rights and identity of the Palestinian people nor by the occupation or annexation of territory on any pretext whatsoever, nor by reliance on a policy of the mailed fist. In Israel itself the more far-sighted people appear to have come to this realization.

128. The international community must not be distracted by the tragic events that we have witnessed in the last days, and all concerned must make a concerted effort to use all the means at their disposal and effectively bring about a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East.

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

130. Mr. AL-OBAIDLY (Qatar): Once again Lebanon, a sovereign State Member of the United Nations, is being subjected to naked barbaric Israeli military aggression by air, sea and land. By committing such savage and vicious acts, Israel is violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon. In the last few days the whole world has been witnessing a series of air and sea attacks at various Lebanese towns and cities, resulting in the death of hundreds of Lebanese and Palestinian children, women and elderly persons, in addition to an overland invasion by tens of thousands of troops and hundreds of tanks and armoured vehicles in Southern Lebanon and the occupation of more than one fourth of all Lebanese territory.

131. We are all aware that this is not the first time that Lebanon has become the target of Israeli wrath and frustration at the innocent Lebanese and Palestinian peoples. We had not yet had time to forget about the air strikes of 9 November 1977, when American-made Israeli bombers raided peaceful farm villages in Southern Lebanon and killed over 100 of their civilian occupants. A reporter of *The Washington Post* who visited the village of Izzeyeh, one of the villages that were levelled, reported that the destruction of the village had been so complete that he had not been able to count how many houses had been left standing. He also added that the attack on that peaceful village had been so unexpected that the 100 or so innocent

villagers had been buried under the rubble of their destroyed houses.

132. That is but one incident in the long list of Israel's brutal acts of aggression against Lebanon, the Palestinian people, Syria, Jordan and Egypt. The present aggression constitutes a new escalation in a series of aggressive acts continuously being committed by Israel, which fails to pay attention to the sovereignty of the Arab nations and takes no account of the moral or humanitarian rules of law. Israel is ignoring the unanimity of the whole world family, which is asking it to put an end to its irresponsible enmity against the dignity of the world community and which has chosen the Charter of the United Nations as the international instrument for the guidance of nations in the realization of its aim, namely, the establishment of international peace and security.

133. I should like to take this opportunity to impress upon the Security Council, on behalf of the State of Qatar and its Amir, Government and people, the responsibility that falls on the Council for defending the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and stopping the wanton Zionist genocide against the uprooted Palestinian people.

134. The Government of the State of Qatar hereby declares that it is high time that the Security Council—especially the permanent members—shouldered its responsibilities and had the moral courage to enforce the Charter and condemn the brutal and destructive Israeli aggression on Lebanese and Palestinian people.

135. Since Israel tried to distort the truth about the Middle East situation and placed the blame for its invasion of Lebanon on the Palestinian freedom fighters, it is incumbent on the Council to clarify the facts: that Palestinian acts of resistance are the result of the Zionist occupation of the Palestinians' home—Palestine—and the repression, injustice and racism that they are subjected to in their own country by the Israeli occupation forces. Even the Palestinians who are living in Lebanon are not there by their own wish, but because they were uprooted from their homeland to make room for the European minorities who coveted their lands and possessions. Their struggle to liberate their homeland is a just struggle carried out in self-defence and to reclaim their usurped homeland.

136. The increasing and widening international support for the struggle of the Palestinian people is of great significance to all other peoples that are oppressed by colonialism and racism.

137. The United Nations, through various resolutions and actions, has recognized that the essence of the Middle East problem is the dispossession and exile of the Palestinian people from their homeland. Since then, Israel has been following a policy of genocide against the Palestinian nation, and one of Israel's main stated pretexts for the invasion and occupation of Southern Lebanon is the continuous Israeli effort to annihilate the Palestinian people, wherever they are.

138. The State of Qatar condemns strongly and firmly the brutal Israeli aggression on Lebanon and equally condemns

the continuous Israeli attempts to attack the Palestinian revolution, which acts only in self-defence and for the restoration of the Palestinians' usurped homeland. The Government and people of the State of Qatar stand firmly, with all their capabilities, in defence of the people of Lebanon and Palestine—both of them our brothers.

139. We also urge all peace-loving nations to condemn unanimously the Israeli adventure in Lebanon and to take concrete measures and necessary steps to bring about an immediate, unconditional and total withdrawal of the Israeli invasion forces from Southern Lebanon. International public opinion and the imperatives of international peace and justice demand a unanimous and strong condemnation of Israeli barbarous attacks on Lebanon, and immediate and unconditional withdrawal from the southern part of that country.

140. My delegation is confident that the resolution just adopted by the Council will be implemented immediately, without any delay.

141. I should like to close my statement with a plea to all members, especially the permanent members, to take the courageous actions needed to fulfil the international hopes placed in the Council and to cast away indecision which might erode the confidence placed in our international Organization.

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

143. Mr. AL-SAHHAF (Iraq): The Security Council is seized of a barbaric act of aggression designed and deliberately executed by the Zionist entity against the very existence of the Palestinian people.

144. What we are witnessing in Southern Lebanon is a part of the Zionist plan towards the fulfilment of their evil and destructive dreams of expansion at the expense of the Arab nation. Under the pretext of self-defence, the Zionists have been carrying out a massive armed attack by air, land and sea, causing great loss of life and damage to the property of innocent people in the area. Many of the victims were finding shelter in Lebanon after having been driven out of their own land by these same Zionist aggressors.

145. Ironically, the United States, which claims that it is the champion of human rights, is the chief backer and supporter and even instigator of the continuous Zionist acts of aggression. The recent statements by American officials and the wide coverage by the mass media are but clear proof of the hostile attitude towards the Arab nation at large, and the Palestinian in particular.

146. In a futile attempt to evade the subject under discussion, the Zionist representative arrogantly and repeatedly insulted the intelligence of the Security Council by trying to lecture it about terrorism. Let me remind him that his entity was planted in the heart of our land solely through systematic acts of terrorism committed by the Zionist gangs led by notorious terrorists, among them the current Prime Minister, Begin.

147. Members of the United Nations are aware of who blocked the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on International Terrorism, and their rejection of the idea of defining international terrorism and discussing the underlying causes and the concept of State terrorism.

148. To cite but a few examples of the institutionalized terrorism of the Zionist entity, one can recall the tragedy of the Libyan civil airliner which was shot down by Zionist military fighters over the Sinai in 1973, killing over 100 innocent women, men and children, the hijacking of an Iraqi civil airliner flying from Beirut to Baghdad, forcing it to land at a military base, the destruction of Beirut International Airport and the assassinations of Palestinians in European capitals, at the hands of the "Mosad".

149. My country expected that, in accordance with the Charter, the Security Council would be duty bound to discharge its responsibilities by ordering the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the invasion forces. The aggressor should not in any way benefit from its aggression against Lebanon.

150. We should like to reiterate the Iraqi people's and Government's full support for and commitment to the just cause of the Palestinian people and its heroic struggle to regain its land. Time and events have proved that the Palestinian question is the essence of the conflict in the Middle East. There will be no durable solution to the crisis in the region unless the Palestinian people fully achieve their inalienable rights. Therefore, the people and Government of Iraq will do their utmost towards the fulfilment of that aim.

151. Examining the draft resolution submitted by the United States delegation and adopted by the Council, we see that, instead of condemning the Israeli aggressors and asking for their immediate and unconditional withdrawal, the resolution in fact will create a new situation and a new problem in the area by providing for the dispatch of a United Nations force to that area for an unlimited period, thus providing the aggressor with the opportunity to obtain the benefit he was seeking and to impose his terms as a result of his aggression. For those reasons we cannot but disagree with this resolution and its consequences.

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

153. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): This is Palm Sunday, on which is celebrated the victorious entry of Our Lord into Jerusalem. If I feel emotional it is because I come from Jerusalem and I used to participate in the Palm Sunday procession from Bethpage to Jerusalem, chanting *Lauda Jerusalem Dominum*. That is a religious right I can no longer exercise. I am denied that right.

154. Palm Sunday marks the beginning of Passion Week that culminates in the Resurrection and redemption. After more than 30 years of passion and agony, the Palestinian people has every right to look for its redemption and the restoration of its inalienable rights in Palestine, particularly those rights that have been defined and reaffirmed by the

United Nations in a number of resolutions. It is sad that the Council should have addressed itself to a derivative and not to endeavouring to seek a solution dealing with the root and heart of the tragedy in the Middle East—namely, the question of Palestine and the denial of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people.

155. The Council has just considered yet another case of aggression—that constant in the Zionist and Israeli racist and expansionist policy. The Council even does not consider it fit to condemn the invasion of the territory of a Member State and the vindictive and indiscriminate killing of hundreds of innocent civilians and the uprooting of scores of thousands yet another time.

156. The Council listened to a diatribe about anti-Semitism. Who is anti-Semitic? Is it the Council? Is it the United Nations? Or is it the organization that was represented here, an organization that considers assimilation the greatest threat to its being?

157. A lot has been said about terror. But I have only one thing to cite about terror: the sinking by the Zionist movement of a ship, the *Patria*, carrying hundreds of refugees from the Nazi concentration camps was a climax of terror.

158. The PRESIDENT: A number of delegations wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I shall now call upon them.

159. Mr. JAIPAL (India): My delegation voted for the United States draft resolution even though it did not fully meet our requirements and concerns.

160. I understand that the representative of Israel referred to the crossing over of Indian troops into Sikkim in 1975. He was quite wrong, as usual, in regard to his facts. What happened in 1975 was that Sikkim, through an act of self-determination by its people, became an integral part of India. When the British were in India, Sikkim was a protectorate of British India by a treaty arrangement, and later, when India attained its independence from British rule, India continued the treaty arrangement whereby Sikkim became an Indian protectorate. It was because Sikkim was our protectorate that Indian defence forces entered Sikkim in 1948, and not, as Ambassador Herzog said, in 1975. He is only 27 years out of date in this regard. But of course he is much more out of date still if we reckon his antiquated attitude by his pathetic reliance on only the Old Testament, without the slightest awareness that nowadays there is such a thing as the Charter of the United Nations.

161. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): It is a new height in impudence for the representative of Israel to dispute the legitimacy of the Ambassador of Lebanon, my colleague Mr. Tuéni and thus by corollary to question the legality of the State and Government of Lebanon under the presidency of Mr. Elias Sarkis. Even though barbaric forces have massively invaded Lebanon and continue until this moment to revel in a bloodbath killing innocent women and children, Ambassador Herzog has no right to tamper with the credentials of that sovereign State. Such questioning is the right and prerogative of the Secretary-General.

162. Furthermore, Ambassador Herzog has repeated the now worn-out distortion about Jordan and the unity of the East Bank and the West Bank. That unity was actually requested and initiated by West Bank inhabitants after Israeli terrorism had terrorized, devoured and truncated the larger part of the territory of Palestine before the end of the Mandate—territory earmarked by the United Nations for a Palestinian Arab State. This all happened before a single Arab regular soldier had entered the territory of Palestine and they only entered that territory after 15 May to salvage and save the rest of the Palestinians from total massacre.

163. The unity of the East Bank and the West Bank was the unity of one family, of brethren. The Act of Parliament of 1950, which enacted that unity, clearly and categorically stated that the people of both Banks would work hand in hand towards restoring the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and that there was nothing in the Act of Unity that would jeopardize or prejudice the final achievement of that goal of salvation and self-determination for the Palestinians.

164. His Majesty King Hussein has repeated this on more occasions than I can remember. As a matter of fact, the Palestinian inhabitants of the West Bank constituted at least half the cabinet of the Jordan Government, almost half the army, half the civil service, half the governors. They were brethren who ruled themselves and ruled a unified State.

165. At present, as they have done for 11 years of Israeli occupation, Israeli soldiers or sergeants trample on anybody, including those distinguished leaders, with total impunity.

166. Ambassador Herzog referred to the tragic events of 1970. Let me assure the Council that those events were a purely internal family quarrel—which happens in almost every country—and that the division did not take a Palestinian or Jordanian line. There were Palestinians fighting in the regular Jordanian Army and there were Jordanians fighting with the resistance movement. It was a family quarrel concerning the management of the Government and internal security. There is no resemblance whatsoever to the case of a foreign Power occupying and invading the territorial integrity and sovereignty of a neighbouring independent State, that is, the State of Lebanon.

167. Ambassador Herzog referred to the so-called Begin plan of self-rule in the West Bank. What is that Begin plan of self-rule? It is a perpetuation of Israeli occupation of the occupied West Bank. It is so wicked that the only description that I can give of it is “contemptible”. Under the plan, Israel would replace legal occupation—which at least theoretically gives some protection under the Geneva Conventions to the people under occupation—by a *de facto* occupation. It is retrogression rather than one iota of progress. Under the plan, Israel would be responsible not only for external security but also for internal security. Under the plan, it would have the right to continue devouring Palestinian lands, whether or not the Palestinians liked it. To date, no less than one third of the West Bank has already been colonized, sequestered from its lawful

inhabitants. What lands are left for the West Bank Palestinians to live in, let alone the 2 million refugees who are living in the wilderness of nowhere?

168. Arab Jerusalem is a small and truncated part of what in 1948 was Arab Jerusalem that included two thirds of new Jerusalem, which Israel has usurped and claimed for itself and has already expanded fifteenfold.

169. I could go on and on speaking about this contemptible Begin plan which he is proposing as a substitute for United Nations decisions, particularly Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and General Assembly resolution 181 (II) concerning the refugees. In fact, the whole purpose of the plan is to perpetuate the Israeli occupation and to replace the illegality of occupation by a facade of “legal” occupation.

170. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): This is not exactly a reply, because I am not interested in polemics. I think this has been a very, very important day in our history—the history of my country and that of this institution to which we are committed and which we very highly respect. Therefore my remarks will be very brief and I am concerned that they should be positive as the spirit of this day has been.

171. First, I address my thanks to the President for the superb and very human manner in which he has conducted the debates. I also want to thank each and all the members who have addressed themselves to the fate of my country, but I cannot name them all. I would, however, want to address myself in particular to the delegation of the United States as sponsor of the resolution just adopted and to express my special thanks for and take note of the spirit and the reservations expressed by Ambassador Young concerning the possible interpretations that have been the subject of some commentary here.

172. Then I should like to address myself to the representative of the USSR. I want to thank him and to say that I do so particularly for his concern for the exercise of the sovereign rights of my Government—which I take very seriously indeed. And I take note, as the Council has, that that concern is indeed almost to the letter what had been expressed by the representative of the United States.

173. As for the very distinguished representative of Israel, I do not have his eloquence, I am not a diplomat, I am not a man of laws; I am only a working journalist, and I do not have his means of communication whereby I can obtain in a matter of hours 24,000 signatures from a town very dear to my heart and person which numbers only 20,000 inhabitants.

174. I read newspapers and I am sure that the representatives here read newspapers. I have nothing to add to the file and, as I said, I am not interested in polemics, but I am sure that pictures reproduced this morning in *The New York Times*, which can hardly be accused of being an instrument of Arab propaganda, are very eloquent. There is a picture of a Lebanese woman and her daughter running for cover during an Israeli air strike in the town of Nabatiye yesterday. It is a picture taken by an American photographer of the Associated Press. There is another picture,

however, one of Israeli soldiers dancing in the destroyed village of Merj'Uyun, a village where I happen to have relatives and friends.

175. I do not want to put the Council's patience to any more trial. I do want to say, in conclusion, that I think this august body has taken very seriously the commitments of the Israeli representative; I hope they have. I would have wanted the President to address a direct question to the Israeli representative: whether he understands "immediate withdrawal" in the only sense it can bear in English, that is, immediate cessation of hostilities, immediate withdrawal operations and immediate liberation from destruction.

176. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Lebanon for the kind words he addressed to me personally. As to his invitation to me to put specific questions to the Israeli delegation, it would seem to me to be somewhat inappropriate for me to do so at this stage. I do not think that that is a function of the presidency at this moment.

177. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): I withdraw my request, Mr. President.

178. The PRESIDENT: I am very grateful for the co-operation extended to me as President during the course of the consultations leading up to this morning's debate, and indeed during the course of the debate itself. It certainly made the work of the Council easier.

179. I should like to inform members of the Council that it is my intention to hold consultations this afternoon at 4 o'clock to consider the report of the Secretary-General and decide precisely when and how we can proceed with the next stage. I should say it is also my hope and intention that, if at all possible, the Council should meet later on today in open session and should proceed to pass the second-stage resolution as it is necessary for us to do in view of the terms of the first.

The meeting rose at 2 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 إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. 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.
