

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SIXTH YEAR

2293rd MEETING: 21 JULY 1981

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2293)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 17 July 1981 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14596)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2293rd MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 21 July 1981, at 7 p.m.

President: Mr. Idé OUMAROU (Niger).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2293)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 17 July 1981 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14596)

The meeting was called to order at 7.50 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 17 July 1981 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14596)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with decisions adopted at the 2292nd meeting of the Council, I invite the representatives of Lebanon, Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take places at the Council table; I invite the representative of Jordan to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tueni (Lebanon), Mr. Blum (Israel) and Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took places at the Council table; Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Mauritania, Saudi Arabia, the Syria Arab Republic and Yemen, in which they ask to be invited to participate in the discussion of the

item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Elaraby (Egypt), Mr. Hamody (Mauritania), Mr. Allagany (Saudi Arabia), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Alaini (Yemen) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Members of the Council have before them the following documents on this item which have been distributed since our last meeting: three letters dated 19 and 20 July 1981 from the representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council [S/14600, S/14602 and S/14603]. Members of the Council also have before them the text of a draft resolution sponsored by Ireland, Japan and Spain [S/14604].

4. I call first on the Secretary-General.

5. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: It may be helpful if I make a brief statement summarizing developments since the Council met last Friday [2292nd meeting].

6. Following the appeal made by the President of the Security Council at that meeting, I instructed the Commander of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), General Callaghan, and the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine, General Erskine, to exert every possible effort to achieve a cessation of hostilities in Lebanon.

7. On 19 July, General Erskine met with the Israeli Deputy Defence Minister, Mr. Zipori, in Jerusalem. The next day, General Callaghan held a meeting with Mr. Arafat in Beirut. During that meeting, General Callaghan proposed a *de facto* cease-fire to take effect at 5 a.m. (local time) on 21 July. Early on 21 July, Mr. Arafat informed General Callaghan that the PLO would accept the cease-fire, provided the other side also accepted it. As members of the Council are aware, efforts are continuing to secure a similar commitment from the Israeli authorities.

8. As regards today's situation on the ground, I have been informed by UNIFIL that, after a lull between 5 a.m. and 10 a.m. (local time), shelling resumed in the area.

9. Between 10.20 a.m. and 4.45 p.m., Israeli Defence Forces and the *de facto* forces fired about 210 artillery rounds into the Tyre pocket and north of the Litani. The PLO fired 49 artillery rounds and 5 rockets at the Nahariya and Marjayoun areas.

10. Between 5.20 p.m. and 6.10 p.m., the Israeli forces carried out six air strikes in the Rashidiye area and north of the Litani. Between 6 p.m. and 7.30 p.m., the PLO fired 41 rounds of artillery and mortar and 27 rockets, some of which impacted in the Nahariya area.

11. The exchange of fire resumed after 8 p.m. today. Since then the PLO has fired 181 rounds of artillery and mortar and 116 rockets at targets in the enclave and in northern Israel. The Israeli forces and the *de facto* forces have fired 296 artillery rounds at targets in the Tyre pocket and north of the Litani. Firing is reportedly continuing at this time.

12. Needless to say, General Callaghan and General Erskine will continue their efforts to secure a lasting cessation of hostilities.

13. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I thank the Secretary-General for the information he has made available to the Council.

14. The representative of Spain has asked to be allowed to speak to introduce the draft resolution, sponsored by Ireland, Japan and Spain, which is contained in document S/14604.

15. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The steps we have been taking in these last few days have enabled us to become acquainted with the grave situation which once again exists in the Middle East, especially in Lebanon.

16. We have taken note of the important statement just made by the Secretary-General, and the information it contains reveals that a cessation of hostilities has not yet taken effect.

17. What has prompted the delegations of Ireland, Japan and Spain to introduce this draft resolution is the desire to speed up action and achieve an immediate cessation of hostilities. The draft resolution, which I shall read out very shortly, does not in any way attempt to interfere with the efforts we know are being made by other delegations on a wider scale, efforts for which we wish to express our sincere gratitude. However, we think that a thorough analysis of the situation—whose usefulness in principle we do not doubt—could in this case considerably delay the Council's taking decisions.

18. For that reason, and bearing in mind that last Friday, 17 July, the President and the other members of the Security Council made an appeal [S/14599] which has not yet been heeded, the sponsors of the draft resolution feel that it is necessary to adopt it, to recall that appeal and to call for an immediate cessation of all armed attacks. In the course of negotiations we have accepted important suggestions from the non-aligned countries members of this Council and observations made by other members of the Council. It is obvious that there will be some who feel that some elements are lacking in the draft resolution, but the sponsors are of the view that what has priority is the urgent cessation of the hostilities. The Council would be assuming a grave responsibility should it give these hostilities a chance to continue while the situation is thoroughly reviewed.

19. On behalf of the delegations of Ireland and Japan and my own, I have the honour to submit the following draft resolution:

"The Security Council,

"Reaffirming the urgent appeal made by the President and the members of the Security Council on 17 July 1981 [ibid.], which reads as follows:

"The President of the Security Council and the members of the Council, after hearing the report of the Secretary-General, express their deep concern at the extent of the loss of life and the scale of the destruction caused by the deplorable events that have been taking place for several days in Lebanon.

"They launch an urgent appeal for an immediate end to all armed attacks and for the greatest restraint so that peace and quiet may be established in Lebanon and a just and lasting peace in the Middle East as a whole."

"Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General [see 2292nd meeting] in this respect,

"1. Calls for an immediate cessation of all armed attacks;

"2. Reaffirms its commitment to the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;

"3. Requests the Secretary-General to report back to the Security Council on the implementation of the present resolution as soon as possible and not later than forty-eight hours from its adoption."

20. On behalf of the three delegations to which I have referred, I wish to say that we trust that this draft resolution will be adopted forthwith and without any discussion. I formally request, therefore, that the draft resolution be put to the vote as soon as possible.

21. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): If no member of the Council wishes to speak at this stage, I shall consider that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution.

A vote was taken by a show of hands.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously (resolution 490 (1981)).

22. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those Council members who have asked to be allowed to speak after the vote.

23. Mr. CHEBAANE (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): In coming before the Security Council today, Lebanon is bringing to its attention information of a particularly grave character. Indeed, we are engaged in debate in this organ, which bears primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, precisely because of the capital importance of this discussion, for what is involved at one and the same time and in an inseparable manner is the maintenance of peace and security in the region, respect for the Charter of the United Nations and for the most elementary norms of law and international morality, and, above all, the fate of two peoples—Lebanese and Palestinian—who have already suffered too much and undergone too many afflictions, and who for many days now have been subjected to veritable genocide.

24. Only a few weeks ago we unanimously adopted resolution 487 (1981), which condemned Israel for its act of aggression against Iraq, and scarcely three days ago the Council launched a pressing appeal [S/14599] for Israel to put an end to its savage armed attacks against Lebanon. Once again we ventured to hope against hope that the Israeli Government would come to its senses and put an end to its blind fury against populations which have neither the capability nor adequate or equal means to defend themselves.

25. Unfortunately, the Council has become all too familiar with this alternation of debates and acts of aggression against Lebanon and the Palestinian people and, from time to time, against other Arab countries of the region. We said as much during the debate on the complaint by Iraq against Israel, concluding that the situation was replete with lessons for anyone who would heed them.

26. The escalation of aggression against Lebanon reveals once again that the departure from a policy of defiance and *faits accomplis* is but an illusion for the international community and that Israel certainly has not drawn the conclusions widely endorsed by the United Nations.

27. It also reveals the same strategy of expansionism, destabilization and the destruction of civilian property, and the same will to exterminate an entire race—the

Palestinian people—with the same probability of its spreading in future to other countries of the region. If the scruples of law can play no part in preventing such violations, what other means must be used to dissuade Israel or at least to make it respect human life?

28. Obviously, this tragedy is beyond Lebanon's ability to cope with alone. That is the reason for this emergency meeting of the Security Council.

29. If it is true that blame must be assessed on the basis of the facts, the Council is abundantly served, having been regularly seized of the numerous acts of aggression and violations which have been committed over a long period and far too often by Israel. Besides, the very detailed and most eloquent reports submitted by the Secretary-General last Friday [see 2292nd meeting] and again today, as well as the well-documented statements of the representatives of Lebanon and the PLO [*ibid.*], have clearly established the responsibility of the culprit and have shown that the pursuit of its criminal acts is part of the same "logic"—that of imposing the law of the jungle and of subjecting neighbouring countries and peoples to its own aims.

30. In such a context, the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples in particular, and all Arab countries and the nations that love peace and justice, attach vital importance to the action of the Council. We do not think it sufficient just to be heard or frequently to voice theoretical support; the Lebanese and the Palestinians need very specifically to be able to ensure the security of their women and children, of their young and their elderly, who are being massacred by the hundreds these days; they need to be able to ensure peace at their borders and to have their rights and dignity respected, because every passing day teaches them that the proximity of a régime haunted by the folly of its dreams of grandeur and military supremacy hardly means peace.

31. Merely repeating injunctions of principle will therefore not be sufficient, for they will hardly compensate for the enormous loss in human lives and the destruction inflicted on Lebanon and on the Palestinians or guarantee the cessation of such aggression in the future. Ordering Israel to put an end to its attacks will not be sufficient to guarantee the implementation of those injunctions or to guard Lebanon from further invasions. Recalling our past resolutions will not be sufficient guarantee that conditions will prevail for the peaceful development, in conditions of security, of the neighbouring countries as a whole, and specifically of Lebanon, which continues to be apprehensive about the prolongation of a long-drawn-out tragedy.

32. It is the duty of the Council to take effective and determined action in the face of the constant defiance and the uncontrollable excesses of the Israeli Government. Any State that is responsible in law must be

confronted with its international obligations; we are witnessing the ceaseless violation of international law and the repeated infringement of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon, which is used, moreover, as a base for aggression against Palestinian refugee camps. In all this the Government of Tel Aviv apparently feels that it is assured of an immunity which is a source of concern to us. From where does it get such assurance? And why are we trying desperately to spare it the full implementation of the measures provided for in the Charter?

33. We feel that this new series of armed attacks against Lebanon, because of their scope and the abundance of military means employed, hardly leaves any hope that Israel will abide by any measure decided upon by the Security Council unless that measure is accompanied by a combination of sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

34. It is no accident that the escalation of acts of aggression and the veritable massacre that has been inflicted upon the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples for so many days have come at a time when peace missions have succeeded in opening up prospects for détente. That escalation therefore reveals a wider strategy and more far-reaching designs.

35. The theory of the security of Israel and of pre-emptive measures will not deceive anyone. Furthermore, by increasing its long-term incursions into Lebanese territory, by isolating whole parts of that territory, by destroying a whole economic infrastructure that is vital for the survival of the population and by sowing death and desolation among innocent civilians, Israel is engaged in dividing and destabilizing Lebanon.

36. In the hope of achieving the beginning of a settlement that will ensure the peace and security of the peoples of the region, we express the wish that the Council may respond unanimously to Lebanon's appeal that it liberate its territory from all aggression and take effective measures to that effect as authorized fully by the Charter.

37. Tunisia could not fail to express to Lebanon and to the PLO its active solidarity and its unfailing support in the long trials inflicted upon them. In calm resistance, may they feel confident of the inevitable victory of justice and law.

38. Before I conclude, and even though we have very serious doubts about the will of the Israeli Government to put an immediate and final end to its aggression, I should like nonetheless to express the hope that the urgent decision which the Security Council has just taken will be complied with without delay. The PLO has already accepted the cease-fire, even though the Palestinians are the victims of the aggression. In our view this measure is necessary because of the considerable number of civilian victims and the

scope of the destruction caused by the armed Israeli attacks. Indeed, the most important thing at this moment is to save human lives, to save Lebanon from destruction and to re-establish peace and security in that country.

39. Mr. LOUET (France) (*interpretation from French*): I should first like to thank the Secretary-General for the clarity and the quality of his most useful report.

40. For several days now Lebanon has once again been the target of armed intervention and bombings whose especially deadly effects are thus added to the sufferings of an already sorely tried people. These raids have taken a heavy toll, assessed at several hundred dead and wounded in Beirut, as well as in the south of the country, in Nabatiyeh, Tyre and Sidon, heavily populated areas. We must also add to this the destruction of buildings and infrastructure. Whereas the international community as a whole should be mobilizing to assist the Lebanese Government to continue its remarkable efforts to re-establish its administration and its authority throughout its territory, bridges and roads linking the south of the country to the capital are thus being systematically destroyed. This deliberate destruction jeopardizes the action of UNIFIL, which is under a mandate from the Security Council.

41. For all those reasons, it was most urgent for the Council unambiguously to speak out in favour of an immediate cease-fire which would be respected by all parties concerned and would put an end to the escalation of violence. That is why the French delegation voted in favour of the resolution that has just been adopted.

42. We cannot imagine that such an appeal will remain unheeded. Indeed, how can one fail to be deeply concerned by the unprecedented nature of the massive attacks perpetrated against Lebanon, a sovereign State which provides refuge to people that are victims of war?

43. France also intends most vigorously to condemn any resort to so-called pre-emptive actions that can certainly not be justified by any interpretation of Article 51 of the Charter. Such actions bring about counter-actions, and thus result in a further cycle of violence with equally deplorable casualties on each side.

44. Once again we must recall that it is not force which will lead to an equitable settlement of the Middle Eastern conflict in which Lebanon has been caught up in spite of itself. It is not by force that one will succeed in guaranteeing the right of Israel to live safely within secure and recognized frontiers, the right of the Palestinian people to have a homeland and the right of Lebanon to live in peace.

45. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): First, I should like to thank the Secretary-General for

the lucid, albeit depressing, report which he has just given us.

46. Serious damage has been done to the already fragile prospects for peace in the region by the increasing use of force in recent weeks. The facts do not appear to be in question. The Israeli air force broke a longish period of relative tranquillity with air attacks on southern Lebanon on 10 July. These attacks continued over the next few days. On 15 July, large-scale retaliation by the PLO began. The casualties mounted. On 17 July, Israel launched a massive air attack on urban Beirut, causing heavy civilian casualties and damage to property. As the Secretary-General informed us this evening, hostilities have continued up to this evening.

47. My Government deplores resort to armed action. We have frequently criticized PLO violence. But the scale of recent Israeli actions and the resulting deaths, particularly the civilian casualties, can in no way be justified.

48. I was particularly struck by something which the representative of Lebanon said in his statement at the beginning of this debate on 17 July. Mr. Saghyyah said:

"What everybody in this hall takes for granted—the right to live in peace and security—appears to be a luxury in Lebanon." [*Ibid.*, para. 35.]

It must be the objective of all of us in the Council to make what contribution we can to bring about a situation in which no Lebanese will have to utter so grim a phrase, a situation in which the people of Lebanon can again enjoy that peace and security which is the inherent right of all of us.

49. The tragedy of Lebanon is of course part of the tragedy of the Middle East problem, which has defied solution over many decades. Over the years the conflicts has developed its own vocabulary, full of phrases which have taken on special meanings. We hear much of "pre-emptive strikes", of "cycles of violence", of "retaliatory action". We must not be lulled into a sense of familiarity and routine by these euphemisms. What do these phrases mean in practice? They mean the destruction of property, the displacement of people; they mean wounding and death. In this particular instance, the casualties in the Israeli air attacks on Beirut have exceeded the thousand mark. We have all seen the press photographs of civilians running for cover, of residential buildings destroyed, of children being carried to hospital and of sad ceremonies at gravesides. Who can fail to be profoundly distressed by those horrors?

50. Surely no one can claim that the policy of "pre-emptive strikes", with its horrible trail of human destruction, can conceivably advance the cause of peace, either in Lebanon or in the region as a whole.

All that it can and does do is to lead to "retaliatory acts", which mean more death and more destruction. That is the so-called cycle of violence; it can be broken only if restraint is exercised on all sides and if the temptation to retaliate is resisted. Otherwise, the sole result will be a prolongation of human suffering and the evaporation of hopes of a just peace and the achievement of legitimate rights for all peoples in the area.

51. Then, again, the Middle East problem has become beset by stereotypes which can do nothing to advance the possibility of progress towards a just and lasting peace. We hear of "the terrorist PLO"; we hear of the "Zionist entity". These are amongst the milder characterizations. But what is the reality? Here, I should like to quote from the Venice Declaration of the then nine members of the European Community, the Declaration made by the European Council on 13 June 1980:

"the time has come to promote the recognition and implementation of the two principles universally accepted by the international community: the right to existence and to security of all the States in the region, including Israel, and justice for all the peoples, which implies the recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people." [*S/14009*, para. 4.]

This is surely the heart of the matter, as the Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary of my country has so frequently stated on subsequent occasions. For example, Lord Carrington said earlier this month in an interview:

"The Arabs have got to recognize the State of Israel and give it security within its boundaries. On the other hand, Israel must recognize the rights of the Palestinian. I simply do not believe that a long-term settlement in the Middle East is possible until both sides recognize that."

Lord Carrington also made clear in the House of Lords, on 25 June, that:

"while it is not the sole cause, the continuing failure to resolve the Arab-Israeli dispute, an important element in which is the need for Palestinian self-determination, is indeed at the centre of continuing instability in the Middle East."

52. Which is more likely to bring about peace and a secure life for all the peoples of the region: the putting into effect of the principles of the Venice Declaration or the continuation of "pre-emption" and "retaliation" and exchanges of verbal insults? Surely, there can be only one answer.

53. Recent events have severely underlined the urgent need for progress towards a just and lasting peace settlement in the Middle East. Channels are open for the parties to take steps towards a peaceful

solution of their differences. My Government most earnestly urges them to take the path of peaceful negotiations, to renounce violence, and thus to give the peoples of the region the chance which they so desperately need to live their lives in security and tranquillity.

54. Meanwhile, the resolution that we have just adopted is what is needed in present circumstances, and my delegation is encouraged that it was adopted unanimously. My Government hopes that those concerned will heed the call for a cease-fire so that the people of Lebanon and all who have suffered and are suffering may have relief from this latest and most grave series of attacks.

55. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Council will now hear statements by speakers whose names are inscribed on my list in the context of the debate devoted to this item.

56. Before we open that debate, the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization has asked to be allowed to speak and I call on him.

57. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): I wish to thank the Secretary-General for the concise and clear report he gave the Council on the response to the urgent appeal made by you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Security Council on 17 July 1981 [S/114599].

58. At 1845 hours New York time today, I was instructed by Chairman Arafat to inform you, Mr. President, that in defiance of and contempt for the Council's appeal, about 50 Israeli armoured vehicles, including tanks, have been attempting to cross the Khardala bridge, since 2300 hours Beirut time—which is 5 p.m. here. Elements of the joint forces—Palestinians and the Lebanese National Movement—are resisting that advance; they have knocked out one tank, and the fighting continues.

59. Furthermore, since 2235 hours Beirut time, Israeli artillery has been shelling the Zahrani area. A new attempt was made by Israeli troops to land in the vicinity. In this case, the joint forces are still engaged in resisting and repelling this invasion of Israeli forces. One Israeli corporal has been captured and is being held as a prisoner of war by the joint forces.

60. The PLO expresses the sincere hope that the Security Council will take immediate action to put an end to the invasion by Israeli forces and order the immediate and complete withdrawal from Lebanese territory, and that it will also order Israel to terminate its genocidal campaign against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples.

61. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The first speaker in the context of the present item is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

62. Mr. ELARABY (Egypt): At the outset, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. It is reassuring to see a distinguished and highly respected diplomat from our African continent guiding the deliberations of the Council during this important debate. I take this opportunity also to express my delegation's appreciation to your predecessor, Mr. Muñoz Ledo of Mexico.

63. Once again the Council is urgently called upon to assume its Charter responsibilities with respect to the repeated Israeli attacks against civilian targets in Lebanon. The magnitude and the indiscriminate nature of the recent Israeli raids have been universally condemned. In point of fact, well before the convening of this Council, Governments all over the globe as well as world public opinion had already pronounced their verdict.

64. It is now up to the Council to determine if peace and security are to be maintained in our contemporary world. States, big and small, advanced and developing, aligned and non-aligned, are entitled to know whether a Member State of the United Nations can take the law in its own hands and strike at will and with impunity. The lessons to be drawn from the Council's reaction to the tragedy that is being arrogantly perpetrated in Lebanon will no doubt affect every single country.

65. It is the considered opinion of my Government that the continuation of the Israeli military attacks on civilian targets in Lebanon should be promptly and effectively terminated. In Egypt, utter dismay and indignation characterized the reaction of the people and the Government. An official statement was issued on 17 July to reflect Egypt's grave concern at the deplorable developments in Lebanon. The statement of the Egyptian Government condemned the flagrant Israeli aggression against the Lebanese people. The Government of Egypt has, moreover, consistently urged the termination of all attempts to dominate Lebanon and reiterated its call for a "hands off" policy in Lebanon. Furthermore, the Egyptian statement urged that an immediate halt be called to the tragic ordeal of Lebanon by putting an end to all forms of intervention and interference in Lebanese internal affairs.

66. This is not the first time that my delegation has addressed the Security Council on this very subject. Nor is it the first time that my delegation has expressed its views on Israel's allegations that it was acting in self-defence. Israel's attempt to justify its actions in Lebanon by invoking the inherent right to self-defence has been previously advanced and categorically rejected. My delegation has already stated on more than one occasion that the right to self-defence must not be abused. The scope of self-defence in international law and in conformity with Article 51 of the Charter could never be twisted and distorted to provide any country with a free hand to kill innocent civilians at will.

67. It should by now be obvious that the international community could not subscribe to flimsy argumentation copied from nineteenth century pre-Charter concepts. Yet a further brief examination of the deliberate attempts to stretch the right to self-defence might still be in order. The purpose would be to expose the fallacies of such attempts to render the self-defence right meaningless.

68. The underlying premise is that the mantle of legitimacy cannot be conferred on military action unless certain conditions are fulfilled. The fundamental conditions are spelled out in the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter, which clearly would not be solemnly invoked until an armed attack had occurred. The examination of available facts would confirm that the Israeli authorities announced that border incidents had occurred. It is a matter of record that the representative of Israel has recently addressed to the Security Council a number of communications drawing its attention to certain border incidents. Such incidents are usually handled by the appropriate United Nations peace-keeping machinery in the area. Last Friday [2292nd meeting], and in a letter dated 20 July [S/14603] to you, Mr. President, the representative of Israel advanced some allegations; but that was, of course, *post mortem*. The action had already taken place. All these incidents should have been promptly referred to either UNTSO, which serves the General Armistice Agreement machinery between Lebanon and Israel,² or to UNIFIL, as appropriate. In my delegation's view, such incidents cannot justify the massive and intensive Israeli reaction. Thus, the provisions of Article 51 could not be convincingly applicable.

69. Israel has also consistently promulgated its right to unleash pre-emptive or anticipatory attacks and its right to retaliate and conduct reprisals. In a pre-Charter era, the rules were generally interpreted as sanctioning the right of States in certain conditions to undertake military actions in circumstances that were beyond the scope of the modern definition of the doctrine of self-defence. However, well before the Charter of the United Nations, the international community had established defined rules to regulate the use of force in international relations. The licence to attack at will and without limitations disappeared decisively with the advent of this century. The point to be emphasized is that, even in a less orderly and less civilized society, States were under a customary legal obligation to observe certain limitations. The most salient of these limitations was articulated by the United States Secretary of State Webster and has been widely quoted in the Security Council. It requires that the situations that give rise to acts of self-defence, in the words of Secretary Webster, be "instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation".

70. It is relevant also to note that, as far back as the period of the League of Nations, a report on the subject

of Article 16 of the League's Covenant, which more or less corresponds to Chapter VII of the Charter, offered the following authoritative statement on self-defence:

"Legitimate defence implies the adoption of measures proportionate to the seriousness of the attack and justified by the seriousness of the danger."

71. Again, it is self-evident that when a reaction fails to be proportionate it must be illegal. The response to minor border incidents, which should be referred to the proper mechanism for investigation, is usually, anywhere in the world, a protest or a complaint lodged with the Security Council, not a full-scale armed attack launched on innocent civilians.

72. I turn now to the question of retaliation or reprisal. The point of departure should be an established historical fact, namely, that, having accepted the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, contained in paragraph 1 of the annex to General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), Israel committed itself to respecting the provisions of that Declaration, which calls upon all States "to refrain from acts of reprisal involving the use of force." Even before the unanimous adoption of that Declaration by the Assembly, the Security Council had already established the law of the Charter with respect to reprisals when it adopted resolution 228 (1966), following an Israeli military attack on Jordan. In paragraph 3 of that resolution, the Council censured Israel for its large-scale military action and emphasized:

"that actions of military reprisal cannot be tolerated and that, if they are repeated, the Security Council will have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against the repetition of such acts".

73. In summation, Israel's futile and unconvincing attempts to give an impression that the general principles of international law and the provisions of the Charter can be stretched and blown out of proportion to accommodate military attacks on civilians are without any foundation and, very bluntly, are void of substance.

74. Such newly-developed Israeli claims and practices, tailored to apply solely to Israel, would undermine the very foundations of the United Nations. The repercussions would transcend the boundaries of our region. In short, what is at stake is not only the credibility of this Council or the credibility of its 15 members. What is at stake is clearly the possible collapse of the contemporary international legal order. The consequence could well be retrogression to the law of the jungle, in which the use of force was the order of the day.

75. The most accurate expression of the worldwide indignation at Israel's recent actions in Lebanon

and of the ominous expectations of what might flow from them appeared in an article published on 20 July in *The Christian Science Monitor*. The title of the article was "No limits on Israel", and it reflects the dilemma the Council will face if it fails to shoulder its responsibilities. The article was prefaced by these words:

"It can only sadden the world that Israel has chosen to escalate the cycle of violence and counter-violence in the Middle East by bombing a densely populated area of Beirut. The Israeli action is deplorable. It is also deeply tragic, not only because it resulted in such a high loss of life but because it shows again the profoundly mistaken judgement of Israel that the road to its security lies through the gun. More and more, Israel conveys the attitude that it has the right and might to do precisely what it wants regardless of the consequences. Few think that such an attitude will ever bring peace."

76. The Security Council has passed several resolutions and yet Israel has continued to escalate its armed incursions against Lebanon, and Israel has also consistently chosen to ignore the provisions of binding conventions. The Geneva Conventions of 1949, to which Israel is a party, prohibit, in no unclear terms, military attacks on civilian targets. The Additional Protocol II of 1977 stipulates, in article 13, paragraph 2, that: "The civilian population as such, as well as individual civilians, shall not be the object of attack".³ The civilian population in Lebanon has sustained heavy human and material losses, which have added further to the tragedies and agonies of Lebanon and of the Palestinian people. It was announced yesterday in Cairo that the Government of Egypt had promptly offered assistance to the innocent and hapless victims of the latest tidal wave of attacks on civilians in Lebanon. It was also announced that Egypt pledged to provide all the necessary aid and assistance to the victimized Lebanese and Palestinian civilians. That position stems from our determination to spare no effort in alleviating the plight of the Palestinian people and our determination to contribute positively towards achieving the exercise of their rights.

77. What is urgently required now is to avoid any further deterioration of an already explosive situation and to ensure a definite termination of the vicious cycle of violence that has plagued our region. We call on all parties to put an end to violence and bloodshed. We call for a total and final cessation of all military attacks on Lebanese soil. The resolution just unanimously adopted by the Council should be fully and faithfully respected by all. It should be followed by a strong rejection of the policy of the use of force at will. It is the collective responsibility of the Security Council to adopt adequate measures and to enforce its decision. In this regard, further measures should be considered by the Council to consolidate, reinforce and widen the peace-keeping functions of UNIFIL, in order to ensure full respect for Lebanese sovereignty.

78. Peace in the Middle East cannot be achieved without the realization of certain basic conditions, the first and foremost of which no doubt is Palestinian rights. Historically and logically, the question of Palestine was and remains the core of the whole conflict.

79. It is in vain that we focus on the effects or the symptoms and overlook the original underlying causes. The time is long overdue for the international community to join in our efforts in an intensive all-out initiative to consolidate the structure which Egypt is sincerely striving to build in order to help to achieve a just, lasting and comprehensive peaceful settlement in the Middle East—a settlement that would fulfil the rights of all peoples and all States to sovereignty and security and, particularly, the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and independence. This is the real cause which we have to espouse and dedicate ourselves to win.

80. Peace in the Middle East cannot be achieved without mutual recognition being exchanged between Israel and the Palestinian people. This is something which Egypt has been advocating for a number of years. Reciprocity and the simultaneous and mutual recognition of the corresponding rights of both peoples are the essential elements for a just and comprehensive settlement. Therefore, Egypt renews its appeal and urges all parties to join hands in the attainment of a just and permanent peace in the area that would safeguard legitimate Palestinian rights and eliminate all causes of tension and turmoil.

81. In conclusion, the new edifice of peace—indeed an historic achievement—which Egypt is faithfully striving to construct in the Middle East is being undermined with the continuation of such practices of violence and bloodshed. Having concluded peace with Egypt, Israel is called upon to renounce its reckless policies and its aggressive practices. Such policies and practices are in clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as being inconsistent with the new era of peace which Egypt sincerely hopes will prevail in the region.

82. As President Sadat declared in 1977 in Jerusalem:

"Peace is not a game of calling for peace to defend certain whims or hide certain ambitions. Peace in its essence is a dire struggle against all and every ambition and whim."

83. Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic): Only a few weeks ago, after a lengthy debate, the Security Council strongly condemned Israel because of its military act of aggression against the Republic of Iraq, which represented a clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations. Although the Council in its resolution 487 (1981) expressed, not for the first time, its deep concern about the danger to international peace and security created by Israel's

policy of aggression and called upon Tel Aviv to refrain in the future from any such acts, the aggressor has again challenged the Council and the international community by its recent brutal attacks on Lebanon.

84. Israel has carried out evidently long prepared, massive military attacks against the territory of Lebanon and bombed refugee camps, communications and Lebanese villages and cities, including the capital, Beirut. The urgent appeal of the President and the other members of the Security Council made on 17 July [S/14599] is being unscrupulously ignored. The Israeli acts of terror continue, as we have just learned from the representative of the PLO.

85. Lebanese people no less than Palestinian refugees are among the numerous victims of these terrorist attacks. In view of the hundreds of victims among Lebanese civilians, it is the height of cynicism for Israel's representative to claim in the Security Council to have no fight with Lebanon and to be striving for peace. The fact is that Lebanon is confronted with a dangerous escalation of force and aggression by Israel, an escalation which, meanwhile, is assuming the proportions of full-fledged acts of war. The representatives of Lebanon, Jordan and the PLO have given convincing proof of this.

86. By its terror raids against the Lebanese population and the Palestinian refugees, Israel seeks to destroy their homes and to liquidate their families. The Israeli aggressors, who drove the Palestinians away from their homeland more than three decades ago, today claim that they feel threatened by the very existence of those Palestinians in Lebanon. With that allegation, Israel's ruling circles attempt to justify their policy. By terror and destruction, the resistance of the Palestinian people against Israel's policy of aggression and expansion is to be broken.

87. The massacre of hundreds of defenceless men, women and children is closely linked with the destruction of vital communications with the aim of paralysing the country and destroying the territorial integrity of Lebanon. At the same time, it is a further attempt to bring about the division of Lebanon with the help of the Haddad bands, Israel's accomplices.

88. United Nations facilities and the lives of the United Nations troops deployed to safeguard peace in the south of Lebanon are placed in extreme danger by Israel's military raids. The destruction of important bridges and communications in southern Lebanon is substantially directed against UNIFIL and jeopardizes its capacity to act.

89. Israel's recent acts of aggression are happening at a time when the aggressor evidently believes itself able to use for its own objectives the deterioration of the international situation caused by imperialist Powers. Like the attack on the Iraqi nuclear research centre near Baghdad a few weeks ago, Israel's raids

against the territory of Lebanon are carried out by means of highly sophisticated weapons which the aggressor receives from the United States of America. Thus Israel is further encouraged to continue its terror raids. Once again the United States is publicly exposed because of its political and moral responsibility for Israel's policy of aggression. The demands for the immediate cessation of military support for Israel are intensifying all over the world.

90. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic again strongly opposes any attempt to bring the national liberation movements into discredit by branding them as terrorist. Under the cloak of anti-communism, some seek to disguise the terrorism of dictators against their own people and against other peoples. The behaviour of the originators of such a policy clearly shows that they are in no way affected by the misery of the Palestinians driven from their homeland or by the suffering of the Lebanese people.

91. The people of the German Democratic Republic are bound in solidarity to the people of Lebanon and support the just struggle waged by the Palestinian people under the leadership of its legitimate representative, the PLO, for the implementation of its inalienable rights.

92. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic strongly condemns Tel Aviv's recent acts of war against Lebanon, which not only represent a threat to international peace and security but an actual breach of it, as well as a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and relevant resolutions of the Security Council. The policy of escalation of Israeli aggression against Arab countries can only be regarded as a link in the chain of Israel's policy against a comprehensive and just solution of the Middle East conflict. Therefore, my delegation reiterates its view that peace and security in the region presuppose Israel's complete withdrawal from all occupied Palestinian and Arab lands and the safeguarding of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to return to their homeland, their right to self-determination and the establishment of an independent Palestinian State. The issue of Palestine is and remains the linchpin of a stable solution to the Middle East conflict.

93. My delegation supported the resolution that has just been adopted by the Council, because we are very much in favour of action by the Security Council without delay. In this connection, I would like to refer to the demands for decisive measures by the Council against Israel raised by my delegation during the debate of the Council in June on Israel's act of aggression against Iraq. What matters now is to make the aggressor feel the authority of the Council in order to stop Israel's acts of war immediately.

94. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent

Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations, to whom the Council extended an invitation at its 2292nd meeting under Article 39 of the Charter. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

95. Mr. MAKSOUD: Mr. President, allow me to express to you, and through you, to the other members of the Security Council our appreciation for the invitation that you have kindly extended to me to speak on behalf of the League of Arab States on the question entitled "The situation in the Middle East". I share with all those who have preceded me a high regard for the manner in which you have conducted the deliberations of this Council, the dignity and steadiness and the impressive leadership you have exhibited in your presidency and throughout your tenure in the deliberations of the Council. You have consistently demonstrated and supported a commitment to our Arab and African values, as well as our common destiny, which our experiences and our aspirations have cemented. Our common struggle against racism and all forms of colonial hegemony has been reinforced by the eagerness of the Arab and African States to spell out a policy that renders national liberation a contributor to international peace and human development and dignity.

96. The Security Council is meeting in the aftermath of Israel's air raid on the capital of Lebanon and the intensified Israeli aggressive strikes by air, sea and land in the south of Lebanon and on the shores of Lebanon. The extent of the loss of life among Lebanese and Palestinian civilians has been amply described by my two colleagues from Lebanon and the PLO. The massive and indiscriminate bombing of population centres represents a qualitative change not only in the policy of Israeli aggression but in its scope, its intensity and in the proliferation of its targets. It is necessary here to underline that what we are witnessing is not an altered Israeli policy of aggression against Lebanon and the Palestinians but an emboldenment of Israel's aggressive thrust, which is assuming genocidal dimensions.

97. This qualitative change in scope has made it imperative for the Security Council to be seized again of the question of Israel's aggression against Lebanon and the violation of Lebanon's sovereignty, airspace and territorial waters. Therefore, it is incumbent upon us to emphasize that we are dealing here with a constant—namely, Israel's aggression against Lebanon—and also a variable, the factors of the exterminating and genocidal dimensions of Israel's military operations and designs.

98. It might be asked why Israel has been emboldened to rise to this new level of aggressiveness. The answer is that Israel has enjoyed a measure of immunity from the sanctions of the international community—sanctions that should have been imposed, but were not, because of the protective shield the United States

provided to Israel in this chamber. As long as Israel considered that it enjoyed this immunity, it escalated its aggression and sought to dictate its terms.

99. We have witnessed how by its invasion of Lebanon in March 1978 Israel circumvented and then sought to render inoperative resolution 425 (1978), and how, with impunity, Israel unnerved the mandate of UNIFIL, and by arming mutineers and providing them with logistical, military and other elements of support, forcibly prevented the central and legitimate Government of Lebanon from exercising its full authority. Such actions have enabled Israel to establish military hegemony in the south and to persist in violating Lebanon's sovereignty for the last three years.

100. Every time Lebanon brought the issue of Israel's aggression and violations to the notice of the Security Council, there was a built-in resistance to the measures that would have inhibited Israel's reckless policies and would have deterred Israel's uninterrupted course of escalated aggression.

101. The latest phase of this escalating aggression against Lebanon occurred when Israel sought to use its military power to disrupt the genuine efforts of the Arab League and the President of Lebanon to bring about the national reconciliation and the political cohesion desired by all Lebanese. The Lebanese people were looking forward to national reconciliation as a way out of their long suffering and as a means of resuming their creative, intellectual and cultural functions within the Arab nation and throughout the world. The cynical use of Israel's military prowess to undermine these Lebanese aspirations was advertised by Israel as a policy aim to be pursued and realized.

102. As the *Osservatore Romano*, the organ of the Holy See, stated on 18 July 1981:

"How is it possible not to think that the bombings which started about a week ago and culminated with yesterday's attack were initiated with no consideration for the political context of efforts directed at possible solution of the Lebanese crisis?"

103. It is clear that Israel intends to wreak havoc on the chances of peace within Lebanon and on the opportunities for genuine peace with justice throughout the region.

104. When Israel struck at the nuclear installations in Baghdad, the Security Council unanimously condemned the attack but refrained from imposing the necessary sanctions. Israel assumed that its immunity against sanctions was permanent and irrevocable. Condemnation of its actions, censure of its behaviour, criticism of its policies—all were treated with contempt, and Israel heaped insults on the international community and on the United Nations for even questioning its motives and its actions.

105. Israel behaved as if it were not accountable to the international community and as if the world must acquiesce in whatever Israel decides and must give licence to its past, present and planned aggressions and violations. The large majority of the international community has rejected this Israeli posture and expectation. The United Nations records are filled with resolutions that articulate a growing independence of judgement on the over-all issues emerging from the Arab-Israeli conflict and on the need for commitment to Palestinian national rights. Yet there remains, especially in the West, and more particularly in the United States, a lingering reluctance to share a growing universal conviction that Israel cannot remain a "protected" outlaw in the international community.

106. Israel thinks that by heaping insults on the critics of its policies and by inferring that any criticism is a form of "lingering anti-Semitism" it can mute and silence the growing scepticism and rejection of its ideological pretensions and its arrogant imposition of policies that threaten peace and stability in the region and throughout the world.

107. I do not want to dwell on this facet of the intellectual and political terrorism through which Israel attempts to pre-empt the emergence of any objective and even-handed policies in the Western countries, and more particularly in the United States. Yet it must be stated for the record that this form of intellectual, political and diplomatic terrorism is a cover-up for the sustained and more easily identifiable terrorism that Israel practises on the ground, such as that manifested in the unmistakably genocidal raids on the capital of Lebanon.

108. The pattern of behaviour and the nature of the escalated aggressive military operations ordered by Begin are no longer subjects amenable to analysis. Rather they have become subjects for psychoanalysis. The compulsion to use the word "terrorist" before the mention of the PLO on the part of Begin and his representatives is a manifestation of a growing realization of the absolute legitimacy that the Palestine Liberation Organization has achieved in the world community as well as in the conscience of mankind.

109. The declared objective of Israel, as stated by Israeli Army Chief of Staff Saguy, "to generate Lebanese civilian resentment against the presence of Palestinian guerrillas there", is another sign of the sick Zionist mentality which seeks to use the blood of civilians in Beirut and in the south of Lebanon to pave the way for its destructive policies in their next manifestation.

110. It also represents a deranged way of thinking, and the Zionists have threatened that if Lebanon cannot voluntarily do Israel's dirty work, then the Lebanese must suffer the consequences and be pushed to carry out Israel's wishes. This not only constitutes a misreading of Lebanon's commitment to its

Arab national destiny and to the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination in their homeland, but it also demonstrates the workings of a sick mind that has been released from the constraints that elementary morality imposes. Israel's insensitivity to the dimensions of the suffering that it generates now and has generated since, as well as prior to, its existence, is not only lamentable but testifies to a sustained moral indifference that is pursued on the pretext of justified paranoia.

111. The danger of such an entity and of Zionist ideology should not only be contained, but curtailed so that constructive forces can function.

112. This mental frame of reference is characteristic of Governments such as those of South Africa and Israel and earlier on of Rhodesia, which mistakenly believed that "pre-emptive strikes" and "massive retaliations" would sow discord among those whose alliances were organic and a matter of principled commitment and conviction. In the case of Lebanon, the sense of sharing a common destiny with the Palestinians and with the whole Arab world is axiomatic.

113. The genocidal dimension of the air strikes against the capital of Lebanon, against the shores of Lebanon and against the south of Lebanon can only have the opposite of the intended effect. It will embolden and reinforce Lebanese and Palestinian solidarity and renew their commitment of purpose and identification with their national aspirations.

114. Israel, in the final analysis, is like all racist entities and ideological anachronisms serviced with modern advanced weaponry. Our shock and anger should not be confined to mere condemnation or expressions of outrage. The international community must undertake measures that inhibit Israel's proclivity towards aggression. Violations of territorial sovereignty and massive air strikes must become costlier. Hence the need for the imposition of sanctions, which should render the United Nations mechanism not only credible but effective and consequential.

115. As I stated earlier, during the past few days we have been witnessing a qualitative change in the level of Israel's aggression against Lebanon and against the areas of Palestinian presence. What has heretofore been described as arrogance is now developing into madness. The dire consequences of Israel's earlier massive retaliations and pre-emptive strikes, with the heavy cost in civilian life to both Lebanese and Palestinians, is now, as the savage raid on Beirut has shown, assuming genocidal proportions. What the Security Council is being faced with is no longer the usual and expected level of Israeli aggression, but a new and very dangerous challenge. The Arab States, those most affected by this new scale of Israeli aggression, are aware of Israel's record of contempt and defiance of all Security Council resolutions. That, however, has not prevented Lebanon and the Arab States from

renewing their faith in the ability of the United Nations machinery to exercise its deterrent functions against the aggressor and to impose measures that will restrain Israel's aggressive actions. But the patience of the Arab world is not limitless, and the resilience of our faith should not wear out. What has taken place in Beirut and in the villages and towns along the shores and in the south of Lebanon in recent days is bringing the Arab world to the brink of exasperation. The only means by which the Lebanese, the Palestinians and the Arabs in general can sustain their commitment to the options available within the United Nations framework and the Charter is the demonstration of the ability of the United Nations to render the Charter and its Articles operative and meaningful.

116. The United States' decision to postpone indefinitely delivery of 10 F-16s to Israel constitutes a signal of strong disapproval of Israel's aggression against Lebanon. It does not constitute, however, a dissociation or the beginnings of a policy reversal. Although it is a positive step, it does not correspond to the level of Israel's violation of international law or its contemptuous abuse of American law. The decision for indefinite suspension is preferable to one which would have merely postponed delivery for a few days, but the most preferable option of those feasible and available would have been to have cut off military and legal aid to Israel completely.

117. In the context of the United States-Israeli equation, there is no question that the United States strongly deplores the excesses of Israel and the obvious and visible abuse of traditional United States permissiveness towards Israel's creeping annexation, expansion and institutional discriminatory practices, along with the multitude of violations that are inherent in the thrust of Israel's over-all policy.

118. However, we cannot allow this United States signal of disapproval to go unnoticed. We take it as a sign, first, of American exhaustion with a mad ally on the loose and secondly, of American disposition to maintain a distance from Israeli rampages in Lebanon and throughout the region.

119. The decision to postpone the delivery of the F-16s indefinitely might usher in a policy reassessment—painful as that might be for those who have been conditioned to give instant and unqualified support to Israel's self-appointed role as a "reliable" policeman of strategic interests of the United States in the area.

120. However, maintaining a distance from Israel's irrationality is far less than what is expected and needed from the United States. There must be not only dissociation from Israel's behaviour but also the adoption of measures that perhaps only the United States can take to reintroduce a modicum of sanity into a highly volatile situation.

121. If we focus on the role of the United States as a global Power with direct responsibility for peace in the region it is because the United States has been perceived by the Arabs more in terms of a Power that is reducing the chances for a comprehensive, just and durable peace than of one that is improving them.

122. Whether or not that perception is precise in absolute terms, it is widespread and can be validated by evidence. However, we are not here to paraphrase the past. Even though in large part United States permissiveness towards Israel has led to the spread of violence, suffering and violations of all sorts of rights—legal, human, territorial and national—we wish to spell out a future, but not just in terms of Arab-American relations. At this juncture, the United States has an historic opportunity *vis-à-vis* the Arab world and the Palestinian question to exercise judgement and objectivity in a long-range reassessment of its policies and to purge itself of policies vulnerable to the short-term exigencies of politics. The United States must seize the occasion to extricate its perceptions of the entire Middle East from the restricted confines of lobbies serving narrow interests and the misguided notions that attempt to reduce the region to an arena of cold war and to see the area in terms of oil wells and strategic bases.

123. When the United States extricates itself from this narrow and restrictive optic, it can then pursue a policy predicated on a vision of the region where human power, economic potential and the utilization of intellectual and managerial talents can coalesce in unity to serve not only the peoples of the region but also the developmental requirements of the third world and the human aspirations of the disenfranchised constituencies such as the Palestinians.

124. The United States must embolden the international machinery that the United Nations represents and provides and instills into its resolutions the vitality that renders the world more amenable to the rationality and sanity that the international consensus invariably imposes.

125. If this is construed as an appeal to the United States, let it be so construed. Inasmuch as the United States provides Israel with the implements to destroy United Nations credibility and the chances for a genuine and just peace in the region, so must the United States assume a tremendous responsibility, perhaps of historic proportions, that disallows any rupture in the dialogue and effort at persuasion. Thus, the minor steps taken by the United States towards the reassessment of its policies must be interpreted as a sign that the United States is ridding itself of its hang-ups over and its excessive identification with Israel and its objectives.

126. Perhaps Israel's blatant act of aggression against Iraq's nuclear research facilities and the massive indiscriminate strikes at civilian targets in

Beirut, in particular, and in Lebanon, in general, constitute, paradoxically and painfully, an eye-opener for those in the United States who have been blindfolded by the conjured and conflicting roles that Israel has assigned to itself in the various American constituencies.

127. Perhaps American liberal supporters of Israel will be disabused of their classical and romantic conceptions and see in the dimension of the violence that Israel practises and perpetrates against Lebanon and the Palestinians the fibres of which fascism is made. Perhaps also American conservatives will be similarly disabused of their ideas that Israel is an orderly, "strategic instrument" of United States global objectives.

128. Security Council resolutions can be made more effective if the United States reassesses its policy in the Middle East to bring it closer to the international consensus, a consensus which Israel seeks to defy and, if possible, destroy.

129. Recent Israeli acts of aggression against Lebanon cannot be viewed either in isolation or out of the context of the over-all implications of Palestinian dispossession and disenfranchisement. The agony of Lebanon is due, in part, to Israel's efforts to make both Palestinian hopelessness and Lebanese helplessness permanent fixtures on the regional scene. This is the central challenge to the United Nations. From it flows the whole evolution of Israel's policies to annihilate the Palestinians, to destroy Lebanon and to render inoperative United Nations resolutions and mechanisms. Israel employs all means to justify those ends. With the passage of time, those means become more virulent, more vengeful, more destructive, more contemptuous, more provocative and more insulting to the international community and even to those who have shown varying degrees of tolerance towards Israeli aggression. Israel's objective of creating Palestinian hopelessness is evident in the attempt to present the Palestinians with three unacceptable options: if the Palestinians insist on their national rights, they must risk annihilation; if they pursue political struggle, they must risk dispersion and confinement; and if they seek an active presence, they must acquiesce in the permanency of their reduced status, as spelled out in the so-called autonomy talks. In other words, Israel treats the Palestinians as human obstacles to the ever-expanding Israeli entity and its aggressive annexationist designs.

130. In the pursuit of this utterly irrational objective, Israel employs the instruments of destruction to bleed the Palestinian people and to impress upon them the futility of their struggle and the meaninglessness of their international legitimacy.

131. Can the international community, can the Security Council, can world opinion, can the conscience of mankind be resigned to the inevitability of

Israel's onslaught? The answer is a categorical "no". The answer of the Palestinian people is the affirmation of their commitment, the closing of their ranks and their total irrevocable identification with the PLO. The PLO is to the Palestinians not only the framework of their peoplehood and the representative of their aspirations and rights; it is for the Palestinians under occupation, in the diaspora, in the refugee camps, also a state of mind that no power can destroy or wreck. The blood-bath that Israel plans for the Palestinians only reinforces and strengthens their determination and clarifies their sense of direction.

132. Israel's long-standing objective of rendering Lebanon helpless is another manifestation of its heightened level of aggression and violence that was demonstrated in its recent air raid on the capital and shores of Lebanon. Lebanon, as you know, is a founding member of the League of Arab States and of the United Nations. Since its inception as an independent and sovereign country, it has been a citadel of learning not only in terms of academic and cultural freedom, but in terms of how to tolerate differences, reconcile conflicts, accommodate divergences, and dream the impossible.

133. Lebanon brought into the political map of the contemporary world the beauty of pluralism, the convergence of values, the humanism of co-discovery. In Lebanon, the pioneering spirit of the merchant and the creative spirit of the poet blended in a mixture that was so elegant and refined that it rendered Lebanon an anchor for all those who sought the comfort of human accommodation and the stimulus of responding to the challenges of our times.

134. Lebanon, historically, has piloted many aspects of the contemporary Arab renaissance. Throughout modern history, Lebanon was a vehicle for rendering the Arabs more emphatic, in being world-conscious and in making the world more Arab-conscious. This unique role in the Arab national context gave Lebanon's independence and sovereignty a significance that went beyond the parameters of the legalistic paraphernalia that is usually associated with the notions of territorial sovereignty and political independence.

135. Independence was for Lebanon the means by which it discovered its roots as well as its mission, roots that lay in the overall Arab heritage and the mission that lies in assuming full responsibility towards Arab solidarity and development. By this definition, Lebanon undertook to be in the forefront of those who defended and articulated the justice inherent in the Palestinian rights. Lebanon realizes that the Palestinian presence within its contours is temporary and transient and that the Palestinians' commitment to exercise their right to return to their homes and to their homeland is legitimate and inevitable. Lebanon realizes that the whole thrust of the authentic Palestinian movement lies in the struggle to establish an independent Palestinian State in the Palestinian homeland and not to

accept a substitute homeland in Lebanon or anywhere else. It is this commitment and its inevitability that defines the dynamics of the Palestinian resistance. It is this insistence of the Palestinian constituencies on building a State, an independent State in their homeland, and the universal support that this insistent struggle has achieved, which explains the ferociousness with which Israel seeks to prevent the realization of Palestinian self-determination.

136. Lebanon recognizes Israel's designs on Lebanese territories in the south. Israel's repeated violations of Lebanon's sovereignty in the south and its insistence on maintaining a monopoly of aerial domination over the Lebanese skies are but the elements of coercion by which Israel endeavours to corner the Palestinians into accepting the notion of a substitute homeland and thus provoke a situation where partition becomes the negation of Lebanese unity and independence.

137. This is the thrust of Israel's conspiracy against Lebanese independence and unity. This is the aim of Israel in the destruction of Lebanese independence and sovereignty. Israel strives to achieve several of its objectives within the arena of Lebanon. In the Israeli scenario, the partition of Lebanon would paralyse Lebanon's function within the Arab national community; would prevent, as a final solution for the Palestinian question, the Palestinian right to return and to self-determination; and disprove once and for all the validity of pluralistic experiments and human co-discovery.

138. The agony of Lebanon, grave, deep and ever painful, is far less than the resilience of the Lebanese in defending their country, its unity and its independence and its legitimate authority and the retrieval of Lebanon's role as a major catalyst in a situation torn by anxiety. That fact of Lebanese resilience explains the diplomatic position that Lebanon enjoys throughout the world and within the United Nations. Lebanon's resilience and the inherent power of its resumed cohesion will disprove, as a matter of course, Israel's portrayal of Lebanon as a "helpless nation" and Israel's determination to render it so, if it can get away with it.

139. It is obvious that the Palestinians are not going to be hopeless and the Lebanese are not going to be helpless. The international community and the Security Council in particular are entrusted with seeing to it that neither of these insane Israeli objectives is reached and that the legitimacy of the Palestinian struggle and of Lebanese independence is not only ensured but reinforced and emboldened.

140. The Arab nation and the Arab people look upon the deliberations of the Council with the expectation that its utterances will be matched with performance, that the cruelty which Israel seeks to inflict upon us does not lead us to a philosophy of despair,

and that the sanity which the United Nations is supposed to render all-pervasive is no longer interrupted by the madness that Israel exhibits and the havoc it seeks to promote.

141. Therefore, the League of Arab States anticipates that the Security Council, whatever resolution it adopts, will live up to the expectation of all mankind. The League of Arab States believes that the most recent aggression by Israel on Lebanon warrants that the Council take the appropriate sanctions prescribed in Chapter VII of the Charter and measures which would render impossible a repetition of these genocidal strikes and would enable the international community to pursue its search for a comprehensive, just and durable peace that the peoples of that region and of the world are eager to achieve.

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

143. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic): While congratulating, you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council, let me assure you that words of yours pronounced in this hall a month ago [2284th meeting] re-echo in our ears, carrying the wisdom of a distinguished son of Africa, the far-sightedness and acumen of a diplomat with a global view of the Middle East conflict, and the deep and genuine concern that the people of Niger and the rest of our African brethren have for our Arab people. You said, Mr. President:

"For 33 years the Middle East region has been unlike other regions. Instability reigns there, because law is no longer respected. Tragedies take place there because justice is flouted. Wars take place there one after the other because brutal force has the key to the city. An entire people is living the life of refugees, and the usurper has sworn to attack any neighbouring country which, out of duty or solidarity, aids and supports that people. Lebanon, for example, is currently paying a tragic price, in full view of the United Nations and, indeed, the Security Council."

And today, under your presidency, the Council is meeting at the request of the Government of Lebanon, a Lebanon which is suffering beyond human endurance, bleeding to death, a peaceful Arab State singled out by the Israeli sadists as a target for their sophisticated methods of barbarity.

144. Yet crucifying the Lebanese and destroying their chances of reaching national accord has not been enough for Israel; scorching the fertile earth of the south and levelling entire villages with their churches, mosques and schools for years has not been exercised enough in ruthlessness and aggressiveness; blowing up bridges and factories, bombarding roads with the intention of halting the flow of food and medication

and disrupting the lives of those heroic Lebanese who have survived, or those who have refused to abandon their lands and properties, has still not satisfied the Israeli man-hunters; and causing a mass exodus among a once-peaceful agricultural population has not quenched the thirst of the Israelis any more than have their frequent forays by air, sea and land in pursuit of civilian targets with their ever-increasing number of civilian casualties. None of these has been enough for Israel.

145. On Friday, 17 July, the Israelis decided to pull yet another murderous trick from their sadistic bag and stage a crime in the heart of the capital, Beirut. They struck at one of the most densely populated quarters of Beirut with rockets and bombs, and in less than 20 minutes they caused the death and maiming of more than 1,200 children, women and men. The scene in the capital was described as carnage, yet another decoration for the butcher Begin and for the war criminals Zipori and Ariel Sharon, for the bloodthirsty Etan and for our arrogant Blum, who is still allowed to sit among us and snicker.

146. We all heard the Israeli representative claiming once again that bombardment, strafing, destruction, annihilation, obliteration and other violations of the Charter, as well as violations of other international instruments, are carried out by Israel in the name of self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter. The same argument by the same representative was used to justify the attack against the nuclear research plant in Baghdad, and similar arguments have been used and re-used ever since the creation of Israel to try to legitimize every illegitimate act, every violation of the Charter and every act of terrorism.

147. The irony lies in the fact that the victims of Israeli acts of aggression are being denied their inalienable right to self-defence on the same principle of self-defence, while their national territory is being colonized and annexed and while their most sacred rights are being flouted, particularly their right to return to their homes and property and their right to self-determination. Let it be clear that the party that can invoke the right to legitimate self-defence is the Palestinian party, whether in exile or under occupation. Fortunately, the overwhelming majority of the international community has rejected this Israeli notion of preemptive self-defence in all its variations, since the might of Israel cannot alter rights recognized as those of peoples under the Charter.

148. The irony lies in the fact that in this, as well as in previous debates, we hear the Israeli representative repeatedly pronounce the terms "terror", "terrorist" and "terrorism", the reason being that he cannot and will not pronounce the words "Palestine" or "Palestinians". To him every Palestinian woman, man and child is a terrorist. By calling the 3 million or more Palestinians "terrorists" and their legitimate and sole representative, the PLO, a "terrorist organization",

the Zionists are in fact attempting to justify genocide, since every Palestinian, whether under occupation or in exile, is determined by all available means, including armed struggle, to restore and protect his usurped national and human rights.

149. Some Israeli voices, and I am quoting from *The New York Times* of 25 June 1981, have acknowledged that in its isolation Israel is "making a cult out of darkness" and that there exists in the Israeli mind a "demonization of the enemy" and a "mystification of the whole Palestinian problem".

150. All colonialists have at one time or other mystified and demonized the colonized, and Israel, as a settler-colonialist suffering from endemic paranoia, finds its salvation in the physical annihilation of its victim.

151. The recent Israeli aggression against Lebanon is an additional link in the chain of premeditated state-terrorism, and it cannot be viewed by the Council in isolation from the nature of the Zionist entity. Nor can it be separated from that entity's goals and policy objectives, unconditionally supported by the United States of America, militarily, politically and economically.

152. At this stage, Israel is seeking to achieve two goals: to seize southern Lebanon without its Arab population and to fragment the country into statelets, satellites under Zionist hegemony.

153. The Lebanese, like the Syrians, have since 1948 known that Zionist expansionism would not spare them. Nor have the Zionists hidden their designs, territorial or otherwise, in regard to Arab sovereign countries bordering Palestine.

154. As early as 1919, the Zionist movement, in collusion with the colonial Powers which were at the time busily dissecting the Arab land, made it clear in the plan submitted to the Versailles Peace Conference that southern Lebanon, the Golan Heights, as well as an adjacent zone in Jordan were to be included sooner or later in *Eretz Israel*. As early as 1919, the Zionists realized that they could not create a State for all the Jews without controlling the water sources of Palestine, which lie in Lebanon, Syria and Jordan. To occupy and control these parts of the Arab homeland was a prerequisite for strengthening the demographic, agricultural and industrial capabilities of an ever-expanding Zionist State.

155. Indeed, Israel accomplished part of its design in 1967 by occupying the Golan Heights and its water resources, and it is at present preparing to pounce upon the area in south Lebanon which lies between the so-called Haddad enclave—itsself an extension of Israeli occupation—and the Litani River.

156. It need not be recalled that Israeli political literature reveals a long-drawn-out colonial cam-

trovery, which started in 1954, as to the ways and means of dismantling a flourishing Lebanon—a controversy which arose not over the substance but, rather, over the timing. The Ben Gurion-Sharrett correspondence remains the best example of this debate. Yet, the Israeli intervention did not start to assume its ominous course openly until the year 1973, the timing was propitious, for it accompanied the beginning of the process of Egyptian capitulation. In order to distract public attention from the Agreement of 1975 between Egypt and Israel on the Sinai [S//1818/ Add.1], which neutralized Egypt, Israel shrewdly calculated that the time was ripe for it to strike and restrike at southern Lebanon, sparing none—Palestinian camps included—on the pretext of pre-emptive and protective self-defence operations.

157. Concurrently, Israel has been engaged in subversive activities to destroy the very fabric of Lebanese society and to undermine the foundations of exemplary coexistence among the various Lebanese communities.

158. The Israeli massive invasion of March 1978, which was deplored by the Council, signalled the beginning of Israel's determination to implement its long-coveted expansionist designs. Attempts at liquidating the Palestinian presence and displacing Lebanese civilians were the precursors of the tragic events we have been witnessing since April this year.

159. The United States squarely bears responsibility for the Israeli aggression against Lebanon, inasmuch as it bears responsibility for encouraging Israel to colonize the West Bank, Gaza and the Golan Heights. The present Administration has broken the American record of unconditional support for Israel's expansionist policies. The total merger of Israeli interests with those of the United States has become so complete that one can no longer differentiate between the two. Even the most pro-Western elements in our area would agree that this merger of foreign policy goals, including military co-operation, has made of the United States of America the very embodiment of Israeli oppression of millions of Arabs, with the result that United States credibility has never been as low as it is today. A country that leaves its destiny in the hands of the racist régime of Tel Aviv and allows itself to be led down a blind alley by Begin can no longer claim that it has any legitimate interests in our area. The last three months have proved without any doubt that only Cairo and Tel Aviv have espoused Mr. Haig's "strategic consensus"—a euphemism to perpetuate United States-Israeli hegemony over the entire Arab world. The United States condemnation of the Israeli attack on Baghdad's nuclear research reactor has fooled no one, for, even while condemning it, the United States representative was humbly submitting her apologies to Israel and reiterating that "nothing has happened that in any way alters the strength of our commitment or the warmth of our feelings" [see 2288th meeting]. She reminded the Arabs in this very Council that Israel

would remain "an important and valued ally" and that "the warmth of the human relationship between our peoples is widely understood" [*ibid.*].

160. Driven by warmth of feelings, the United States surely feels that this "important and valued ally" deserves to be promoted in "importance and value" after its carnage in Beirut. Furthermore, it deserves to be compensated for the pursuit of its "important" role in the Middle East.

161. *The New York Times* of 19 July 1981 reveals the double standard of the United States as follows:

"Mr. Begin also faces less opposition from the Reagan Administration to his military actions in Lebanon than he did from the Carter Administration, which frequently criticized Israeli air attacks. Whether deliberately or not, President Reagan and Secretary of State Alexander Haig have given Israel the impression that hitting potential terrorists in Lebanon is justifiable self-defence."

162. As long ago as 6 April, Secretary of State Haig, in an effort to magnify Israeli military supremacy in the area, promised Israel an additional "qualitative edge" over the Arabs, adding, in the context of the "strategic consensus", that only "a strong Israel" could play an essential role in protecting common American-Israeli strategic concerns. As of that date, the situation in Lebanon began to deteriorate. According to *The New York Times* of 7 April 1981, no sooner had one of Mr. Haig's senior aides announced that "we are right on the brink of a major outbreak of hostilities in and around Beirut" than a reassured Begin stated that he had "reached understanding" on major points with Secretary Haig. As of that date, the people of Lebanon were to be deprived of the hopes of a burgeoning national reconciliation.

163. This hostile United States attitude towards the Arabs—once more confirmed—has killed forever all false hopes and illusions pinned on the United States' sense of justice or its awareness and rationality. No Arab is willing today to tell the United States where its legitimate interests lie; nor will any Arab appoint himself a guardian of these interests. Apparently, only the "King of Israel" will dictate his wishes to the people of the United States of America.

164. For us Syrians—Government and people alike—Lebanon has always been and will always remain the nearest and dearest in the Arab family. Our ties with Lebanon are too old, too deep, too embedded in a long common history and a common cultural heritage for Begin, who comes from Europe, and his Western clique imported from abroad to understand or appreciate. But a common destiny has drawn us yet closer together in contemporary history. Since 1948, the Syrian and Lebanese Arab peoples have been deeply traumatized by the tragic fate of their kith and kin in Palestine and irreversibly involved in their plight—a plight which the entire Arab nation deeply feels, endures and lives.

165. We are not here to mourn our martyrs, Lebanese or Palestinian, nor are we here to indulge in an exercise of self-pity. The Syrian Arab Republic, which is deeply committed to the Palestinian cause as well as to the independence, sovereignty and unity of Lebanon, is here to ask the Council to discharge its duties towards Lebanon and towards the people of Palestine. To condemn the acts of Israel, experience has taught us, will not deter the aggressor from escalating its onslaught. We demand that the Council recognize that Israel has committed an act of aggression grave enough and ominous enough to require the strict application of sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. It requires also its expulsion from the Organization. Unless and until Israel is severely punished by the international community, no State, however big or small, can hope to live in a secure and peaceful world. We expect the Council to take the necessary measures for the full and immediate implementation of its resolution 425 (1978), as well as those resolutions it adopted relating to the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Lebanese territory and the cessation by Israel of its military action against Lebanon's territorial integrity and its people.

166. We know beforehand that the United States, according to press reports, will veto such a draft resolution. Yet we find some comfort in this irresponsible and negative United States position, because this very veto will once and for all unmask to the whole world the true nature of United States imperialism and its Zionist patron.

167. Mr. LING Qing (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has listened attentively to the statements made by the representatives of Lebanon, of other Arab States, the PLO and the League of Arab States. We fully support their stern exposure of and accusation against the crimes of the Israeli aggressors. In recent days, the Israeli authorities have again sent large numbers of warplanes to strike indiscriminately at roads, bridges, factories and schools in Lebanon and at Palestinian residential areas in southern Lebanon. On 17 July, Israel's aircraft bombed the headquarters of Al-Fatah in Beirut, its warships attacked Lebanon's coastal areas and its long-range artillery shelled the town of Sidon. This has caused heavy casualties among Lebanese civilians and Palestinian refugees, as well as great damage to properties. It is especially intolerable that so soon after the Security Council adopted resolution 487 (1981), strongly condemning Israel's attack on an Iraqi nuclear reactor, the Israeli authorities had the audacity to launch a new series of massive armed attacks, this time against Lebanon, insolently trampling upon the Charter of the United Nations. This has not only added to the long list of serious crimes committed by the Israeli authorities against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples but constituted a flagrant provocation designed to aggravate tension in the Middle East. The Chinese Government and people voice their vigorous indignation at and condemnation in the strongest terms these acts of aggression by the Israeli authorities.

168. For a long time the Israeli authorities have obstinately persisted in their policy of aggression and expansion, refusing to withdraw from large tracts of occupied Arab territories or to recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. Moreover, they have provoked incidents time and again, seriously infringing upon Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Repeated Israeli incursions and perennial conflicts have shattered Lebanon, bringing untold suffering to the population and endless turmoil to the country. The Israeli authorities have been reckless in stepping up their policy of aggression and expansion simply because they enjoy the support and connivance of super-Powers which can hardly exonerate themselves from blame. It should be pointed out at the same time that the perennial turmoil and unrest in the Middle East resulting from Israel's aggression are already opening this region to infiltration and intervention by an ambitious super-Power, thus adding to the complexity of the situation there. Israel's policy of aggression and expansion, and super-Power connivance at and support for it, can only antagonize the entire Arab people, including the Palestinian people, and bring serious consequences for the proponents of this policy.

169. The Lebanese Government has again appealed to the Security Council to take effective measures to support Lebanon against Israel's unscrupulous attacks and to ensure strict respect for Lebanon's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. The Chinese Government and people firmly support this just demand of the Lebanese Government, as we have always supported the people of the Arab countries and Palestine in their just struggle to recover lost territories and restore national rights, including the right of the Palestinian people to return to their homeland and to establish their own State. In our view, the Council should firmly defend the Charter and uphold justice by sternly condemning Israel for its aggression, and should take effective measures pursuant to the provisions of the Charter to put an end to Israeli aggression against Lebanon.

170. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Democratic Yemen, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

171. Mr. ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen): Mr. President, may I, at the outset, congratulate you on assuming the presidency of the Security Council for this month. We recognize your high qualities as a judicious and skilful diplomat and should like to hope that under your stewardship the Council will accomplish its task successfully. Yet we note with distress that one permanent member of the Council will side-step the Council's efforts to live up to the ideals and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. We have now learnt what to expect from the Council.

172. Last month Israel committed a calculated and premeditated act of aggression. A number of its highly

sophisticated American-supplied warplanes struck the Iraqi nuclear facilities near Baghdad. In a pathetic act of self-righteousness, the Israeli Prime Minister had to remind the world that "Operation Babylon" took place on a Sunday afternoon to avoid human casualties. Concurrently, the United States Government moved to shield Israel from international censure and sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. Its chief representative here was later praised for having extracted a mere condemnatory resolution from the Council, and Israel was let loose to engage in other adventures.

173. Last Friday, Israel had another mission: "Operation Genocide" one might call it. Waves of Israeli warplanes bombed heavily populated neighbourhoods in Beirut and targets in southern Lebanon, killing at least 400 and wounding more than 800 persons, mostly women and children. Israeli aircraft also destroyed at least 10 bridges in the south. But this time Israel had to make sure that its targets would be innocent civilians. Its brutal bombardment of a university, a stadium, residential quarters and refugee camps was timed in such a way as to maximize the death toll among the civilian population. It was indeed a mission of rampage and madness; a perfect model of Israeli State terrorism, sustained and indeed encouraged by the Government of the United States.

174. Israel is not the spoilt baby of the United States; neither is it its unruly child who messes around with flying toys. Israel is not only the trusted friend of the United States; nor is it just another ally, whose interests occasionally clash with those of its benefactor. Israel is an American surrogate in the Middle East. It is America's anchored base in the heart of the Arab homeland. It fights American battles and defends American interests that are intertwined with its own. It is paid for that by an uninterrupted hand-out of deadly weapons and economic aid. The United States Government is no less responsible for the aerial massacre of Lebanese and Palestinian women and children, for without its total support the Zionist butchers in Tel Aviv would not have dared to have committed such a heinous crime.

175. Not only does the United States Government finance Israel's adventures, but it unreservedly and pitifully espouses Israeli policies and political stratagems. It is significant that neither the American Government nor Congress can determine what is Israeli defence and what is not. Some American officials have even invoked the notion of "hot pursuit" to justify acts of Israeli aggression against Lebanon. The fact remains that Israel and South Africa alone uphold that notion and seek to promote it to the level of a principle in international law in order to legitimize their policies of aggression and expansion.

176. Every now and then American officials speak of "legitimate" Israeli defence, but they conveniently leave its definition to Tel Aviv and to the Zionist lobby

in Washington. It is indeed a pity that a super-Power is being heckled and pushed around by its own offshoot. One cannot but imagine the United States as a large ship being towed away by a tiny Israeli tug-boat. The United States cannot even categorically define its own interests in the Middle East, because they have to be tailored to Israel's perceptions. To ask the United States to rid itself of its Zionist hang-up or to resist such Zionist extortion at home and abroad is to ask too much.

177. The question is: when are America's Arab friends going to realize that Israel and the United States are like two sides of the same coin; that the United States can only be a broker of arms, not of peace; that it cares less for their friendship and more for their oil; and that it stands for expediency, not justice? Washington is a prisoner of its own junior ally. Its policy towards the Palestinian people and their national and political rights is dictated by Israel. It is already committed not to recognize the PLO. It cannot even question Israeli concepts of security, although they have been used as a justification to commit acts of aggression and genocide.

178. Yet, the Reagan Administration is feverishly trying to establish a so-called strategic consensus in the Middle East, lumping together Israel and its Arab victims in an unholy alliance against the Soviet Union. So far this looks like the American formula for unravelling all the local and regional conflicts in the Middle East. It is a master plan that solves problems by simply ignoring them. One would think that this is a naive proposition coming from a new Administration obsessed with the cold war.

179. But here again the United States is opting for a Middle Eastern policy which fits in with long-term Israeli designs. Such a policy not only seeks to make Israel more acceptable in the region, but also increases its strategic importance and its role as a regional Power. Indeed, Israel has proved that, far from being the underdog, it is aspiring to emerge as a dominant force in the Middle East. Having effectively neutralized Egypt as a regional Arab Power, the United States has made it possible for Israel to be more aggressive and defiant.

180. Today Israel is waging a total war against Lebanon and against the Palestinian people. The most modern weapons are being used to massacre innocent women and children in Beirut and other Lebanese cities. Israeli warplanes have broadened their targets to include basic infrastructural installations. Israel seems to be preparing for a full-fledged invasion of Lebanon.

181. Delaying the shipment of ten F-16 planes for a few weeks is not going to deter Israel from pursuing its policies of occupation, annexation and expansion. Israel is not short of weapons and ammunition—it is now in the business of exporting them. Israeli arro-

gance and lawlessness can only be checked when the Security Council decides to apply sanctions in line with Chapter VII of the Charter. But we all know that the veto of the United States and maybe of its allies will torpedo any resolution, leaving no option for the valiant Lebanese and Palestinian people but to fight. In the words of the PLO spokesman: "Maybe they can break our hearts with our dead women and children, but they will never break our determination and will".

182. The PRESIDENT (*Interpretation from French*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Yemen. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

183. Mr. ALAINI (Yemen): My delegation is pleased at seeing you, Sir, presiding over this august body during this month. We are particularly pleased at seeing the representative of a country which shares faith and aspirations with my country, assume this important and difficult task. Your personal qualities and vast experience will substantially contribute to the success of the current deliberations.

184. Since the end of the Second World War, our region has become a scene of tragic events, caused mainly by the expansionist policies of the newly planted State of Israel. Since its establishment, the Zionist State has pursued an aggressive policy of expansion, undermining the political sovereignty and territorial integrity of its neighbours in total disregard of international law and morality.

185. However, the recent attacks on Iraq and Lebanon have added a new dimension to the long-established Israeli policy of aggression. Last month, Israeli forces attacked an Iraqi nuclear energy project, a civilian target, in a country which has no common borders with Israel. The most recent daily Israeli attacks on Lebanon are intentionally directed against densely populated areas in a peace-loving country which is totally preoccupied with its own internal strife.

186. The Israeli leaders are admittedly frustrated at being unable to put down the Palestinian struggle for the achievement of the right to self-determination. They have opted for tactics of intimidation, hoping to silence the Palestinians and to force their leadership to give up their legitimate struggle. For the last 11 days, Israeli forces have fiercely and mercilessly attacked the Palestinians in their refugee camps and innocent Lebanese civilians in their homes and shelters. Schools, hospitals, highways and bridges have been destroyed and—most important—hundreds of innocent people, mainly women and children, massacred. In their nature and intensity, those Israeli barbaric attacks are comparable only to those employed nearly four decades ago by the bloodthirsty Nazis.

187. Last month the Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear energy installation was thoroughly discussed in

this chamber. The Arabs and, indeed, world public opinion felt that at last the Security Council had begun to recognize the dangers of Israel's adventurist policy. The imposition by the Council of the sanctions prescribed in Chapter VII of the Charter was taken for granted. However, the Council failed again to cope with the Israeli aggressive action for exactly the same reasons. Some members of the Council who, by virtue of their permanent status, bear a special responsibility for peace and security have chosen to abdicate that responsibility by threatening to use their veto power in order to block any meaningful action aimed at restraining Israel's aggressive drive.

188. Today, encouraged by this Council's impotence, Israel is launching a new act of aggression. The negative approach of those permanent members of the Council is precisely what has encouraged the Israeli Government to pursue its traditional policy of aggression. The same irresponsible approach on the part of those Council members has encouraged the terrorist Begin proudly to announce that his Government will pursue the current policy of continual attacks against Lebanese civilians and Palestinian refugees as long as the situation in Lebanon remains unfavourable for Israel's ambitions. Did he not previously say "We are not afraid of any reactions in the world"?

189. To be sure, the Begin Government is not the only party to be blamed for the ongoing genocide practised by the Israeli forces against the innocent Palestinians and Lebanese civilians. The United States Government, which provides Tel Aviv with the most sophisticated weapons and pours billions of United States dollars into the Israeli Treasury to finance the Israeli war machinery, must bear its share of responsibility. Unreserved American diplomatic support for Tel Aviv, including the United States' recurrent abuse of the veto in the service of Israel, does not contribute to the stability and security of the Middle East region. It remains to be seen, however, whether the United States Government will explicitly or implicitly condone the recent massacre of innocent Lebanese and Palestinians carried out by the American-equipped Israeli armed forces.

190. We hope that this time Senator Larry Pressler will not need to say what he said last month: "We are going to have to stretch our imagination a bit to find that the Arms Export Control Act has not been violated."

191. If the Arabs are repeatedly bringing their complaints of Israel's aggression to the Council it is because they still firmly believe in the legitimacy of the United Nations and the sanctity of its Charter. Some might misinterpret this and take it as a sign of weakness and despair, especially at a time when it has become obvious that the Council is unable even modestly to restrain the Israeli expansionist drive.

192. Although we remain convinced that upholding the Charter principles is the only alternative to vio-

lence and destruction, Arab patience and tolerance are not unlimited. It should be understood that the Council's failure to check effectively the ongoing Israeli aggression will put the Arab Governments in a critical situation. The Arab peoples can no longer accept their Governments' continued simple resort to bringing their complaints before this Council. Arab potential and capabilities, if unleashed, will certainly put an end to Israeli intransigence and arrogance. General mobilization of such capabilities and potential will create a volatile situation, thereby affecting world peace and stability.

193. "Violence that alters nothing is a desperate confession of political bankruptcy," as *The New York Times* said on 19 July 1981.

194. If Begin really believes that he can usurp Palestine forever and eliminate the Palestinians, he is in fact deceiving not only himself and his people but also his allies. No Israeli Government can ignore the reality of the existence of the Palestinian people and effectively deny them their legitimate rights recognized by the international community. Equally, no Israeli Government can by force impose its illegitimate ambitions on its neighbours. Israel should always remember that he who lives by the sword shall perish by the sword.

195. The time is ripe for concrete measures to be taken by the Council to check effectively the Israeli aggression against the Arab people. Last month's Israeli aggression against Iraq, together with the recent attack on Lebanon, has clearly exposed Israel's lust for expansion and domination. We urge the members of the Council to shoulder their responsibility, and we particularly urge the United States Government to act responsibly to enable the Council to discharge its responsibility to preserve peace and security.

196. Again, condemnation is not enough; sanctions are what the whole world is expecting.

197. The PRESIDENT (*Interpretation from French*): I now call on the next speaker, the representative of Lebanon.

198. Mr. TUENI (Lebanon): This has been a very long day and you, Mr. President, have been very patient with us all. We thank you for your patience and for your wisdom.

199. On behalf of my Government and the people of Lebanon, I wish to thank the Security Council for its prompt response to a most urgent situation.

200. I want to say only one thing. We have listened very carefully to all the speakers. We have listened particularly to the representative of Spain explaining the spirit in which the resolution adopted by the Council was presented.

201. I want, on behalf of my Government, while again thanking the Council for its speedy response, to pledge our full support for the efforts undertaken by the Secretary-General and by Governments that are in a position to influence developments in the area, to achieve not only a cease-fire but a just and lasting peace. We are confident that the 48 hours provided for in the resolution will not be lost, and we hope that all those concerned will respond to this necessity.

The meeting rose at 10.35 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *The Parliamentary Debates (Hansard), Fifth Series*, vol. CDXXI, House of Lords (London, HM Stationery Office, 1981).

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

³ *International Committee of the Red Cross, Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 (Geneva, 1977), p. 3.*

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

如何购买联合国出版物

联合国出版物在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处。

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 пишете 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.
