

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FOURTH YEAR

2147th MEETING: 12 JUNE 1979

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2147).....	1
Expression of thanks to the retiring President	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 30 May 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13356); Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/13384)	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.

2147th MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 12 June 1979, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Oleg A. TROYANOVSKY
(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Bangladesh, Bolivia, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Gabon, Jamaica, Kuwait, Nigeria, Norway, Portugal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2147)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 30 May 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13356);
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/13384)

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

Expression of thanks to the retiring President

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): Since this is the first official meeting of the Security Council in the month of June, I should like, on behalf of the Council, to pay a tribute to my predecessor, the representative of Portugal, Ambassador Futscher Pereira, for the tireless efforts and great diplomatic skill with which he conducted the proceedings of the Council in May. I believe that those words also express the view of all members of the Council.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 30 May 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13356);
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/13384)

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): In accordance with the decisions taken by the Council at the 2146th meeting, I invite the representative of Lebanon to take a place at the Council table. I invite the representative

of Israel to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber. I invite the representative of the Palestinian Liberation Organization to take a place at the side of the Council chamber.

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

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic containing a request that he be invited to take part in the discussion of the question on the agenda. In the light of established practice and with the consent of the Council, I propose to invite him to take part in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. El-Choufi (Syrian Arab Republic) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to draw the Council's attention to document S/13384 which contains the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) for the period from 13 January to 8 June 1979. I should also like to draw the Council's attention to the following documents: S/13379 which contains the text of a letter dated 6 June from the representative of Kuwait transmitting the text of a letter dated 25 May from the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization addressed to the Secretary-General, and S/13387 which contains the text of a letter dated 11 June from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General.

5. I call on the Secretary-General who wishes to make a statement.

6. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: The Council has before it my report on UNIFIL which describes the activities of the Force up to the morning of 8 June. Since that time, the UNIFIL Command has reported to me that there have been renewed exchanges of fire between the Palestinian armed elements in the vicinity of Chateau de Beaufort and the *de facto* forces in the Marjayoun area, particularly on the afternoon and evening of 8 June. There were also on

that day attacks by Israeli aircraft against targets north of the UNIFIL area of operation, in the Nabatiyah and Arnoun areas.

7. These new incidents, just as the Security Council is about to consider the renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL, serve to emphasize both the inherent instability of the situation in Southern Lebanon and the great difficulties confronting UNIFIL.

8. As indicated in my report, despite the obstacles which have so far prevented UNIFIL from fulfilling all its tasks, the Force is actually performing an indispensable function in bringing calm to a sorely affected area and in reducing the active threat to international peace and security. For this reason, I have felt obliged to recommend a further extension of the mandate of UNIFIL. Taking into account both the political and practical factors concerned, I have recommended that the period of extension be for six months. The Lebanese Government fully agrees with this recommendation.

9. In my report, I have commented in some detail on the difficulties and the problems confronting UNIFIL, and there is no need to reiterate them here. I wish, however, to emphasize one point to which I attach special importance.

10. While recommending the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL, I have pointed out that UNIFIL cannot continue to function unless certain essential conditions are fulfilled. These essential conditions are, first, the establishment of an adequate security zone around Naqoura; secondly, the cessation of the harassment of the civilian population and of UNIFIL personnel by the *de facto* forces; thirdly, a change in the position of the Israeli authorities, without which no significant progress can be achieved; fourthly, the continued over-all co-operation of the Palestine Liberation Organization. The fulfilment of these conditions would enable UNIFIL to achieve a significant and steady rate of progress in fulfilling the tasks assigned to it by the Council. On the other hand, if these conditions cannot be met, there is no real possibility for the Force to complete the mandate entrusted to it by the Council. In such circumstances, it may well become necessary even to envisage the withdrawal of the Force before it has fulfilled its mandate, despite all the dangers that that would entail. I feel that I should make this clear, particularly because I do not consider it would be right to ask the troop-contributing countries and their contingents to continue indefinitely to bear their heavy and often dangerous burden, if the essential minimum conditions for the effective functioning of UNIFIL cannot be met.

11. If the Council decides to extend the mandate of UNIFIL, I hope that the members of the Council, and especially those in a position to bring influence to bear, will exert all possible efforts to achieve the objectives I have just outlined. I shall, of course, instruct the Force Commander, as well as the Chief Co-ordinator of the United Nations Peace-keeping Missions in the Middle East, to contact immediately all the parties concerned with the same end in view. I myself shall take every opportunity to facilitate progress in the right direction. Let me once again here express the hope that all the parties concerned will respond to these efforts and will extend to UNIFIL the co-operation and support that it requires.

12. I feel also obliged to mention the financial aspect of the UNIFIL operation. In the existing circumstances, it seems regrettably to be the fact that the troop-contributing countries cannot expect anything near the reimbursement to which they are entitled under the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. This is an unacceptable addition to the burden which those Governments already have to bear as a result of their voluntary participation in UNIFIL. I take this opportunity to appeal to the members of the Council, as well as to all Member Governments of the United Nations, to consider urgently the measures they can take to alleviate this burden.

13. In concluding, I wish to express once again my deep appreciation to all the commanders, officers and men of UNIFIL and to their civilian colleagues. All of them have carried out the important tasks entrusted to them by the Security Council with remarkable efficiency, dedication and courage. In this connexion, I wish to pay a special tribute to the memory of those soldiers who have died in the service of peace in Lebanon.

14. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The first speaker is the representative of Lebanon, on whom I now call.

15. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): There would have been no need for me to speak again in this debate, which we view as a continuation of the meeting held on 31 May [2146th meeting]. However, the publication of the Secretary-General's report of 8 June calls for some remarks, which I shall make very briefly, reiterating my hope that our discussions will remain pragmatic and calm and that we shall all try together to achieve concrete results, lest a further deterioration of the situation in Southern Lebanon really lead, in the very words of Mr. Waldheim, to an "active threat to international peace and security [S/13384, para. 4].

16. But first, Mr. President, in lieu of the conventional words addressed to the President on his assumption of the presidency of the Council, I should like, as a tribute to your foresight and perspicacity, to quote from your speech made before the Council 15 months ago, on 18 March 1978:

"The present act of open aggression has been dictated by Israel's desire to fulfil its age-old design: to occupy Southern Lebanon to destroy utterly the Palestine resistance movement. . . . It is becoming more and more obvious that Israel has elevated terror and the spreading of fear to the level of State policy. Israel's attacks on its neighbours under the pretext of strengthening its own security, its expansion under the pretext of seeking living space, the deprivation of a whole people or of whole peoples of their elementary rights. . . ." [2073rd meeting, paras. 37-38.]

17. The most elementary right which my country and my people now seek is that of peace—the right to live in peace, and liberty. And we cannot fail to remember with you, Mr. President, how much the Russian people have suffered through the ages from war, from destruction, from invasions and from terror. And though we may not be—and I say this very candidly—your country's closest allies in the Middle East, yet we strongly believe that you probably understand us best and have, in historical perspective, a

greater interest than many others and a greater stake in our independence and in the freedom without which we cannot survive either as a nation or as a system, a freedom which we have granted others as well as ourselves, confident that history will ultimately bring justice to those who suffer and sacrifice for human rights.

18. It is in this spirit that, with your permission Mr. President, I invite the members of the Council and all those interested to share with us the viewing of a documentary film on Southern Lebanon. It is the story of a village in the war, and we shall present it, with your permission and the Secretariat's co-operation, as an argument in support of our case for peace.

19. I should now like to address the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, not to express to him thanks or appreciation, which he hardly needs, but to tell him of the heartfelt sentiment of intellectual and moral comfort that his report inspires. Courage, displayed with such simplicity and realism—almost as a matter of fact—is what gives his analysis of the situation its greatest credibility and sense of urgency.

20. I should like, in the same simple terms, to emphasize the following conclusions—which Mr. Waldheim has, in fact, just re-emphasized in his statement—that I have reached from his reading of events: first, that the situation during the period under review has deteriorated rather than improved; secondly, that UNIFIL is encountering greater difficulties and is experiencing, as a result of attacks on it and of frustration, an erosion of authority and capabilities; thirdly, that the fulfilment of the mandate is contingent upon a basic change in the attitude of Israel; fourthly, that the international community, in response to Lebanon's fulfilment of its undertakings, has "an obligation to give a very high priority to assistance to the Lebanese Government in its efforts to restore its authority and sovereignty"; fifthly, that the Palestine Liberation Organization, despite certain incidents, is now more officially and practically committed to co-operating with UNIFIL and the Government of Lebanon in preserving peace and security in Southern Lebanon.

21. Dwelling for a moment on this last point, I ask the Council whether it is not strange indeed that the PLO communiqué announcing a most positive step, which we had all worked for, should have been saluted immediately, not by an Israeli response but by a breach of the cease-fire and a resumption of hostilities. Could it be that Israel does not even want the Palestinians to accept peace? I feel very gratified that, after a week now of intense shelling and air raids, the PLO has been relatively able to control itself and not to be trapped into escalating the war or transforming it, as was done once before, into a civil war with the Lebanese in which Israel can assist both, attack both, and prompt both to fight its war for it, vicariously—a terrible, horrible war of attrition—in the strangest triangular pattern ever seen.

22. To review all the facts and observations in the Secretary-General's report would be an abuse of the Council's time, as I am sure that report has already been carefully and thoroughly examined by all concerned. Adding to it

would be no less pretentious, for there is nothing to add that could be of equal significance. My final remark is therefore the following: in my presentation of 31 May I suggested that the Council should adopt an action-oriented resolution that would put an end to hostilities in Southern Lebanon by checking Israeli aggression, giving UNIFIL greater means to achieve success in the full implementation of its mandate and restoring the General Armistice Agreement of 1949, which was concluded in response to an injunction by the Security Council.

23. At this point I have no arguments to add in my plea for such a resolution save the fact that the Secretary-General's report makes it still more imperative than it appeared to be two or three weeks ago.

24. Many members of the Council, particularly those, such as the Government of the United States, which have invested tremendously in resolution 425 (1978) and in efforts at its implementation, have looked at our proposal with interest and support. The troop-contributing countries, to which Lebanon owes so much, will have to have a major share in deciding what course we should follow. Our other friends have all indicated their concern in one way or another.

25. Such a resolution, if and when adopted, should not be looked upon as just another resolution in the already long yet unproductive list of rhetorical condemnations. It will have to produce an immediate return to the cease-fire, which should in turn be conducive to a solution of the stalemate reported by the Secretary-General.

26. All this will require the full authority and co-operation of the Council as such and of all its members. For in such instances we view the Council not only as the supreme executive instrument of the world Organization but also as the only valid point of encounter for the Member States when they are genuinely interested in international peace and security.

27. To all members, therefore, I reiterate Lebanon's appeal for peace and my people's call for the right to live again free from terror and tragedy. Five years of war, of dispersion and destruction are more than enough. So give us back our land; for never shall we cede, nor forget, nor forgive.

28. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): Mr. President, I should like at the outset on behalf of the delegation of Kuwait to express to you warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of June. It is, I understand, a busy month, but your patience, skill, tolerance and experience are in my view formidable allies for us in ensuring success in the work of the Council this month. I pledge to you, Sir, our co-operation and our sincere dedication and, indeed, to some extent, our obedience. I wish you good luck.

29. I should also like to thank the outgoing President, the representative of Portugal, for his skilful handling of the proceedings of the Council in May. He worked hard behind the scenes, and we are all indebted to him.

30. The Secretary-General deserves a sincere tribute for the unflagging efforts he has been making since the creation of UNIFIL. We congratulate him on his report and, indeed, we entirely support his drive to fulfil the objectives of UNIFIL.

31. The performance of the Commander, the officers and soldiers of UNIFIL have captured our admiration. They are persons worthy of the responsibility that has been placed on their shoulders.

32. The delegation of Kuwait welcomes the presence of the new representative of Bolivia. He will no doubt maintain the same level of vigour Bolivia has so far displayed in the work of the Council.

33. My delegation learned with indignation, sadness and shock of the brutal assassination of David Sibeko, spokesman of justice, spokesman of the anti-apartheid movement, whom I had known for many years. This dastardly act shows the illusion colonial officials entertain. They think that by assassinating individuals, they will make the spirit and determination of peoples to resist oppression fade away. David Sibeko is yet another in a procession of martyrs sacrificed for human dignity.

34. The Council adopted its resolution 425 (1978) in March 1978, in the aftermath of an Israeli invasion of Southern Lebanon. When it adopted that resolution, it had two main goals in mind. The first was the restoration of Lebanese authority in Southern Lebanon; the second was the restoration of peace and security in the area. After 15 months, we have come back here, and members of the Council are indeed entitled to ask what has been restored of Lebanese authority in the south. Where is the peace and security resolution 425 (1978) was supposed to ensure? There is neither peace nor security.

35. Resolution 425 (1978) calls for the deployment of United Nations forces down to the internationally recognized boundaries between Lebanon and Israel. Where are those forces now? Why are they not deployed on the borders? Who prevents them? Which side blocks their deployment? The reports on the implementation of resolution 425 (1978) have always placed the blame on the negative attitude of the Government of Israel. It has blocked UNIFIL. It has undermined the discharge of its mandate. Opposition to UNIFIL's full deployment and resistance to the implementation of resolution 425 (1978) are well-known elements of the policy of the Government of Israel. Major Haddad would not have been in the south had it not been for the generous and unlimited support of Israel. The attitude of the Government of Israel to resolution 425 (1978) is, to put it mildly, one of defiance of the Council. Yet Israel gets away with it, because the Council has found itself engulfed and entangled in a situation in which options have become limited. Israel makes no bones about its support for the militia group in the south, and it unabashedly states that it has no intention of co-operating with UNIFIL for the full deployment of its troops in the south.

36. In paragraph 35 of his report, the Secretary-General states:

“Continued representations to the Israeli authorities have as yet failed to achieve the change of position

required for a significant improvement in the deployment of UNIFIL.”

There is in this sentence an unmistakable sense of anger caused by the Israeli attitude. In paragraph 42, the Secretary-General states:

“It goes without saying that a change in the position of the Israeli authorities is yet another prerequisite for significant progress.”

37. The Council is aware of the negative policy of Israel. The main obstacle to the full deployment of UNIFIL would immediately vanish once Israel extended a hand of co-operation to UNIFIL. That is the crux of the matter.

38. The Council's resolutions are challenged and the diplomatic efforts by some members have not yet succeeded. The power of persuasion, about which so much has been said here, has not worked with Israel and the Council finds itself a prisoner of the ugly and crude realities of politics.

39. What can the Council do, then? There is no hope for a sudden change of heart by Israel. Its opposition to UNIFIL's total deployment will continue and the militia group in the south will continue to be the tool for carrying out and implementing such opposition.

40. It is regrettable that the Lebanese Government is unable to restore its authority in the south, in its own country. Nevertheless, the Council should, without let-up, insist on the implementation of its resolutions.

41. The only glimmer of hope for the full deployment of UNIFIL in the south, as stipulated in resolution 425 (1978), lies in insistence on the full implementation of the Council resolution through the efforts of those who have leverage with Israel and through the contacts of the Secretary-General and his representatives in the area.

42. It is tragic that the first casualties of this policy of blocking UNIFIL are the innocent civilians who have left their homes and abodes and gone towards the north, looking for safety. *The New York Times* reported on 31 May that “Tyre was little more than a ghost town, with shops shuttered and streets deserted”.

43. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees appealed for half a million dollars to feed 40,000 persons displaced by Israeli attacks in Southern Lebanon. Thirty houses have been destroyed. These Palestinians have experienced displacement many times in their lives. The original sin was their displacement by Israel in 1948. Even in their dispersal, they are chased and gunned down.

44. The representative of Israel stated in the course of the debate in the Security Council on 31 May that Article 51 of the United Nations Charter gives his Government the right to strike at the Palestinian concentrations in Lebanon. He said:

“my Government is exercising its inherent right of self-defence, a right enjoyed by every sovereign State, a right

which has found expression also in Article 51 of the Charter" [2146th meeting, para. 50].

That bold misinterpretation of the Charter amounts to adding insult to injury. Israel, whose record in violating the Charter is almost unmatched, has no right to invoke Article 51 of the Charter. It is the Palestinians, more than any other people, who should seek protection in the Charter. Those who occupy the territory of others and claim it as their own should not expect the lawful owners of the land sheepishly to surrender their unquestioned rights. Where is the Palestinian homeland? What is left of it? The policy pursued by Israel of colonizing the West Bank and Gaza is well known to everybody in the world. On the basis of a strange and really undefinable claim brought out by the theologians and politicians, the West Bank and Gaza have suddenly, almost overnight, become part and parcel of the land of Israel. Palestinians, who are owners of the land, exist in their own country on sufferance, and Israel treats them as undesirable aliens in their own country.

45. Programmes for the establishment of Jewish settlements are pursued in frantic earnest. Water, which is the life-line of the Palestinians in the territory, is being diverted to supply the illegal Jewish settlements.

46. The world has not yet recovered from the shock triggered by the decision of the Israeli cabinet on 3 June to authorize the establishment of a Jewish settlement adjacent to Nablus. The fencing off of 200 acres immediately followed. This land was taken from defenceless Palestinians who have owned it for hundreds of years. The official spokesman of the United States, on whose political, military and economic support Israel is entirely dependent, said:

"The point most disturbing about the Israeli Cabinet's decision yesterday is that the establishment of new settlements is harmful to the peace process and it is particularly regrettable at this time, with negotiations just beginning."

According to a Jewish Telegraphic Agency report of 5 June, the State Department spokesman said that "the United States would not take any steps to prevent further settlements in the future, other than diplomatic between friends".

47. It is this ambivalent attitude of the United States that has encouraged Israel to defy the United Nations, its Charter and resolutions, and in many ways has pushed the Palestinians to despair.

48. It is inconceivable, in my view and in that of my delegation, that a permanent member of the Security Council, which has special responsibility for upholding the provisions of the Charter and ensuring respect for those provisions, provides Israel with all the assistance it needs—including, incidentally, money—for the establishment of these settlements, often described by United States officials as an obstacle to peace.

49. The Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Begin—whose experience in terrorism is, I would say, not very much less considerable—lost no time in answering his critics, including those from the United States. At the opening of the Herut Party's fourteenth national convention, he said: "Set-

tlement is a right and a duty. We have fulfilled and will continue to fulfil that right and that duty."

50. The Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, issued a statement in which he deplored the action by Israel. The indignation over Israel's action is world-wide. Yet the representative of Israel has the gall to pontificate on the right to self-defence. The most fundamental principles of the Charter are the right of peoples to self-determination, and the non-acquisition of territory by force. The Israeli representative conveniently overlooked them. So long as the territory of the Palestinians is being colonized, their land expropriated, their basic and elementary rights denied, their resources—including water—confiscated, they will continue their struggle for the achievement of their goals as defined in the Charter. It is they, and not the Israelis, who are upholding the tenets of international law which are so disingenuously invoked by the representative of Israel.

51. The UNIFIL problem arises from the fact that Israel is waging a campaign of genocide against the people of Palestine. It does not allow UNIFIL to be deployed on the borders because it is obsessed with the Palestine Liberation Organization, whose only objective is the termination of Israel's occupation of the West Bank and Gaza.

52. Violence by Israel will not leave the Palestinians forlorn and forsaken; on the contrary, it will sharpen and whet their appetite to fight even more tenaciously.

53. Palestinian withdrawal from the city of Tyre and from other villages in the south and the closing of the military offices in the area are constructive steps. They underscore the spirit of co-operation the PLO has been displaying since the arrival of UNIFIL. The Israeli answer to these gestures of goodwill and co-operation is the intensification of Israel's genocidal campaign against the Palestinians.

54. Bringing death upon civilians, Lebanese or Palestinian, will not end the resistance of the Palestinian people to occupation, as the invasion by Israel of Southern Lebanon has shown. Therefore, the Israeli strategy may wreak havoc on Southern Lebanon but it will not exterminate the Palestinians.

55. In this connexion, I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to a letter from Chairman Yasser Arafat of the PLO addressed to the Secretary-General. This letter has been published at my request as an official document. Chairman Arafat wrote the following:

"The war of annihilation which the aggressor Israeli authorities are waging against our people, our institutions and our camps is a crime punishable under international law and is taking place at this stage in this century in which all mankind, the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the principles of civilized nations have condemned such heinous crimes as are being perpetrated by the Israeli forces against us on land, by sea and by air." [See S/13379.]

56. We read with extreme indignation and anger about the acts of vandalism by Jewish fanatics against defenceless Palestinians in Hebron, when a group of gangsters raided

the houses of poor Palestinians, beat them up and destroyed their furniture. All these acts of defiance, be they committed by the Government of Israel or by Jewish vandals, are the result of the military occupation by Israel of the West Bank and Gaza.

57. It is the inability of the Security Council to take drastic measures against Israel in order to put an end to its occupation of Palestinian territory that has given rise to the present actions of Israel. Had the Council decisively confronted Israel, that situation would not have reached the present stage. The Lebanese Government comes to the Council with legitimate expectations. It expects from the Council the full implementation of resolutions 425 (1978) and 444 (1979). UNIFIL, with its limitations, cannot by itself ensure the attainment of such a goal. In the view of my delegation the Council should apply punitive measures against Israel so as to force it to comply with its resolutions. Israel banks mainly on the opposition of the United States to the application of sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. It is because of that opposition that the Council finds itself in the present morass. It is high time to take the Israeli bull by the horns. There is always a limit to patience. Those who expect Lebanon to settle for ice in wintertime are mistaken. The situation in the Middle East has proved beyond any doubt that the kid-glove treatment given to Israel is counter-productive. The Council, therefore, must throw down the gauntlet and act decisively.

58. Mr. HULINSKÝ (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): Permit me first of all to congratulate the representative of Portugal, Ambassador Futscher Pereira, who with outstanding diplomatic talent and authority discharged the functions of the President of the Security Council in May. The fact that he is a skilful and experienced diplomat is something that I have long known; but the fact that he is a connoisseur of Czech classical music is something which I only found out in the course of his term of office as President.

59. Mr. PRESIDENT, permit me also most cordially to salute you, a talented diplomat and outstanding diplomatic representative of the fraternal Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in your post as President of the Security Council for June. Only the other day the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, Mr. Kosygin, concluded a visit to Prague where he exchanged views with my Government on a wide range of questions of co-operation between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. Particular attention was focused on questions of intensifying socialist economic integration between our two countries, but the parties to the talks also expressed their views on a number of foreign policy issues, in particular a question that is closely linked to the item on the Council's agenda today: the question of the situation in the Middle East. In this regard, both parties, as was indicated in the communiqué issued at the end of the visit, expressed their solidarity with the Arab peoples which reject the separate deal concluded under the aegis of the United States between Egypt and Israel and reaffirmed their unswerving desire to achieve a just peace in the Middle East.

60. Since the last meetings of the Security Council and the adoption of the two statements of the President of the Council dated 26 April [2141st meeting] and 15 May [2144th

meeting], the situation in the area of activities of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), and indeed other parts of Lebanon, has continued to deteriorate. The reason is not far to seek. It lies in the incessant aggressive actions on the part of Israel against that country.

61. My delegation in the course of the unofficial consultations among the members of the Council supported the view of those countries which considered that the Council should take more decisive steps to call a halt to Israeli aggression. In this regard we drew attention to the passage contained in the memorandum of the Lebanese Government dated 30 May 1979, which states:

"The Lebanese Government believed that the time had come for the Council to choose between allowing Israel to continue escalating the so-called 'cycle of violence' or putting an end, forcefully and unhesitatingly, to a course of action that inevitably leads to a state of affairs wherein international peace and security will be most seriously imperilled, in the Middle East. . .". [S/13361, annex, para. 2.]

The experience of the latest informal consultations of the Council and the diplomatic efforts which have been made on this matter only serve to confirm the view of the Lebanese Government that:

"As there are no visible signs of any Israeli compliance with the Security Council's consensus, Lebanon can only express regret that precious time was lost." [Ibid., para. 3.]

62. The open acts of armed intrusion by Israel into Lebanese territory, the severe bombing of Lebanese towns and villages and also Palestinian refugee camps is only one link in the chain of conspiracy against Lebanon. Lebanese independence, its territorial integrity and sovereignty are threatened. What we are dealing with here is a deliberate plan both for the dismemberment of the Lebanese State and for the undermining of the Palestinian resistance movement.

63. The timing of the Israeli aggressive actions against Lebanon, symbolically enough, has coincided with the handshaking going on between the parties to the separate treaty between Cairo and Tel Aviv. But even without this gratuitous symbolism it is not difficult to see in the intensification of Israeli armed intervention in Lebanon and in the continuing refusal of the Israeli Government to comply with the resolutions of the Security Council a connexion and a direct relationship with that separate treaty.

64. Within the context of the item under discussion, concluding a separate peace in the Sinai Peninsula amounts to ensuring that the internal affairs of Lebanon and to create conditions for striking a blow against the Palestinian resistance movement. Their ultimate goal is obvious: it is to impose upon the Arab countries, one by one, conditions which could lead, *inter alia*, to abandonment of the idea of creating an independent Palestinian State.

65. The separate peace, signed by its authors in disregard of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly and in contradiction of the basic interests of the Arab peoples, only serves to exacerbate the situation in that area and seriously complicates and makes

even more remote the possibility of achieving a just and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict. Confirmation of this danger to peace and security is the present situation in Southern Lebanon.

66. The Czechoslovak delegation shares the concern of the Secretary-General over the situation in Southern Lebanon—concern which he expressed in his report on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), published on 19 April 1979 [S/13258]. The latest events in that area have once again confirmed the timeliness of the Secretary-General's remarks contained in paragraphs 26 and 27 of that report with regard to obstacles to the performance by UNIFIL of its mandate. The latest events in Lebanon have also fully confirmed that Israel's continuing refusal to comply with resolution 425 (1978) is the primary, nay the sole, reason for this explosive situation. Israel, in spite of the decisions of the Security Council, is continuing its direct military presence in Southern Lebanon and is openly using the border area as a spring-board for carrying out its uninterrupted concatenation of aggressive actions against that country. Furthermore, Israel is openly using for its purposes elements under the leadership of Major Haddad which represent an unprecedented threat to the United Nations Force in the performance of its task. Thus a situation is being created which is constantly causing fresh affliction to Lebanon and may lead "to a renewed and serious deterioration of the situation in the Middle East as a whole" [*ibid.*, para. 29].

67. At the present time, the Security Council agenda contains two items which are being discussed in tandem: first, the situation in Southern Lebanon in light of the continuing aggressive actions of Israel and, secondly, the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL in Lebanon. In spite of the interdependence of these two items, the Czechoslovak delegation shares the view of those members of the Council which have expressed their preference for the adoption of a separate resolution on each of these two items.

68. Israel's continuing aggressive actions are, as we have stated, a constituent part of the conspiracy against Lebanon, and the Security Council cannot, in our view, relegate discussion of the complaint of the Government of Lebanon and of this new situation, as it were, to a secondary level. In taking into account the conduct of Israel, the Council will only be able to arrive at a decision on the problems before it by the immediate adoption of effective measures under the Charter for the purpose of ensuring compliance with Security Council resolutions on Southern Lebanon.

69. With regard to the question of the UNIFIL mandate in Lebanon, taking into account the position of the Government of Lebanon, we will not object to its extension. However, for the record, we reaffirm the Czechoslovak position and reservations with regard to the Force, as set forth by my delegation at the meetings of the Security Council on the question on 19 March [2074th meeting], 3 May [2076th meeting] and 18 September 1978 [2085th meeting], as well as on 19 January 1979 [2113th meeting].

70. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I thank the representative of Czechoslovakia for his kind words about my country and about me personally. For my

part, I should like to express my deep satisfaction at the fraternal relations existing between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union.

71. The next speaker is the representative of Israel, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

72. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Sir, at the outset let me join with previous speakers by paying my respects to you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. We trust that you will conduct the Council's business with skill, propriety and impartiality.

73. I should also like to take this opportunity of reiterating the words of appreciation which I addressed at the previous meeting to the representative of Portugal for the exemplary manner in which he carried out his duties as President of the Council last month.

74. The principal business before the Council today is the renewal of the UNIFIL mandate, which expires on 19 June 1979.

75. Resolution 425 (1978), which established UNIFIL, took cognizance of the fundamental problems of Lebanon which extend throughout the length and breadth of that troubled country. However, there was a built-in contradiction between that recognition and the UNIFIL mandate, which was limited in scope and confined to the south of Lebanon. The UNIFIL area of operation was further constricted in practice by the terrorist PLO, which prevented by force of arms UNIFIL's entry into the Tyre pocket. The PLO weakened UNIFIL's effectiveness still further by infiltrating several hundred of its terrorists into the area under UNIFIL control and also by challenging it directly, with growing intensity in recent months, as was noted also by the Secretary-General in his statement to the Council on 31 May [2146th meeting], and again in his report of 8 June [S/13384].

76. None the less, most of us would agree that UNIFIL fulfils a useful function and Israel will continue to cooperate with the Force. Israel appreciates the efforts made by the officers and men of UNIFIL, who are serving in the most trying of conditions, and hopes that the outstanding problems will be solved in the near future to the satisfaction of those directly and legitimately concerned.

77. It is, therefore, a matter for regret that the representative of Kuwait should have expressed himself this afternoon in such unconstructive terms, engaging in diversionary tactics by introducing issues totally extraneous to the matters here under discussion. In so doing, he confirmed once again that he is the undisguised spokesman in the Council of the rejectionist Arab States, unable to let pass any opportunity to continue the political warfare against peace in the Middle East. Perhaps the only thing that can be said to the credit of the Kuwaiti representative is that he is reflecting faithfully the position held by his Government ever since it was one of the few countries in the world to reject Security Council resolution 242 (1967). Everything that Kuwait has done and is doing with relation to Israel, however disguised in the Security Council and elsewhere, flows from this consistent position.

78. On previous occasions the representative of Kuwait has claimed that he is not a partisan of the Arab States, but a partisan of the Charter. As such, he might have been expected to be familiar with Article 23, paragraph 1, defining the criteria for eligibility of non-permanent members for election to the Council. That Article provides that due regard should be specially paid:

"in the first instance to the contribution of Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the Organization".

79. Having regard to that provision, the record of Kuwait and of the group of States it represents scarcely qualifies it for membership in the Council. Over the past 30 years that group of Arab States has violated, with regard to Israel, every purpose and principle of the Charter. In this respect, they have ignored, *inter alia*, Article 2, paragraph 1 of the Charter—that is, the principle of the sovereign equality of all Members of the Organization; Article 2, paragraph 3, which lays down the duty of States to settle their international disputes by peaceful means; and Article 2, paragraph 4, which prohibits the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State.

80. More recently, in a letter of 29 May from the Chairman of the Arab Group to the Secretary-General, issued as document S/13354, those Arab States have in effect issued a formal declaration of war on the first step towards a comprehensive peace between Israel and its Arab neighbours. One can safely assume that the presence of Kuwait on the Council will be put forcefully at the disposal of that rejectionist position and it will prevent, as it has in the past prevented, the adoption of any resolution unacceptable to the Arab States concerned.

81. As a self-proclaimed partisan of the Charter, the representative of Kuwait is also no doubt aware that under Article 7, paragraph 3 he is bound to refrain from voting on any matter connected with the Arab-Israel conflict—a dispute to which his country is party—unless, of course, it is proved that Kuwait is no longer a party to that conflict. And yet, the representative of Kuwait comes here as a self-proclaimed partisan of the Charter and all it stands for.

82. The crucial question before the Council in the present context is whether once and for all the use of Lebanese territory for acts of aggression against Israel will be ended and to what extent UNIFIL will be instrumental in that. In that context, attention has been drawn to the "reaffirmation" of the terrorist PLO of its so-called commitment not to initiate any action from inside the UNIFIL area of operation and not to shell Israel Defence Forces or the local Lebanese forces in the south from Lebanese territory "unless they are attacked first" as the Secretary-General's report has it [*ibid.*, para. 38].

83. Members of the Council should not be hoodwinked. This so-called commitment is carefully phrased so as not to apply to civilians, the traditional and almost exclusive target of PLO barbarity. Moreover, the PLO has never honoured such a "commitment", and indeed was in the process of violating it in South Lebanon at precisely the same time as it

was supposedly "reaffirming it" through United Nations channels at Beirut. On the night of 4 to 5 June, PLO terrorists made an unprovoked attack on the village of Bint Jebel in the Irish sector of the UNIFIL area of operation. Then, on the morning of 8 June, the very day that the Secretary-General's report was being prepared, PLO terrorists attacked Lebanese militiamen near the village of Taibe. They were beaten off, leaving behind arms and bazooka rockets. A group belonging to the so-called Popular Front—a constituent of the PLO—has boasted of its responsibility for both those incidents.

84. Moreover, on 8 June, there was an attempt at infiltration at Ras al-Beide in the western sector of the UNIFIL area of operation. On 9 June, UNIFIL apprehended a truck full of PLO terrorists, once again in the western sector of its area of operation. On 11 June, three PLO terrorists were caught by soldiers of Fiji and three others by Dutch soldiers. All six were taken out of the UNIFIL area and conveyed to the Tyre pocket.

85. As if this were not enough with regard to the UNIFIL area of operation, the PLO has also broken its so-called commitment not to initiate hostilities across the border, for, again on 8 June, it shelled civilian targets in northern Galilee.

86. All this corroborates the notice I gave the Council in my statement on 31 May, when I mentioned that lately Israel had received information from reliable sources that a decision had been taken to step up violence by the terrorist PLO in Southern Lebanon.

87. Mention has also been made of a joint communiqué, issued by the PLO and certain Lebanese groups allied with it, to the effect that "all armed forces will be evacuated from villages and towns" in Southern Lebanon and "the PLO will remove all of its offices from the city of Tyre" [*ibid.*].

88. The practical implications of that communiqué are virtually meaningless, and there can be little doubt that the communiqué will serve as a smoke-screen for continued PLO violence both within the UNIFIL area of operation and across the border with Israel.

89. The communiqué is not the first one of its kind and, as with the PLO so-called renewed commitment which I have just discussed, it will not be the first to be totally ignored by the its authors. Even if it is implemented, all that will happen is that some PLO operatives will be redeployed at a distance of a few kilometres from the villages in which they have taken cover thus far apparently under pressure from the local inhabitants themselves, who are no longer prepared to put up with the devastation and agony inflicted on them by the terrorist PLO. Also, as the communiqué makes clear, there is no intention of removing the hundreds of PLO terrorists located inside the area controlled by UNIFIL or to withdraw the 1,500 or so PLO terrorists and their weaponry from the Tyre pocket, which reaches to within eight miles of Israel. In short, the communiqué is nothing more than a transparent exercise in deception.

90. I feel bound to refer at this point to another attempt at diversion carried out with a view to making political capital by confusing the issues. I have in mind the misleading

references to the Israeli-Lebanese General Armistice Agreement of 1949, contained in the Lebanese memorandum [S/1336], an agreement that was drawn to the attention of members by the Lebanese representative in his statement before the Council on 31 May.

91. The sudden interest of the Lebanese representative in that armistice agreement and his professed attachment to it at this late stage rings hollow, to say the least. The Lebanese representative surely does not believe that the Council's memory is so short or its members so ill-informed that they are not aware of the fact that in 1967 the Government of Lebanon renounced the Armistice Agreement with Israel.

92. As members will recall, on 8 June 1967, the third day of the Arab-Israel war, the Israel representative on the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission requested at Rosh Hanikra a meeting with the Lebanese representative within the framework of the Commission. The Lebanese reply was that Lebanon would not agree to such a meeting "in view of the state of war". That position was consonant with that taken by the Foreign Minister of Lebanon in this very chamber on 30 May 1967 when he expressed unlimited support for the acts of war being committed against Israel and announced that

"The Government and people of Lebanon would fulfil their commitments under the charter of the League of Arab States and the Arab Treaty of Mutual Defence." [1344th meeting, para. 19.]

93. Not only did Lebanon declare that it was in a state of war with Israel but it also took active part in the war by sending its aircraft to bomb Israeli territory. Thus, by these declarations and actions, the Government of Lebanon made it clear that it considered that the Armistice Agreement had come to an end.

94. There are fundamental facts which cannot be side-stepped or distorted in any circumstances or in any context. The Israeli-Lebanese General Armistice Agreement of 23 March 1949 was a bilateral instrument between our two countries, which were the only parties to it. It is totally inadmissible for the Lebanese representative to try, as he did in his aforementioned memorandum, to make others party to it.

95. Moreover, the essence of the Israeli-Lebanese Armistice Agreement was a commitment to putting an end to all hostilities and acts of aggression between Israel and Lebanon. This was summed up in article III of the Agreement, which *inter alia* prohibited terrorists from operating on or from the territories of both parties. Paragraph 2 of that article laid down that no "para-military forces", including "non-regular forces"

"shall commit any warlike or hostile act against the military or para-military forces of the other Party, or against civilians in territory under the control of that Party".¹

96. That obligation under the Armistice Agreement was merely a reiteration of the fundamental obligation of all

¹ Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 4.

States under general international law to prevent the use of their territory for acts of aggression against another State.

97. Lebanon has for years—and not just since the massive entry of the PLO into its territory in the early 1970s—ignored those obligations flowing from both the Armistice Agreement and general international law. As long as those fundamental obligations are not respected—and assurances are not forthcoming that they will be respected—reference to the Armistice Agreement and the frameworks established under it can scarcely be meaningful.

98. The position of Israel vis-à-vis Lebanon remains unchanged. Israel supports the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries.

99. Moreover, despite Lebanon's ongoing problems and their complexity, Israel believes that the time has none the less come to exert all efforts to move towards a negotiated peace between Israel and Lebanon. In keeping with this primary objective of Israel's foreign policy, Prime Minister Begin in the Knesset on 7 May 1979 addressed a direct appeal to the President of Lebanon, inviting him to a meeting with a view to reaching a negotiated peace treaty between Israel and Lebanon.

100. On 31 May 1979, in this chamber, I drew the attention of the Lebanese representative to that proposal to make peace. The Government of Israel still awaits the response of Lebanon to that proposal.

101. I reserve the right to participate again in this debate at a later stage.

102. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): Mr. President, I regret that the representative of Israel should have left the table. I should have liked him to continue sitting here and listen, instead of employing the tactics of hit-and-run. Israel can employ those tactics in Lebanon but not here in the Council.

103. It is always the habit of Israeli official circles to quote biblical sources and religious documents. I have brought the Koran with me—in English—and I should like, by way of introduction to my remarks, to read out the following excerpt from it:

"He"—meaning God—"will enrich them from his own abundance. As for those who are scornful and proud, He will sternly punish them and they shall find none besides Allah to protect them."

That is taken from the *Penguin Classics* translation of the Koran, on page 384.

104. Now it has been stated that Israel is willing to support the UNIFIL mandate. First, let me say the following—perhaps it is easier to refer the representative of Israel to the report of the Secretary-General in which he has said:

"Continued representations to the Israeli authorities have as yet failed to achieve the change of position required for a significant improvement in the deployment of UNIFIL." [S/13384, para. 35.]

In paragraph 42 of the same document, which we are now considering, the Secretary-General, says:

"It goes without saying that a change in the position of the Israeli authorities is yet another prerequisite for significant progress."

105. That is not new. In our debate of December 1978—and even before that—I addressed two questions to the representative of Israel as to whether Israel was willing to co-operate with the United Nations and whether it was willing to co-operate with UNIFIL, in particular, for the full deployment of the UNIFIL troops. He did not answer my questions. The two questions are therefore still valid. It is in Israel's hands to achieve the successful attainment of the UNIFIL objective. He has brushed them aside; that is his right and prerogative.

106. The representative of Israel accused me of interjecting into the Council debate extraneous elements about Jewish settlements and so on. It is not my nature to depart from the item on the agenda; it is the nature of representatives of Israel—not only of the present one but also of those who were here in the United Nations before him—to depart from instead of concentrating on and confronting the issue and to bring in extraneous elements. I never do that.

107. What is at stake here? Of what is UNIFIL's inability to bring about the full deployment of its forces on the internationally recognized borders between Israel and Lebanon a consequence? Of occupation.

108. Mr. Begin, as reported today in *The New York Times*, has said "we shall pay no attention" to criticism about the recent decision of the Government of Israel to establish Jewish settlements close to Nablus in the heart of Palestinian territory. The article continues: "Mr Begin said Israel has a right to build settlements in the West Bank and Gaza Strip 'since this is our land'." That is the crux of the matter. UNIFIL is a casualty of this concept of Zionism: that the West Bank and Gaza is the land of Israel. I do not know what kind of "land" it is that Mr. Begin can claim it to be his. I do not like to take part in an acrimonious debate, but it is my understanding and that of the international community that that is Palestinian territory occupied by force since 1967.

109. Ambassador Blum always gives us what I would call prosaic and pastoral dissertations on international law. The first tenet of international law is that it proscribes, prohibits and is against the occupation of other people's territory by force. Is this occupation really in line with international law? Is the building of Jewish settlements in line with international law? What about the Charter which underscores and reaffirms that the non-acquisition of territory by force is one of its sacred tenets? Is that respected by Israel or its representative who pontificates here on the tenets and nature of international law?

110. I should also like to remind members of the Council of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Incidentally, Israel is a party to those two international covenants. Both those covenants begin with the same sentence to the effect that all peoples have the right to self-determination. That is the crux of the matter.

111. Haddad, who is no friend of mine, is a product of this anachronistic situation. UNIFIL's powerlessness is also a result of it. But what is really the crux of the matter is this genocidal campaign against the Palestinian people, this denial of their basic, elementary and primordial human right to self-determination and to live in peace in their own territory in the West Bank and Gaza.

112. Mr. Begin now says that the land is theirs and that they want coexistence. Mr. Dayan has said that he wants coexistence with the Palestinians. That is fair and square if he wants coexistence. But coexistence, not on the West Bank and Gaza only; there should be coexistence all over the land of Palestine, a land in which all peoples, regardless of their faith, religion or creed, should live and coexist; not only in the West Bank and Nablus where they expropriate the lands of those defenceless, poor Palestinians who have no way of defending their rights and who are being subjected to humiliations, insults and, should they open their mouths, deportation and consignment to the camps of thirst and hunger. That is really the crux of the matter.

113. The UNIFIL situation is a casualty, a consequence, a result and a by-product of the whole unacceptable malaise of the situation in the Middle East. The Secretary-General is correct in saying that it is part and parcel of the whole situation.

114. The representative of Israel said I am the spokesman of those who are complicating the peace process. Sometimes it seems to me that we are treated as though we were children in this Council chamber. Who is really complicating the peace process—those who speak here in line with the tenets of the Charter, or those who occupy the territory of Palestine, those who expropriate the lands of poor Palestinian farmers, those who claim the land as theirs, although according to international law, facts and truth the land belongs to the Palestinians? Sometimes I feel as though we were engaged in a wild-goose chase over the whole matter. Where are we heading? It is a pity that the Council should be subjected to this futile linguistic exercise.

115. We are not really here for acrimony and polemics. We are here for the promotion of UNIFIL's success. We are here for the promotion of peace. But how can we achieve peace when the bases of peace, the structure, the edifice of peace which is respect for human rights, respect for the rights of self-determination for the Palestinian people and respect for the principle of withdrawal from territories occupied by force are being mutilated?

116. Yet the representative of Israel comes here and accuses us of complicating the peace process. That is not in line with what we want; that is in line with the mentality of his Prime Minister.

117. I am sorry that when today I read *The New York Times* I was shocked. I am a student of Shakespeare, and the first thing that came to my mind was that the statement of Prime Minister Begin was reminiscent of King Lear in the last act of the play of that name. It was totally irresponsible and imperious. It was total lunacy without any regard to reason or to civilized behaviour. It was reminiscent of King Lear in the play's last act. I am sorry to have to say this, but we cannot produce a King Lear in the last half of the

twentieth century. We do not want to have anyone like King Lear in this world. That is the whole problem. It is amazing that at this juncture when all peoples are drawing closer to one another and heading for co-operation and in view of what we say here on the concept of interdependence, all of a sudden in the second half of the twentieth century a King Lear emerges. Really, it hurts me to draw this analogy with King Lear, but this is what came to my mind. That was how King Lear behaved when he was trying to distribute his wealth among his three daughters—in total irrationality and irresponsibility and in complete disregard of all human values.

118. I really sympathize with the representative of Israel because he has to defend the indefensible. Yet we are here subjected to this endless verbiage, which will not lead us anywhere. I recognize that UNIFIL is only an exercise in futility so long as the Government of Israel fails to display sincerity or to co-operate. We are not interested in engaging in a wild-goose chase. We are interested in the promotion and success of UNIFIL.

119. My last point is about this campaign against the Palestinian people. I am not Palestinian. But if I were a Palestinian, I would hold aloft the banner of terrorism and be proud of it. When people feel they are cornered and consigned to poverty and degradation and to denial and subjugation, in despair they can only resort to terrorism—and, by the way, the Israelis have no right to speak about terrorism. I do not like to speak bad English, but we know about the pot calling the kettle black. I shall not go on about this. It is unfair to call the Palestinians "terrorists". After all, Mr. Begin is no saint.

120. When I see the representative of the PLO sitting there modestly and humbly—and it is he who is a product of the soil of Palestine, not these spokesmen of the Israeli delegation—I sympathize with him. The product of the soil of Palestine cannot return to his own country, while foreigners, aliens can go there. I do not know where they come from; I have not really researched their origins. I have no interest in that. I never indulge in personal issues. But we read in *The New York Times* that seven Americans who attacked these poor Palestinians the other day were arrested, and the Defence Minister of Israel, Mr. Weizman, displayed a sort of kindness to them saying "We apologize" or something to that effect. Seven Americans attacked these poor Palestinians in their own country and burned their furniture, and yet we hear of the terrorism of these Palestinians. In what part of the world are we living? If this is a global picture of the world, then I suppose that we shall have to bid civilization good-bye. This is the problem that is confronting us. It is not really one of introducing extraneous elements or of speaking about complicating the peace. The crux of the matter is the survival of the poor Palestinians. Where are they to go from their land? They cannot go back, while they see and read about these American citizens who fly in and overnight claim citizenship in Palestine and go to Nablus and take over the territory, the homes and the abodes of the poor Palestinians, who are thrown out. This is the situation.

121. What is this? This is really a Broadway comedy. Sometimes it reminds me of James Bond stories, but that is the nature of the problem. And yet we are subjected to

dissertations, pontification and unwelcome lamentations about international law and civilized behaviour. This is not the way to confront the problem. If Israel wants to live in peace, well, the provisions of the Charter are clear. They call for the non-acquisition of territory by force, and for the right of people to self-determination. After all, Israel subscribed to the Charter and to the two international covenants I cited earlier. And yet we are subjected here to this unwelcome complaint about extraneous elements and so on. That is all I wanted to say at this juncture.

122. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya containing a request that he 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 that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

123. I invite the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

124. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya): Mr. President, I should like at the outset to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. My delegation has had ample opportunity to witness your skill and wisdom, and we are confident that with these abilities you will successfully guide the affairs of the Council.

125. I also take the opportunity to commend your predecessor in that high post, Mr. Vasco Futscher Pereira of Portugal, who skilfully and successfully guided the work of the Council last month.

126. The issue before the Council is clear. A sovereign State and Member of the United Nations has been subjected to flagrant acts of aggression committed on a daily basis by the racist Zionist régime. Parts of the land of Lebanon continue to be occupied by Zionist military forces both directly and indirectly through their agents. Villages, towns and refugee camps have been subjected daily to indiscriminate bombardment by aircraft, heavy artillery, ground missiles and warships. The Zionist military forces continue to obstruct the work of the United Nations forces and the implementation of the resolutions of the Council.

127. During the last few weeks we have witnessed the escalation by Israel of its criminal attacks in Lebanon that are aimed at the civilian population. We are informed by Zionist statements and press reports that this policy of aggression will be further escalated in the future. The Tel Aviv daily, *Ha'aretz*, reported on 31 May that a new policy of daily attacks on Lebanon had been adopted and that those attacks might be escalated in the future into wider and deeper raids than the Litani invasion that took place in March 1978.

128. The Zionist military spokesman has been saying after every raid on Lebanon in recent weeks that:

"The raid was carried out in accordance with the policy adopted by Israel to strike at any time and any place in Lebanon it deems it proper."

129. On 18 May, the Zionist forces raided farmers' buildings in the Adloun area, north of the Litani river—a raid which was described by the Israeli press on 21 May as:

“another look at the chain of selective strikes at Palestinian targets, and from this aspect it is part of the war of attrition that the Israeli Defence Forces began against the Palestinian organizations without any connexion to Palestinian acts or reprisal for them”.

130. The Zionist representative cannot convince anyone here by his statements that these barbaric acts of aggression are a result of Palestinian acts of resistance or that they are directed in self-defence against military targets in Lebanon, or by attempts to put the blame on others. His statements are contradicted by the military spokesman of his régime. They are obviously contradicted by statements of members of the Begin cabinet. On 16 February 1979 the General and Minister Ariel Sharon told the Israeli radio, “I have always maintained that a war of annihilation must be waged at all times against Yasser Arafat and the PLO”—meaning against the Palestinian people and the Lebanese people.

131. In May 1978, Mordechai Gur, the Israeli Chief of Staff in charge of the invasion of Southern Lebanon in March 1978, gave a frank interview to the Israeli press. That interview was very important and, in fact, very shocking in its arrogance, to the extent that Gur admitted committing war crimes against the civilian population in Southern Lebanon and elsewhere.

132. With the Council's permission I should like to read some excerpts from that terrifying interview with the former Israeli Chief of Staff following the invasion on March 1978 of Lebanon, in which he personally took command. The interview was given by General Gur to the daily *AlHamishmar* on 14 May 1978. Excerpts were reprinted and commented on in the weekly *Haolam Hazi* on 23 May 1978. When asked by the reporters whether he had ordered the army to harm the civilian population, General Gur answered:

“How come this population become all of a sudden so noble? They knew what the terrorists were doing. They helped them before and after the operation and received them as heroes.”

Question: “Your argument is that this population had to be punished?”

Gur: “Like all others, I did not doubt this for one moment.”

Question: “In your instructions to the Israel Defence Forces, you did not ask them to distinguish between the population and the men we want to harm?”

Gur: “I do not lie to myself. I gave this order to all the army. When I give an order to the Israel Defence Forces to enter into a populated area, and when I authorize a doctrine of fire, I know what I am doing. When I ordered Yanush (Commander-in-Chief of the northern zone, Avigdor Ben Gal) to use planes, artillery and tanks, I knew what I was doing. When I told Yanush, ‘Move tanks into Maroun El-Ras as quickly as possible and shell the village from a distance before our men arrive and engage in a face-to-face battle’, I did know what I was doing. I was the one who gave that order.”

That is a clear admission that the Chief of Staff gave a clear order to shell and bombard the civilian population in the villages and towns of Southern Lebanon. As was known to the world, thousands of those civilians were killed and wounded. Tens of thousands became refugees. Their houses and properties were destroyed. Were these Israeli war crimes limited to that area and to the invasion? “No,” admitted General Gur. He said:

“It does not help to be a nice person. When I served as Commander of the northern zone, I shelled and bombarded them for two and a half years.”

Question: “With no distinction?”

Gur: “What distinction? and what did the civilians of Irbid (northern Jordan) do to us when I shelled and bombarded it? The Israel Defence Forces keep two fighter jets in the sky. They shoot, we bombard.”

Question: “But the statements of the military spokesmen always spoke of returning fire and hitting terrorist targets?”

To that question, General Gur had a cynical answer of two words: “Oh, really . . .”. In replying to another question, the General went on to say: “for 30 years, we have been fighting against a population which is living in villages and towns”.

133. In the Israeli weekly, *Haolam Hazi* of 24 May 1978, Uri Avneri commented on that interview with General Gur. He said:

“Now it appears that for 30 years the Israeli Governments and the Israel Defence Forces authorities have lied not only to the whole world but also to the Israeli public on whose behalf they acted.”

Avneri added:

“It is possible to assume that most of the population in Southern Lebanon sympathizes with the Palestinian cause and with the PLO men. It is possible that they embraced these men as heroes and helped them. But according to international law this does not justify massive attacks on this population and, of course, not punishment like all the others.”

Avneri went on to say:

“In Nuremberg, Germany officers were brought to trial because they killed civilian hostages in France. It did not help them to claim that the civilian population was hostile to them and supportive of the French underground against the Germans. Those officers were sentenced to death and executed.”

134. The Zionist representative cannot deny these facts; I challenge him to do so. Nor can he justify to the Council these acts of mass murder and these war crimes admitted to by a Chief of Staff of the Israeli army who led the largest invasion so far against Lebanon. Such acts are still going on today, and they will continue tomorrow.

135. If every one who supports the Palestinian cause is considered by the Zionist military authorities to be a military target who must be punished by being murdered and by having his house and property bombarded, then we can

assume that the entire Arab nation is a military target of the fascist Zionist army. Anyone or any institution in the world that expresses sympathy for the Palestinian cause can become a military target, according to this Nazi Zionist principle.

136. Is it a crime to support a people that was expelled from its homeland, whose homes and lands were usurped, whose rights have been denied, whose physical existence is being attacked? Is it a crime punishable by mass murder and total destruction to give refuge to a people that is waging a legitimate struggle against the occupiers of its homeland?

137. The Palestinians are in Lebanon and in other Arab countries not because they chose to be there but because the Zionist fascists forced them to be there and denied them their inalienable right to live as a free people in their own country, Palestine. They have a legitimate right to struggle in order to live in peace as a free and independent people in their own country, and they have every right to be supported by all the peace-loving and freedom-loving peoples of the world.

138. There is a clear link in the Zionist mind between the escalation of Zionist aggression against Lebanon and against the Palestinian people in and outside Palestine, on the one hand, and the so-called peace treaty signed some weeks ago, on the other.

139. Former Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin wrote in the Tel Aviv *Yedeot Ahronot* on 11 May that "the Egyptian-Israeli treaty increased Israel's freedom of action in Lebanon". It was made clear that the Zionist régime is using the treaty in order to put pressure on other Arab countries to make them surrender to the Zionist régime's imperialist schemes. That régime is attempting to liquidate the forces of resistance, with the aim of subjugating the Palestinian people and the whole Arab nation. The barbaric attacks on Lebanon, as well as the criminal methods used against the Palestinian people in the occupied West Bank and Gaza, are part of an over-all evil policy of subjugating the area under the Zionists and their imperialist allies and masters.

140. That policy is conducted under the cover of negotiations on the so-called autonomy plan for the Palestinians in the occupied territories—and even the American press has begun to doubt the goals and aims of that plan, in view of the Zionist actions.

Anthony Lewis of *The New York Times* wrote on 4 June:

"The testing-ground of whether the treaty can set a general pattern for peace is the West Bank, and there Israeli actions have lately been so unrestrained as to seem almost provocative. It is as if Israel were trying to show that the peace treaty gave it carte blanche to settle and permanently subjugate the West Bank."

141. This cynical trick which is called "autonomy plan" in the West Bank and Gaza is as cynical as the Zionist trick of "Major Haddad" in Southern Lebanon. Through these so-called *de facto* forces, the Zionist régime is carrying out its Hitlerite methods of occupation, expansion and eviction.

142. The Zionist press has admitted that the Haddad occupation of parts of Southern Lebanon is simply other

language for Israeli occupation. On 23 March 1978, *Haolam Hazi* wrote the following about the Haddad force: "This force was created by Israel. It acts according to Israeli instructions and it serves the Israeli interests." It is clear that when the Zionist authorities handed over this area to the so-called *de facto* forces, they in fact kept the area under their own occupation.

143. Under the cover of this cynical trick, the so-called autonomy plan, crimes against humanity are being committed by the Zionist fascists against the Palestinian Arabs in the occupied territories. The plan itself is worst than an insult to every self-respecting human being. Joseph C. Harsch said in *The Christian Science Monitor* on 29 May last that the plan "would, in effect, give the Arabs less self-rule than American Indian tribes enjoyed even during the worst days of white exploitation".

144. Civilians of the villages and towns in these occupied lands are being subjected to the worst kind of occupation, indeed to barbaric occupation. Cultivated land is being confiscated. Houses are being bulldozed. People are being arrested, killed in the streets, attacked in their homes. Round-the-clock curfews are enforced in the villages, towns and refugee camps. Farms and vineyards are destroyed. Universities and schools are forced to close. According to the 20 May 1979 issue of *The Washington Post*, the director for West Bank operations of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees in the Near East described those atrocities in this way: "Now the policy seems to be to impose long-term collective punishment for the actions of a few."

145. The policy of colonization and the building of settlements on confiscated Arab lands has been intensified. On 7 June, like thieves under the cover of night, using army helicopters, the Zionists built a new civilian colony on the hills overlooking the Arab town of Nablus, which has a population of over 50,000 Palestinians. By officially approving that colony, which is one in a long list of planned colonies in heavily populated areas, the Begin Government has proved that it is in full agreement with vigilantes like Rabbi Meir Kahane, who, according to the 21 May issue of *The Washington Post*, proposed "that all the 700,000 Arabs in the West Bank be expelled by force". The Begin Government has proved that it is in agreement also with Rabbi Moshe Levinger, who said, according to the same paper: "Judaea and Samaria" that is, the West Bank "are not needed for security. God gave it to us."

146. That policy is carried out in accordance with the old racist Zionist claim—a false claim—that Palestine was "a land without a people for a people without land". According to the racist Zionist ideology, the Arab Palestinian people are a non-existing people. The aim of the Zionists is to establish an exclusively racist Jewish State, which continues to liquidate the Palestinian people, Moslems and Christians.

147. The Zionist entity is by its character and ideology a racist, expansionist entity. Unless that racist and expansionist character is relinquished, peace will not be achieved in the area.

148. We have again and again noted with regret that this Zionist aggression and Zionist actions against peace in the area are encouraged by the unlimited, illogical and unjustified support the Zionist entity receives from the United States. The attitude of the United States establishment, which is in support of the Zionists and against the interests of the American people in the long run can only harm the cause of peace in the Middle East.

149. The continued Zionist occupation and the brutal Zionist attacks with modern United States arms and cluster bombs against the Lebanese and Palestinian civilian population and against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon constitute a grave threat to international peace and security in the area and in the world.

150. Those Zionist acts of aggression must be strongly condemned. Those continued crimes of war must not be allowed to go on unpunished. The Security Council must bear the responsibility for taking the necessary measures immediately to put a stop to those serious acts of aggression including the application of sanctions as provided by the Charter.

151. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

152. Mr. ABDEL RAHMAN (Palestine Liberation Organization): Mr. President, since this is the first time that I have spoken during your presidency allow me to congratulate you on your assumption to the presidency of the Council for this month. We are confident that under your wise and skilful guidance the business of the Council will be fruitful and productive.

153. In reference to the situation in Lebanon, the position of the Palestine Liberation Organization is very clear. As has been reiterated time and again before the Council and on every other opportunity that we have had to express ourselves, we are for the territorial integrity of Lebanon, we are for the national unity of Lebanon, and we respect the sovereignty of Lebanon.

154. So far as UNIFIL is concerned, the recent report of the Secretary-General is as clear in that regard as previous reports of the Secretary-General have been; the position of the PLO is one of full co-operation with UNIFIL in order to allow it to implement its mandate.

155. The PLO and the national Lebanese movement adopted a declaration a week ago wherein they made gestures, reflected in concrete actions, to facilitate the work of UNIFIL and to accommodate the Lebanese Government. Among the essential points made in that declaration is the fact that the PLO declared it would withdraw all resistance forces from the city of Tyre and would withdraw all armed forces from villages and towns in Southern Lebanon. That is in addition to other elements of that declaration which are directed specifically to alleviating the situation of the people living in South Lebanon.

156. What was the response of the Israeli Zionists to the declaration? Further brutal and cowardly attacks on con-

centrations of Lebanese as well as Palestinians. I say "cowardly" because it cannot conceivably be heroic for anyone to fly a plane 10,000 feet above a defenceless civilian population and drop bombs on them to kill them. That is not an act of heroism and therefore it should be described as it really is, an act of cowardly murder against the civilian Palestinian and Lebanese populations.

157. The PLO has part of its headquarters in Lebanon. That is not because the PLO moved into Lebanon and created refugee camps around it. It is logical that people in exile in refugee camps should be able to use men and women who fight for justice. We did not gather the Palestinians around our offices, we grew out of the Palestinian refugee camps. There is no shame in starting a revolution from outside, especially if one is expelled from one's home and property and finds oneself forced to live in exile. General de Gaulle did not fight the Nazis from inside France, he conducted his war of liberation against the Nazis from outside France. Other national liberation movements such as those of our brothers in southern Africa have part of their military and political forces outside their own countries in neighbouring friendly countries which believe in the justice of their cause and which are willing to make sacrifices sometimes to allow them to continue their just struggle, a struggle that is recognized by this august body as well as by other organs of the United Nations.

158. We have heard a lot about the question of peace. The Zionist representative definitely uses a perverted logic and I think he is a master of that. The perverted logic lies in the fact that he is talking about a peace that will tear the Palestinian people into pieces and not a peace that will secure justice for the Palestinians. The Camp David accords, with the name of which we have been bombarded so often, clearly deny the Palestinian people their right to self-determination. They legitimize the Israeli foreign occupation of the territories seized in 1967. They do not deal with the question of the settlements nor with the question of Jerusalem. They do not recognize the national integrity of the Palestinian people.

159. They divide the Palestinian people into several categories. Those who live in the West Bank are separated from those who live in the Gaza Strip, and those who were expelled in 1967 are different from, and in fact have no relationship with, those who were expelled from their homes in 1948. And they have been used, at least in concrete Israeli policies, to aggravate the situation of the Palestinians, to allow the Israeli racist Government of Menachem Begin to expropriate more land, confiscate more property and conduct more and more aggression against the Palestinian people by imprisoning Palestinians and by closing institutions of higher education, such as Bir Zeit University, as a result of which the whole international academic community declared its condemnation of the State of Israel for that act of infringement on the academic freedom of the people of the occupied territories.

160. Furthermore, there are the extremely dangerous vigilante acts conducted by the settlers against the people in the occupied territories. On 2 May, several thousands of Israeli settlers brandishing machine-guns moved into the occupied territories, into the villages and towns, harassing, humiliating and beating our people. And when a "civilized" profes-

sor of medicine, who at least should have had some respect for human life, found it proper to take his gun and shoot a student at Bir Zeit University, the man who committed that crime was gaoled for two days only, and he is now free. On 26 May a gang of settlers from Kiryat Arba entered the city of Hebron, occupying the houses of Palestinians, terrorizing the inhabitants of those houses and beating up women and children, telling them: "These houses belong to the Jews. Get out of here."

161. The acts of the people who committed those crimes, which are reminiscent of those of the storm troopers of Nazi Germany who used to terrorize innocent Jews, are very threatening and very disturbing, not only to us, the Palestinians, but to public opinion in general. However, there has been not one single statement for those who consider themselves champions of human rights to protest about those crimes against the innocent Palestinian population. On the contrary, they seek to find excuses for them. Not only do they not condemn them, but they excuse them, finding reasons to rationalize those acts, whereas those crimes should be condemned by the international community as a whole.

162. Why does all this take place? Because we have an illegal occupation, an occupation that denies people their basic human rights, including their right to self-determination. It is an occupation that is directed at the very existence of the Palestinian people as a nation, because the confiscation of land and the establishment of settlements have to be seen in the light of what land means to the Palestinian. Land to the Palestinian is not only the source of his livelihood. Land to the Palestinian is the geographic base where he, as an individual and as part of a collectivity, affirms his existence; where he, together with his people, should exercise his national existence. And if that land is taken away from him and ghettos of Palestinians are established in accordance with the plans that are set by the Israeli Government, it is an attack on the very national existence of the Palestinian people; it is an attack to pre-empt the possibility of the emergence of a national existence for the Palestinians and of their exercising that right.

163. As I have said in previous statements and as has been affirmed and confirmed by my colleagues in the PLO, peace is our goal, our objective; we struggle for it, we want it—for we are not a bunch of masochists. We do not enjoy suffering and we do not enjoy dispersion; we do not enjoy exile either. We are normal people, like any other people in the world. We want to live together as Palestinian people; we want to be allowed the opportunity to build a nation, to reconstruct our national identity, to create a culture, put it together and establish normal relations with everyone in the world.

164. In order for this to be achieved, certain conditions have to be established. Those conditions are: total Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories; recognition of the national rights of the Palestinian people, which include the right to self-determination and national independence; and a just solution of the Palestinian refugee problem, in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations pertinent to the refugee problem. When those conditions are met, peace can be established very soon thereafter. But if those conditions are not established, I think it is the moral as well as

legal obligation of the international community to stand together with the Palestinian people in their legitimate struggle for the achievement of their legitimate rights.

165. The Camp David accords were described by an Israeli, Uri Avneri, not as documents for peace but as "a declaration of war against the Palestinian people, against their right to self-determination and against their right to national independence".

166. We the Palestinian people want peace—but peace with justice, not peace that will tear us to pieces.

167. The representative of Lebanon has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I call on him.

168. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): I had asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply earlier because I did not want my intervention to be an anticlimax after the very moving statement made by the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization or the very well researched and documented statement made by the representative of Libya. In addition, I could never compete with the representative of Kuwait on Shakespeare or on other topics either. However, I do not want this meeting to end without challenging two minor points, while reserving my right at the end of the debate to reply in detail to the various points that have been raised.

169. My first very summary point is that the Israeli representative, although he is a professor of international law, has also practised his art of misquotation of international treaties. This is the General Armistice Agreement, and it says very clearly in article VIII, paragraph 2, that:

"This Agreement, having been negotiated and concluded in pursuance of the resolution of the Security Council of 16 November 1948 calling for the establishment of an armistice in order to eliminate the threat to the peace in Palestine and to facilitate the transition from the present truce to permanent peace in Palestine, shall remain in force until a peaceful settlement between the Parties is achieved."²

170. In my memorandum to the Security Council [S/1336], I also dwelt on this and explained the various parts of that treaty. I shall not try the patience of the Council, but it states that, even by mutual agreement, the two parties are not empowered to consider this treaty as invalid. Witness the various reports of the Secretary-General ever since 1967. I have here the report of 1967, and I advise the representative of Israel to do a bit more research with respect to the part which says that the agreements are still valid in the eyes of the United Nations. That is my first point.

171. My second point concerns UNIFIL. I have noted very carefully what the Israeli representative has said about Israel's preparedness to co-operate with UNIFIL, but that commitment I can only verify in the field. I do not claim, as he does, to set myself up as judge and jury and decide what is right and what is not right. There is a commander of UNIFIL, there are officers of UNIFIL, there is the Secretary-

² *Ibid.*

General, and they and they alone can say whether there is co-operation and commitment to co-operating with UNIFIL.

172. A question was asked 15 months ago by the representative of Kuwait in this very chamber before the Council adopted the first resolution. It was a question addressed directly to the representative of Israel: did they or did they not intend to withdraw from Lebanon? That question, unfortunately, has always been answered in the negative.

173. My concluding, very minor, point concerns Mr. Begin's peace offer. I thought I had also answered that by quoting the President of the Republic of Lebanon. But today perhaps I should quote from a very distinguished United States newspaper, *The Christian Science Monitor*, which commented on that offer by saying with regard to retaliation against Lebanon:

"Surely such retaliation and utter disregard of the United Nations is out of all proportion to the Palestinian guerrilla threat. It is all the more saddening because it frustrates the creditable efforts of Lebanese President Sarkis to reassert his authority over the country. Meanwhile Prime Minister Begin's offer to Lebanon to negotiate a peace treaty under which Syria, Libya, Saudi Arabia and Iraq would absorb and resettle the now stateless Palestinian refugees can only be viewed cynically by the Palestinians and other Arabs as a diversionary tactic. How could Mr. Sarkis possibly accept such an offer?"

174. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Israel has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

175. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I do not propose to debate the rambling statement of the representative of Kuwait. Prime Minister Begin, a Nobel Peace Prize winner, certainly does not require any defence from me against the outbursts of the representative of Kuwait. Likewise, I shall refrain from replying to the representative of Libya, the representative of a country whose concern for justice, law and human rights was so vividly demonstrated recently in its participation in the genocidal activities carried out against the people of Uganda. It is only natural that, given his standards of justice, law and human rights, he has rushed here to support the cause of the murder organization known as the PLO. After all, the terrorist PLO was one of the pillars on which Idi Amin's brutal régime saw fit to lean.

176. Let me briefly refer to the reply of the representative of Lebanon. Lebanon's abrogation of the Armistice Agreement of 1949 and its acts of war against Israel in 1967 were in the nature of a material breach of that agreement which brought about its termination.

177. Let me also briefly remind the representatives of Kuwait and Lebanon that a State cannot invoke in its favour benefits deriving from certain provisions of international law without being prepared at the same time to abide by the duties flowing from international law. The Arab States seek to impose on Israel duties stemming from the international law of peace while simultaneously claiming for themselves the privileges of the international law of war.

178. If certain Arab Governments are either unwilling or unable to prevent the harbouring, training and financing of terrorists who operate from their territories with a view to harassing other States, they must surely be prepared to face the risk of those States' taking the necessary counter-measures to stop such harassment. That is not only a fundamental premise of international law; it is also a conclusion dictated by simple logic.

179. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

180. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya): The representative of the Zionist régime referred to what he called the role played by Libya in some events that occurred in Africa. I do not want here to speak about our African problems. We are dealing with them inside our African organization. I shall not indulge in any discussion concerning the situation in Uganda or the internal affairs of that country.

181. I just want to say that the Zionist position regarding what happened in Uganda is typical of the Zionists' duplicity in their policies. Idi Amin was a friend of Israel. He was trained in the Israeli paratroopers and he received the Israel wings. At that time, while Idi Amin was being influenced by Israeli policy and a friend of Israel, he was an angel, a good man. When Mr. Idi Amin changed his opinions and his view—and many people are changing their opinions concerning what is happening in the Middle East, because they have begun to understand the Zionist crime against the Palestinian people—the whole Western mass media changed their view of Idi Amin and started to attack him.

182. I must point out that Idi Amin was attacked not because he was bad to his people—every African understands that—since the Israeli racist régime does not care about the African people. We know the links between the Israeli régime and the *apartheid* régime in South Africa. Israel is a supporter of the racist régime in South Africa. So the only criterion of goodness or badness in the eyes of the Zionist and pro-Zionist forces, and especially the Western mass media, is one's stand concerning the Palestinian problem.

183. So it is irrelevant to talk about what Idi Amin did or did not do in Uganda. Israel is supporting the South African régime and the minority racist régime in Zimbabwe and arming and supporting dictators around the world and corrupt figures in many corners of the world—and I do not want to mention them one by one. Everyone knows about it.

184. Mr. Blum, therefore, cannot deceive the Council because Idi Amin has now lost. Suppose that he had not lost and that he was still there and a friend of Israel, no one would attack him, even if he exterminated three quarters of the Ugandan people, because you do not care about the Ugandan people and the African people.

185. The representative of Israel also referred to what he called the help to terrorism given by my country. We know

that there is a continuing campaign against Libya for the simple reason that we are supporting the freedom fighters and liberation movements in the world, among them the liberation movement in South Africa. We and the Israelis and their friends are on opposite sides. They are supporting the racist régimes and we are supporting the peoples of Africa. We are supporting the Palestinian people not only because they are Arabs and our brothers but also because it is in line with our support of all the freedom fighters around the world.

186. So the representative of the Zionist entity has merely started again to repeat the Zionist and imperialist anti-

Libyan propaganda, and everyone knows about that propaganda and those false allegations.

187. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to inform the Council that, in accordance with the invitation extended to the Council by the representative of Lebanon in the course of his statement earlier in the meeting, and at my request, the Secretariat has informed me that it has made arrangements for the screening of the film on Southern Lebanon at 3.30 p.m. tomorrow, in the auditorium of the Dag Hammarskjöld Library.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

如何获取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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