

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR

2379th MEETING: 18 JUNE 1982

NEW YORK

UN LIBRARY

JAN 26 1990

UN/SA COLLECTION

CONTENTS

| | <i>Page</i> |
|--|-------------|
| Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2379) | 1 |
| Adoption of the agenda | 1 |
| The situation in the Middle East: Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/15194 and Add.1 and 2) | 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.

2379th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 18 June 1982, at 6.15 p.m.

President: Mr. Luc de La BARRE de NANTEUIL
(France).

Present: The representatives of the following States:
China, France, Guyana, Ireland, Japan, Jordan,
Panama, Poland, Spain, Togo, Uganda, Union of
Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great
Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America,
Zaire.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2379)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the Middle East:
Report of the Secretary-General on the United
Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/15194
and Add.1 and 2).

The meeting was called to order at 6.40 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

**Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations
Interim Force in Lebanon (S/15194 and Add.1
and 2)**

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*):
I should like to inform members of the Council that
I have received letters from the representatives of
Israel, Lebanon, the Netherlands and Sweden in which
they request to be invited to participate in the discus-
sion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the
usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the
Council, to invite those representatives to participate
in the discussion without the right to vote, in confor-
mity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and
rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Blum (Israel)
and Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon) took places at the Council
table; Mr. Scheltema (Netherlands) and Mr. Thunborg
(Sweden) took the places reserved for them at the side
of the Council chamber.*

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*):
I should like to inform the Council that I have received
a letter dated 18 June from the representative of
Jordan [S/15238] which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request the Security Council to extend an invitation to the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the discussion of the item entitled 'The situation in the Middle East,' in accordance with the Council's usual practice."

3. The proposal by Jordan is not made pursuant to rule 37 or rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, but, if approved by the Council, the invitation to participate in the debate would confer on the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) the same rights of participation as those conferred on Member States pursuant to rule 37.

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

5. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America):
The United States regularly objects to permitting the PLO to participate under the same rules which govern the participation of Member States. The United States supports the right of the PLO, or indeed any other interested party, to participate in debates here under terms which are appropriate to its status. It seems perfectly clear that to treat the PLO as though it were a State is not treatment appropriate to its status, since it clearly is not a State but is a collectivity which acts in the name of a people but has no juridical and territorial embodiment.

6. For that reason, the United States will oppose permitting the PLO to participate under this rule and asks that a vote be taken on this question. We shall vote no.

7. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*):
If no other member of the Council wishes to speak, I shall take it that the Council is ready to vote on the proposal by Jordan.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: China, Guyana, Ireland, Jordan, Panama, Poland, Spain, Togo, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Zaire

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: France, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The proposal was adopted by 11 votes against 1, with 3 abstentions.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

8. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 18 June from the representative of Jordan [S/15239] which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request the Security Council to invite Mr. Clovis Maksoud, the Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States, to participate in the consideration of the item entitled 'Situation in the Middle East,' in accordance with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure."

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council decides to accede to this request.

It was so decided.

9. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) for the period 11 December 1981 to 3 June 1982 [S/15194 and Add.1 and 2]. Members of the Council also have before them document S/15235, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of consultations by the Council. I understand that the Council is prepared to vote on the draft resolution. If there is no objection, I shall now put this draft to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: China, France, Guyana, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Panama, Spain, Togo, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Against: None

Abstaining: Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

The draft resolution was adopted by 13 votes against none, with 2 abstentions [resolution 511 (1982)].

10. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those members of the Council who have asked to be allowed to make statements following the voting.

11. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): The United States is pleased that the Council is extending the mandate of UNIFIL for a period of two months. We are likewise pleased and grateful that the troop-contributing countries are prepared to continue to so materially assist the Organization in carrying out its responsibilities.

12. Obviously the situation in Lebanon is fraught with uncertainty as well as with pain and turmoil.

13. The United States has voted today to extend this mandate without any extension of responsibilities, functions or territorial scope because we believe that this course will contribute most directly and clearly to the restoration of the peace and well-being of the area and to the restoration of the authority and sovereignty of the Government of Lebanon.

14. The mandate has been extended for two months. During that period, while the situation stabilizes, we in the Council will have the opportunity to collectively study what best serves the common good of the people of Lebanon and the peace of the region.

15. Mr. DORR (Ireland): The six-monthly mandate of UNIFIL expires on 19 June and it was necessary to renew it by then if the Force was to continue in being.

16. Until two weeks ago it had seemed that this would be a normal, though not of course routine, matter, and that we would have been able to renew the mandate for a further period of six months as we have done often in the past. That is no longer the case.

17. The events of the past two weeks have brought a major change in the situation in the region. The full impact of that change cannot yet be understood. But it is impossible to speak here in a limited way about the UNIFIL mandate without addressing oneself, to some degree at least, to that larger question.

18. How does one describe those events? The ceasefire which by and large had held reasonably well since 24 July 1981 was broken in early June. During the night of 4/5 June massive Israeli armoured forces, brushing aside UNIFIL invaded Lebanon. They have now occupied the whole of southern Lebanon up to the suburbs of Beirut, and they hold that city under siege. No reliable figures are yet available, but it appears that Israel's invasion of Lebanon has cost thousands of Lebanese and Palestinian lives as well as the lives of several hundred Israeli soldiers. It has brought widespread destruction and has made hundreds of thousands homeless.

19. Israel has justified its actions by invoking the legitimate right of self-defence. I cannot but repeat here again what I said on 8 June: Where is the correspondence, where is the sense of proportion [2377th meeting, para. 34]? Can this really bring true peace to Galilee, now or ever? It seems me that, on the contrary, the spiral of violence has been given another violent upward twist and that we are farther and farther removed from any hope of a comprehensive peace settlement in the region.

20. As my Prime Minister, Mr. Haughey, emphasized in a debate in the Irish Parliament on 16 June, Ireland

adheres firmly to the Middle East policy enunciated by the member States of the European Economic Community in their Venice declaration of 13 June 1980 [S/14009]. We believe strongly in the need for a negotiated peace settlement which would take account of all aspects of the Middle East problem, including the right of Israel to peace and security and the right of the Palestinians to recognition and self-determination as a people. We therefore strongly deplore and condemn the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. It may have succeeded in the short term by sheer weight of military force, but in the long term the fruit of what has happened over the past two weeks can only be a deeper bitterness for which Israel and all of us may yet pay heavily in years to come.

21. These are, however, wider issues which I do not wish to address here in detail. There will be a time for that later. There is one aspect of what has happened, nevertheless, which is directly relevant to our present decision on the UNIFIL mandate. That is the contempt shown for a United Nations peace-keeping force which was brushed aside by a vastly superior military force—by tens of thousands of troops with heavy armour and with naval and air support. On this point something must be said.

22. The concept of United Nations peace-keeping as it has evolved over the years is a fragile one, but it is one of the notable successes of the United Nations. Though peace-keeping contingents carry light weapons, United Nations peace-keeping is quite a different matter from military or enforcement action. Peace-keeping is a gentler art. It always depends fundamentally on consent—the consent of the parties to the conflict and the consent of the Government of the country where the force is to be stationed. But it is not just a matter of consent in the sense of grudging acquiescence. To be fully effective a peace-keeping force should not only have no enemies; it should receive full co-operation from all concerned. The peace-keeping force is there in their interest. Its function is to separate forces which are mutually antagonistic, but not to subdue them. Its authority is moral rather than physical or military. The force indeed has behind it the authority of the Security Council and the international community as a whole. But United Nations peace-keeping troops on the ground can never be more than a thin blue line. That line exists only so long as it is given acceptance and respect.

23. Since it was established in 1978 [resolution 425 (1978)], UNIFIL has operated in extremely difficult conditions. Its mandate has always been difficult and ambiguous. One side in the conflict has focused on one paragraph of that mandate; the other side has focused on another.

24. But the United Nations has lived before with ambiguity. More serious in this case was the fact that UNIFIL was never allowed to deploy fully throughout the whole area of operations assigned to it by the Coun-

cil—that is, up to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon. Instead it had to contend with the so-called *de facto* forces of Major Haddad, based in a strip between the southern lines of UNIFIL and the Lebanese border. Those forces were armed, directed and supplied at all times by Israel, and UNIFIL was subject to frequent harassment by them. UNIFIL also came into conflict at times with the armed elements to the north, which tried to infiltrate its lines, and the Force suffered deaths and injuries from both quarters.

25. Many times over the four-year period the Council reiterated in successive resolutions its determination to ensure that the Force would indeed be allowed to operate fully throughout the area assigned to it up to the international border. But this remained at all times an aspiration. The aspiration was piously repeated in successive resolutions of the Council. But it was never something which the Council or its members were prepared to insist on or to carry into effect. Still, and despite these circumstances, UNIFIL was one stable element in a very unstable region.

26. Together with 10 other countries, Ireland has maintained a contingent of some 750 troops with the Force since 1978. Why have we done so?

27. Like most of the other small countries which took part, we had no direct involvement in the affairs of the region and no direct interest to serve there. We sent our troops to southern Lebanon and we kept them there despite the difficulties and the losses because the Council, through the Secretary-General, asked us to do so. We responded because we wanted to strengthen and uphold the principles of the United Nations and because we believed we were contributing, even though in a small way, to the effort to bring peace and stability to a troubled region for the benefit of all its people. I repeat, for the benefit of all its people. That is not mere rhetoric—or, if it is, it has been backed by four years of service by our soldiers in very difficult circumstances.

28. When the United Nations is criticized as ineffective, as it so often is today, let this be remembered as the effort of the small countries to make it effective. Let it be remembered too that for over 25 years other small and middle-level countries from every region—Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America—have sent their men to serve in other peace-keeping forces, a total of more than 300,000 in all.

29. We 11 countries are now asked to continue that commitment for a further interim period pending the working out of some more permanent arrangement in the region. We are being told essentially that much has now changed; big things may be afoot; new ideas may emerge; it is not yet certain that we will be needed when the smoke has cleared, but we should not go away in case we are.

30. We accept this approach reluctantly as the best the Council can do for the moment. But it is clear that

it creates an even more difficult situation for the countries contributing troops to UNIFIL. We have to ask ourselves now why we should stay when we have no certainty that we will eventually be needed, what we will be allowed to achieve while we stay and how far those who wish us to stay will help us to achieve it.

31. Ireland has a double interest in these questions—as a member of the Council and as a troop-contributing country.

32. After careful consideration as a member of the Council, we have agreed to join in the decision which the Council has just taken. This means leaving the Force in being for an interim period. In addition, as a troop-contributing country, Ireland is also prepared to retain its contingent with UNIFIL for the period now decided on by the Council.

33. But if we agree, as we do, then I believe that we are also entitled to insist on certain basic conditions. There are certain obvious requirements which simply must be met. If they are not, then the moral authority and the credibility of the Force, and perhaps of United Nations peace-keeping in general, will trickle slowly into the sand.

34. The first requirement is that UNIFIL be given full co-operation in whatever it is now expected to do. There is a limit—an obvious limit—to how far a United Nations peace-keeping force can be brushed aside by superior military forces, treated with contempt and still retain the credibility which it may yet need to serve a future purpose. To retain that credibility in the present difficult interim period, UNIFIL contingents must be allowed freedom of movement and the Force must be given co-operation in carrying out the functions assigned to it, including in particular the humanitarian tasks it will now assume under paragraph 2 of the resolution.

35. The second requirement is that the present decision to extend the mandate of UNIFIL for an interim period must be seen as inherently a temporary expedient. It is an interim arrangement for what was, in theory at least, an interim force. The word "interim" must now, for once, be given its full meaning.

36. That is not to say that Ireland will not be ready in appropriate circumstances to consider a new or expanded role for UNIFIL if the Council should so decide. My Government wants to maintain our commitment to, and our involvement in, United Nations peace-keeping in the area and United Nations peace-keeping in general. What I want to do here is simply to emphasize strongly that the present prolongation of the mandate is no more than a holding operation. Some much larger decisions must be faced and new dispositions made for anything beyond this temporary period. It will be vital this time that Council decisions once taken should be fully respected and fully implemented by all concerned. In particular, we do not be-

lieve that it is acceptable that Israel should remain indefinitely in Lebanon or that the United Nations should condone this. Israel will have to withdraw to the internationally recognized boundaries, as it was already obliged to do unconditionally under the terms of resolution 509 (1982), which we adopted unanimously here on 6 June.

37. Taking account of all that I have said, however, Ireland, as a member of the Council, has voted for the draft resolution before us as an interim measure, and as a troop-contributing country we are prepared to maintain our existing commitment to UNIFIL for the interim period for which the mandate has now been extended.

38. I should like to say, finally, that my Government has decided within the past few days to make available a sum of 100,000 Irish pounds to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) for emergency relief work in Lebanon.

39. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The question which is today being considered by the Council goes far beyond the scope of the officially approved agenda.

40. Two weeks ago Israel carried out another large-scale aggression against a sovereign Arab State, Lebanon. The Israeli troops broke through the lines of the military units of the United Nations that were sent into southern Lebanon pursuant to a decision of the Council following Israel's aggression in 1978. The Government of Israel is thus once again showing its utter disregard of the Council and its decisions, which have binding force for all States Members of the Organization. The Israeli troops have invaded deep into Lebanese territory, sowing death and destruction among the Lebanese and among the Palestinians who had sought refuge in that country. The occupying forces have seized more than one third of the territory of Lebanon, barbarously destroying dozens of population centres, and have now laid siege to the capital of the country, Beirut. A serious threat has arisen to the sovereignty and independent existence of Lebanon.

41. The scale of this recent criminal action by Tel Aviv is truly horrifying. Many thousands have been killed or wounded, hundreds of thousands have been left homeless and without any means of survival. The entire Palestinian people has fallen victim to the Israeli aggression. A policy is pursued against it that can be described only as a policy of genocide.

42. The aggressor does not conceal the fact that its heavy blows are directed primarily against the Palestinian movement of opposition, against those forces that stand in the way of the plans to decapitate the Palestinian people and to settle the Palestinian problem on the basis of the notorious "administrative autonomy" worked out at Camp David. At the same time,

there are other far-reaching objectives, namely, to terrify the Arab peoples and to force them to abandon their struggle for their legitimate rights and submit to the military and strategic designs of the imperialists in the Middle East. But the Palestinian problem, the right of the people of Palestine to self-determination and to establish their own State, has been, is and will remain the heart of a settlement in the Middle East. Until this problem is resolved, the struggle for a just solution will continue, despite terrorism and murder by the Israeli occupiers.

43. The Soviet Union has on frequent occasions emphasized that this present adventuristic policy could cost Israel and its people dear. In a statement by the Soviet Government published on 14 June, Israel was once again warned with great seriousness that events in the Middle East, in a region in the immediate vicinity of the southern frontiers of the Soviet Union, cannot but affect the interests of the Soviet Union [see S/15223, annex].

44. In the light of recent events, we can see particularly clearly that direct responsibility for the actions of the Israeli aggressor lies with its senior partner and protector, the United States of America. It is the United States that has armed Israel to the teeth and by its connivance given Israel the green light to carry out criminal anti-Arab actions. It is the United States that is providing diplomatic cover for the policy of State terrorism being pursued by Tel Aviv.

45. It was no mere chance that the invasion of Lebanon was preceded by the deal between Washington and Tel Aviv relating to the so-called strategic alliance and by massive supplies and deliveries to Israel of American weaponry; and it was no coincidence that on the eve of the Israeli attack Israel's Defence Minister, Sharon, visited the United States. When the invasion was already in full swing the Prime Minister of Israel, Begin, received an invitation to go to Washington for talks with the American President about the so-called new situation that had developed in the region.

46. In the Security Council the American representative blocked the adoption of a draft resolution [S/15185] that could have helped put an end to the Israeli aggression in Lebanon. To date there has been not a single word of condemnation from the United States of those piratical actions by Israel or in defence of human rights, something that the American representatives are always very eager to preach about under any pretext, or even without any.

47. The situation in Lebanon remains critical. The United States and Israel are now making efforts to strengthen to the advantage of the aggressor the situation that has developed in that country. The Israeli leader and the American representative, Habib, acting at one with them, have in fact stated a number of political demands to make more secure the fruits of

Israeli aggression. Washington does not hide the fact that the United States intends to extract from the situation considerable political and military strategic advantages for itself.

48. In such circumstances it is essential to put an end to this cynical juggling with the fates of peoples, which has once again brought the Middle East to the dangerous brink.

49. The Soviet Union considers that the Council, as the organ bearing the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, must immediately take steps to halt the Israeli aggression, force Israel to implement resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), and defend the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and the legitimate rights and interests of the Arab peoples.

50. To refer specifically to the item on the agenda, the Soviet Union found it possible not to oppose the extension for a limited period of the mandate of UNIFIL. At the same time, it should be emphasized that this is an interim measure. As the Secretary-General stressed in his report:

“recent developments have radically altered the circumstances in which UNIFIL was established and under which it functioned since March 1978.”
[S/15194/Add.2, para. 11]

In this connection a number of questions arise, questions that the Council will have to study and consider in the coming weeks.

51. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): My Government is horrified by the terrible suffering and damage which have been inflicted upon Lebanon and its people. Large numbers of innocent men, women and children have been killed or wounded. Hundreds of thousands have been made homeless. Whole coastal cities have been devastated.

52. The dangers to international peace must be evident to us all. We are seriously concerned about the risks of the conflagration spreading. Already there has been bitter fighting between Israeli and Syrian forces.

53. The events leading to this awful destruction have been clearly set out by the Secretary-General in his report to the Council [S/15194/Add.1]. Beginning with the bombing of Beirut by Israeli aircraft on 4 June, he has described how hostilities escalated despite appeals for restraint both by him and by the President of the Council [S/15163]. On 5 June the Council met [2374th meeting] and unanimously adopted resolution 508 (1982), calling upon all the parties to the conflict to cease immediately and simultaneously all military activities within Lebanon and across the Lebanese-Israeli border no later than 0600 hours, local time, on 6 June 1982. The PLO responded to this call, but

Israel did not. The following morning, 6 June, Israeli forces invaded Lebanon forcing their way through the UNIFIL lines at gunpoint. That evening the Council met again [2375th meeting] and unanimously adopted resolution 509 (1982), calling for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces. The PLO and the Lebanese Government accepted that resolution, but the Government of Israel did not. The invading Israeli forces have subsequently advanced to the outskirts of Beirut, leaving a wave of destruction behind them.

54. The facts are plain. Israel has invaded Lebanon in flagrant violation of international law and of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as in complete disregard of the demands of the Council. My Government regards the invasion and occupation as a violation of Lebanon's sovereignty, and we cannot accept that the Israeli action amounted to self-defence. Together with the other member States of the European Community, we made our position clear in a statement issued at Bonn on 9 June [S/15195, annex]. In that statement the Ten called urgently on all the parties concerned to act in accordance with Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), and in particular called on Israel to withdraw all its forces immediately and unconditionally from Lebanon and to place UNIFIL in a position to accomplish its mission without hindrance. The statement continued that should Israel refuse to comply with those two resolutions the Ten would examine the possibilities for future action.

55. My Government strongly supports the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon. We believe that it is the duty of the Council to uphold these essential conditions. We want, as we believe the Lebanese people want, to see a Lebanon free from the violence and suffering which have been its tragedy.

56. At the same time, we believe that there can be no real peace or stability in the region unless the aspirations of the Palestinian people are also taken into account. We do not believe that it is either wise or just for Israel to seek to deny people the right which it claims for itself. Any lasting and peaceful solution will have to confirm both Israel's right to peace and security and the Palestinian people's right to self-determination. These principles have been set out in the Venice declaration [S/14009]. They are principles which my Government believes remain essential to the search for peace.

57. Our immediate task this evening was to consider the future of UNIFIL. My Government warmly supports resolution 511 (1982), extending the Force's mandate for two months. We believe that it is still too early to know whether there is a role for UNIFIL in the new and radically altered circumstances in Lebanon. But we believe that it is right to preserve the option for such a role, an option which might well be

lost if the Force were precipitately disbanded. We also believe that, in so far as circumstances permit, the Force may be able in the interim to play a helpful and humanitarian role. In this context we call on the Government of Israel to show the full respect for UNIFIL which it has so far failed to show.

58. On behalf of my Government, I should like to pay a tribute to the officers and men of UNIFIL, and to their Governments, for the selfless efforts which they have made, and are continuing to make, on behalf of the international community. We do not accept the misguided criticisms that have been made about the Force's inability to prevent the Israeli advance. As the Secretary-General has rightly stated, the Force has neither the mandate nor the military capacity to counter an invasion [S/15194/Add.2].

59. We acknowledge the difficulties which confront General Callaghan and his men in maintaining UNIFIL and its positions after the Israeli invasion has made it impossible for them to carry out their mandate. We salute with gratitude their readiness to respond to the international community's wish that they should nevertheless remain on the spot until better times, when it may again be possible for them to exercise all their functions. Meanwhile, they deserve the continued support and appreciation of the international community.

60. Tonight, our thoughts must be above all with Lebanon and the people who live there. The heartfelt sympathies of the British Government and people go out to the people of Lebanon in their plight. My Government is contributing to the urgently needed humanitarian relief effort through the international agencies, both bilaterally and via the European Community. We hope that all countries will co-operate in this international effort.

61. Above all, it is essential that the fighting should now come to an end, and that Israel should comply with Council resolution 509 (1982) and immediately withdraw all its forces from Lebanon to the internationally recognized boundaries. The rule of international law must be upheld, or we shall all suffer the grim consequences of the failure to do so.

62. Mr. LING Qing (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Israeli authorities, in defiance of the relevant resolutions of the Council and of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, have taken the obdurate course of carrying out a policy of aggression and expansion. They have flagrantly launched a massive military invasion against Lebanon, forcibly occupied large tracts of territory of the central and southern parts of Lebanon, bombarded and attacked Lebanese cities and towns and Palestinian refugee camps, thereby causing bloodshed and spreading death among tens of thousands of innocent Lebanese and Palestinian civilians.

63. At present, Israel is using its announcement of a cease-fire as a camouflage to continue expanding its acts of aggression. It has surrounded the urban areas of the Lebanese capital of Beirut, thereby creating an extremely grave situation. The Israeli authorities have openly trampled underfoot the norms of international law and have carried out naked aggression against a sovereign Arab State, in a premeditated attempt to wipe out the resistance forces of the Palestinian people.

64. It has committed a new crime against the Palestinian people and seriously aggravated the situation in the Middle East region. The Chinese Government and people express the utmost indignation and strongly condemn this Israeli act of aggression.

65. At a time when Israel's frenzied invasion of Lebanon was being condemned by the people of various countries unanimously, the United States Government openly used its veto power in the United Nations to prevent the Security Council from adopting a draft resolution condemning Israel for its refusal to withdraw its troops [S/15185]. This only resulted in heightened Israeli aggressiveness and in the failure of the Council to fulfil its task of defending international peace and security. The United States connivance at, and support for, Israeli aggression should be condemned.

66. Because Israel has wantonly invaded Lebanon, UNIFIL has long found itself unable to discharge its functions. However, in view of a possible need that may arise from the development of the situation in Lebanon and the request of the Lebanese Government, we voted in favour of the resolution which has just been adopted.

67. I wish to take this opportunity to reiterate that the Chinese Government has always held that Israel must withdraw from the Arab territories occupied since 1967, that the Palestinian people must regain their national rights, including the right to return to their homeland, the right to self-determination and the right to establish a State, and that there must be a comprehensive and just settlement of the Middle East question.

68. We firmly support the Lebanese, Palestinian and Syrian armed forces and people in their just struggle to resist Israeli aggression and safeguard their national rights. Israel must comply with the relevant resolutions of the Council, stop its aggression against Lebanon immediately and withdraw all its troops from Lebanon unconditionally.

69. It is the great Arab people, with its glorious tradition of struggle, which will determine the destiny of the Arab nation. The unity of the Arab people is the best guarantee of the victory of the Arab nation. We are deeply convinced that, pursuing the general policy of striving to achieve the lofty goal of the Arab nation, the Arab peoples will certainly be able to eliminate

meddling from outside, strengthen their unity and persist in the struggle against the common enemy.

70. We wish to address an appeal to all peace-loving and justice-upholding countries and peoples to make common efforts to curb Israeli aggression, support the just struggle of the Arab peoples and defend peace in the Middle East.

71. Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): May I first of all congratulate you most warmly on your accession to the presidency of the Council for the month of June.

72. Your eminent diplomatic qualities, of which you have already given proof, Mr. President, together with the constant desire of the friendly Government of France to contribute by concrete actions and initiatives to the solution of the major problems of international concern, are a guarantee of the success of our work under your presidency.

73. I should also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Mr. Ling Qing, for the distinction and skill with which he guided the work of the Council during the month of May.

74. Finally, I should like to thank the Secretary-General for the clarity of the reports which he has submitted to us on the present events in Lebanon [S/15194 and Add.1 and 2].

75. In speaking in this debate, our sole concern is to respect the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law.

76. The present agony of Lebanon, a State Member of the United Nations, the loss of human life and the destruction of property of all kinds are causing us great anxiety.

77. I recall that, following our independence, Lebanese citizens, whose great erudition fascinated us, came to teach in our schools and universities. We were impressed by their great open-mindedness.

78. Furthermore, we have memories of the Lebanon of the 1960s and before—memories of our various stays in that lovely country, memories of a gay, welcoming and prosperous people, devoted to dialogue as a result of their position at the intersection of the Western and Eastern worlds and of the Muslim and Christian worlds. We remember a people whose contribution to international co-operation and to the international community's efforts to promote understanding among peoples and international peace and security has always been remarkable.

79. Today, that people, which has been stricken by an unjust fate, and which has already lost its characteristic smile, seems to be destined to lose everything if the United Nations does not react firmly and appropriately.

80. Nevertheless, we admire the determination of Lebanon to remain itself and to defend its sovereignty, political independence, unity and territorial integrity. In accordance with the Charter, the United Nations has no alternative but to protect Lebanon from destruction, humiliation, annihilation and flagrant attacks against its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

81. The tragedy of the Lebanese people today, weaponless in the face of attempts to dismantle its country and in the face of threats to and constant violations of its territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence within its internationally recognized boundaries, is especially moving for us of Zaire, for we ourselves have greatly suffered from similar violations and threats in the course of our history. We must therefore express our anxiety with regard to the obstacles which continue to be put in the way of the implementation of resolution 509 (1982), the harassment of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in Lebanon and the challenge they are facing in carrying out their functions. This is clearly described in the reports of the Secretary-General in paragraphs 36 and 37 of document S/15194 and especially in paragraphs 12, 13, 14, 15, 21 and 22 of document S/15194/Add.1.

82. We should like to pay a special tribute to the commander, the soldiers and the civilian personnel of UNIFIL for their courage, devotion and professional conscientiousness in the face of harassment, threats and even, for some of the Force, death.

83. We continue to believe that it was essential, in the obvious interest of Lebanon, which the United Nations must protect, and for the sake of the credibility of the United Nations in general and the Security Council in particular, to renew the UNIFIL mandate for a reasonable period in the hope that the parties primarily concerned will co-operate with UNIFIL in discharging its mandate, without restrictions or obstacles, and that all the members of the Council will reaffirm their confidence in the usefulness of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in Lebanon.

84. What has recently happened in Lebanon, in particular the harassment of the UNIFIL troops, must not happen again if we do not want to strike a blow at future United Nations peace-keeping operations and thus severely weaken the Security Council's ability to fulfil its main responsibility regarding the maintenance of international peace and security. I do not recall any situations on such a scale and involving such brutality in the past.

85. We can only deplore the lack of co-operation by the parties concerned in the efforts of UNIFIL fully to discharge its mandate. The Council must immediately call upon all the parties concerned to refrain from activities incompatible with the objectives of the

Force and to co-operate in the achievement of those objectives.

86. Zaire, which voted in favour of resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), considers that concrete and effective measures should be adopted to put an end to actions against the territorial integrity, unity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries.

87. The Council should furthermore call on Member States which are able to do so to use their influence with the parties concerned to ensure on the one hand compliance with resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) and on the other hand that the Force is able to accomplish its tasks fully and without obstruction. The difficulties placed in the path of UNIFIL in its efforts to deliver food and medicine to the civilian population affected are certainly very regrettable.

88. It is of the utmost importance that the parties concerned heed the appeal of the Council in the successive resolutions it has adopted on the question, for the purpose of the Council is, and must be, to guarantee strict respect for the integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries and for the provisions of the relevant conventions on the treatment of civilian persons in time of war.

89. It was in that spirit that the Republic of Zaire voted in favour of resolution 511 (1982), which has just been adopted, with the aim, on the one hand, of restoring to Lebanon its territorial integrity, full sovereignty and political independence within its boundaries and, on the other hand, of assisting in the fulfilment of the mandate entrusted to the Force by the Council.

90. Furthermore, the delegation of Zaire is particularly pleased by the final preambular paragraph of resolution 511 (1982), which states that the Council bears in mind "the need to avoid any developments which could further aggravate the situation and the need, pending an examination of the situation by the Security Council in all its aspects", and I emphasize this, "to preserve in place the capacity of the United Nations to assist in the restoration of the peace". We have always said that instead of continuing to deal with individual aspects of the Middle East situation, it is high time to begin new efforts to consider all aspects of this thorny problem with a view to finding a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the Middle East crisis on the basis of the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions.

91. In conclusion, I should like to say that Israel has a right to peace and security, just as the Palestinian people has certain inalienable rights, in particular its right to establish a sovereign independent State, which must be recognized and respected, for the question of Palestine is at the core of the Middle East crisis.

92. Mr. NOWAK (Poland): Poland abstained in the vote taken a short time ago. Our previous reservations concerning certain important political and financial aspects of UNIFIL remain valid. They are even more timely in the light of recent developments in the situation in the region.

93. There is no need to emphasize that this meeting is taking place in special circumstances. The ominous sounds of Israeli armed aggression against Lebanon were clearly audible here; they reached this chamber as the barbaric attacks continued unabated in spite of the cease-fire that was declared, in defiance of the unanimous resolution of the Council demanding an immediate cease-fire and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon, and in flagrant violation and disregard of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international law. The wave of protests, the outrage of public opinion and the condemnation of this new brutal act have been world-wide. They have found expression, *inter alia*, in numerous statements and communiqués. On 9 June the following statement was issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Polish People's Republic:

"On 5 June Israeli ground, naval and air forces invaded Lebanon, and are continuing criminal hostilities, to which the civilian population—women and children—are falling victim. This massive attack constitutes another act of Israeli aggression against the Arab States, and against the sovereignty, inviolability and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

"The aim of the invasion is the physical liquidation of Palestinian refugees in Lebanon, the destruction of their political and military organizations, terrorizing the Arab nations and imposing on Lebanon the Israeli-American policy of dictating from a position of strength and imposing separatist solutions in the spirit of Camp David which negate the inviolable rights of the Palestinian nation.

"Israel's aggression constitutes a violation of the basic norms of international law and of the principles of co-existence among nations and is a cynical challenge to the United Nations, as is demonstrated by such facts as the crossing by a part of the Israeli tank forces in Lebanon of territory controlled by the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and Israel's arrogant disregard for the recent Security Council resolutions calling on it to cease aggression immediately and withdraw its forces from Lebanon.

"Israel's aggression against Lebanon and the Palestinians has been prepared long in advance. It was preceded by the barbaric bombing of Beirut and other Lebanese cities last April, May and early June. Obviously, Israel would not be able to pursue this policy of aggression and terror against the Arab States and the Palestinian people without the support and connivance of its imperialist protectors.

"Expressing the profound indignation of Polish society, the Government of the Polish People's Republic resolutely condemns the new Israeli war against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples and the objectives that are being sought. It calls for the immediate cessation by Israel of hostilities and for the withdrawal of its forces from Lebanon's territory. Continuation of the aggression threatens to spread hostilities in the region, with sinister consequences for world peace.

"Poland expresses its solidarity with the victims of the barbaric aggression and will continue consistently to work towards a comprehensive and just solution of the Middle East conflict, taking into account the rights and interests of all the States and peoples in that region."

94. Yesterday, the spokesman for the Polish Government pointed out in his statement that the aggressor was continuing the invasion to create a *fait accompli* particularly with regard to undermining the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon and to the physical elimination of the Palestinian nation and its organizations fighting for the attainment of the inalienable rights of the Palestinians to self-determination and the establishment of their own State. The spokesman said:

"The Government of the Polish People's Republic strongly condemns the criminal aggression of Israel against Lebanon and the Palestinian nation. It is with indignation and growing concern that Polish society watches the barbaric methods used by the Israelis.

"Their efforts to exterminate the Palestinians in Lebanon should be stopped immediately."

95. The statement went on to say that the Israeli invasion of Lebanon would not have been possible without the support given to the aggressor by its imperialist protectors in blocking the action of the Council. This poses the threat of a dangerous spread of the Middle East conflict. The responsibility for that will be borne by Israel and those States which do not use their opportunities effectively to stop the aggression.

96. The Polish Government demands that an end be put to the invasion of Lebanon and that an immediate withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from that country be carried out.

97. It is obvious that the solution of the conflict in the Middle East cannot be achieved through war and aggression. It cannot be achieved through so-called strategic alliances protecting the aggressor, through the plans of so-called administrative autonomy, through arrogant ultimatums. It can be attained only as a result of peace negotiations with the participation of all parties concerned and by taking into consideration their vital rights and interests, including the

inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Such is the firm point of view of my Government.

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

99. Mr. SCHELTEMA (Netherlands): Mr. President, I thank you and the members of the Council for allowing me to participate in this debate. As a Member of the United Nations and in particular as a contributor of troops to UNIFIL, the Netherlands Government is profoundly concerned about the recent developments in Lebanon. In their statement of 9 June [S/15195, annex], the members of the European Community strongly condemned the recent Israeli invasion of that country. My Government deeply regrets the countless casualties, particularly among the civilian population, and the large-scale destruction the Israeli invasion of Lebanon has caused.

100. The Netherlands Government strongly supports the territorial integrity of an independent Lebanon in a region where all States can live in peace and security free from outside threats, aggression or acts of violence. Together with its partners in the European Community, the Netherlands has repeatedly stressed that the Palestinian people must be placed, by an appropriate process defined within the framework of a comprehensive peace settlement, in a position to exercise its right to self-determination. The recent display of force cannot be justified under international law and creates the danger of further escalation of the conflict rather than the conditions for a durable settlement. My Government, therefore, repeats its urgent call on all parties concerned to act in accordance with Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) and, in particular, calls on Israel to withdraw all its forces immediately and unconditionally.

101. I now turn to UNIFIL. The Israeli violations of the UNIFIL area and the continued presence of Israeli troops and units in various positions have seriously undermined the mandate of UNIFIL. In these circumstances, UNIFIL cannot properly perform its duties. If we have nevertheless agreed to maintain our troops for the limited period the Council has just set, it is because of the protection and humanitarian assistance UNIFIL can extend to the population and because we hope UNIFIL can be preserved for a future role, that is, if the terms of resolution 509 (1982) are to be implemented. It would not be expedient at this moment to go further into this matter, since the situation remains too fluid and too unclear. However, I should like to state that in the future UNIFIL should serve the interests of all parties concerned, should be ensured of their full co-operation in the implementation of a durable mandate and should operate in an uninterrupted and clearly defined area.

102. Our willingness to continue our participation in UNIFIL for this limited period should in no way

be construed as an acceptance of the intolerable presence of Israeli troops in the UNIFIL area, nor of the restrictions imposed upon the freedom of movement of the Force. We therefore appeal urgently to the Israeli Government to respect UNIFIL fully, to withdraw the Israeli units from the Netherlands and other UNIFIL sectors at once and to allow humanitarian assistance without hindrance.

103. In the opinion of the Netherlands, it is quite inconceivable that UNIFIL should be given an additional lease of life only to be harassed and vilified in the course of its duty. The credibility of the United Nations and its peace-keeping operation in Lebanon is at stake.

104. In conclusion, I should like to reaffirm the commitment of the Netherlands Government to the concept of the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations. If this concept has been shaken by Israeli violations of UNIFIL, we should in no way lose sight of the importance of peace-keeping operations for the containment of conflicts nor, for that matter, of the achievements of various peace-keeping operations in the past and, indeed, of UNIFIL over the past four years.

105. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

106. Mr. MAKSOUD: The resolution submitted and voted upon today constitutes the expression of international insistence on the continued legitimacy of a United Nations presence in Lebanon. It is an insistence that is also, one hopes, pre-emptive of any attempt to deny the authority of the Council to deal with the problems that have arisen as a consequence of Israel's repeated incursions into Lebanon and its most recent invasion of that country.

107. In spite of the fact that the Council resolution has been called an "interim" arrangement, it is to be hoped that that interim arrangement can be implemented and that the content and substantive parts of the resolution will be taken seriously. It is also to be hoped that the Secretary-General will report as quickly as possible on the implementation of Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982).

108. This insistence on a legitimate United Nations presence, coupled with the growing concern over Israeli violations, is, however, making the world community aware that Israel's studied contempt for the resolutions of the United Nations is nothing but an attempt on its part to remove the international authority from the scene so that it can pursue its own objectives of destroying Lebanon and of dispersing that country's population, Lebanese as well as Palestinians.

109. The juridical continuity represented by the Council resolution forms a backdrop to the carnage Israel has wreaked in Lebanon as it pursues a vendetta unprecedented in modern history—save for the possible exception of that carried out by Hitlerian nazism against the people of the Jewish faith. It is a vendetta masked in the hypocritical Israeli statements—such as those Menachem Begin made today and yesterday—by which that country attempts to persuade us that its ravaging of Lebanon and the carnage it is wreaking there afford an opportunity for peace. Israel has even had the audacity to claim that what it is doing is analogous to events that once occurred in Czechoslovakia.

110. The tragedy, the human suffering, the death toll, the indiscriminate attacks and the arrogance with which the so-called defence minister of Israel parades past the symbols of Lebanese sovereignty and unity, as he did near the Palace of the President, all reveal Israel's contempt, which cannot be concealed by its claims that it tramples upon Lebanese sovereign territory out of a concern for its own sovereignty. Behind its repeated claims that it is desirous of saving Lebanon, Israel is destroying that country. When it thrusts its military machine through that country it is communicating to the United States that what is taking place in Lebanon is a test of superior American arms in the hands of talented Israeli warriors.

111. In the United States today, there are elements attempting to maintain, as former Secretary of State Kissinger did yesterday, that, notwithstanding the misgivings one might have with regard to the Lebanese tragedy, Israel is none the less providing an opportunity for the United States to achieve its own long-established and cherished strategic objectives. I am sure that, when the people of the United States realize the extent of the civilian casualties—which exceed the 15,000 figure that has been mentioned—and of the maimed and the wounded, when they realize the extent to which Israel has deliberately prevented ICRC from delivering medicines, equipment and sanitation equipment—when they come to realize all those things the constituency of conscience in the United States will realize that to claim that the carnage that Israel, in the name of its so-called self-defence and security objectives, has inflicted upon Lebanon, a carnage with genocidal dimensions, and the tragedy that the Lebanese people and Palestinian refugees have experienced in recent days is requited by the fact that it represents an unprecedented opportunity for the United States to achieve its own strategic objectives is to commit an obscenity, to say the least.

112. What are the strategic objectives that Israel claims for its invasion? It is attempting to persuade the United States that these objectives are to provide Israel with a so-called security belt in order to sanitize—as it claims—a region in Lebanon so that Israel can establish in a permanent form, and institutionalize, a violation of Lebanese territorial sovereignty.

113. What are the strategic objectives of the United States that this invasion is supposed to serve? An entire Arab people has been alienated as it witnesses the carnage around the capital of Lebanon. For the first time, that capital is being threatened by an invasion force, alienating the entire Arab world. The United States is reinforcing an impression which we had hoped we could avoid—an impression that the United States has weakened its commitment to its friendship with the Arab countries by buying time for Israel to pursue the unfolding objectives of its invasion.

114. The United States must reassess immediately many of its assumptions and policies and behaviour patterns. It cannot lump together so-called foreigners, because the only foreigner in Lebanon is the invasion force of Israel. This attempt to lump together foreigners, so-called, in order to give Israel a sort of equal share in determining Lebanon's destiny cannot be justified.

115. New reality? The invasion has created a new reality? Then there is a premium on aggression. There is a premium on legitimizing aggression for political objectives. That is what is bringing us to the brink of destabilization throughout the region. That is what is making a comprehensive and just settlement more and more unlikely.

116. The United States in its attempt to exercise a global responsibility has been propelled into a role in Lebanon. If this role can be step by step, it nevertheless must ensure that in the process there is no compensation—political, strategic or military—which Israel can reap from its invasion. Any attempt to translate the military carnage that Israel's invasion has caused in Lebanon into any permanent political or strategic benefit would let loose in the world community any force seeking to utilize military means for political objectives. The Arabs would not like to see the United States, in any circumstances, viewing its commitment to Israel's existence as a commitment to underwriting Israel's objectives without any question.

117. Lebanon the system, Lebanon the country, Lebanon the legitimacy may have been denied the instruments of power, but the resilience of the people, their commitment to Lebanon's independence, to its integrity, to its sovereignty have never faltered; on the contrary, this has been reinforced by the dimensions of the tragedy the Lebanese people are experiencing.

118. Israel's attempt to decimate the Palestinians in the refugee camps of Lebanon in order to subjugate the Palestinians permanently in the occupied territories of the West Bank, Jerusalem and Gaza is a well-known, established part of Israel's inherent policy. Unless the aspect of the problem is realized, with its dire consequences for the chances of peace and stability in the entire Arab region, the world community will come closer and closer to the brink of disaster, in direct symmetry with Israel's troops trying to surround the capital city of Beirut.

119. The people in Lebanon are suffering today, hanging on any sign of hope, appreciative of any sympathetic response. Israel's genocide in Lebanon requires from us more than sympathy and philosophy. It requires firm determination on the part of the international community not to allow any strategic or political benefits to result from such military means as invasion and aggression. Unless that determination is shown, we repeat once again, the credibility of this body will be undermined, just as UNIFIL forces in southern Lebanon have been trampled upon by the invasion forces of Israel. And the fact that they have been trampled upon should not surprise anybody in the Council, because such action is inherent in Israel's studied contempt for the United Nations, the Charter of the United Nations and the resolutions of the Organization.

120. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Israel, upon whom I now call.

121. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I should like to make a statement, not to deliver a sermon.

122. A unique opening is now presenting itself in Lebanon, an opportunity that holds great promise. Israel, as I have indicated on numerous occasions, including over the past fortnight, has no intention of maintaining any presence in Lebanon. Operation "Peace for Galilee" was prompted solely by dictates of self-preservation and self-defence, which is an inherent right of every State and recognized also by the Charter of the United Nations.

123. If all the statements made in the Council were to be taken at their face value, nothing would be simpler than restoring to Lebanon what is rightfully Lebanon's: its independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty in the fullest sense of these words. The situation obviously is more complex than that.

124. As far as Israel is concerned, we have repeatedly stated—and I state it here tonight again—that we have no territorial ambitions whatsoever in Lebanon. We do not covet even one single square inch of Lebanese territory; we do not want to stay in Lebanon or in any part thereof. But we are entitled to demand, and we are indeed demanding, that proper arrangements be made so that Lebanon should no longer serve as a staging ground for terrorist attacks against Israel's civilian population. We are entitled to demand, and we are demanding, that concrete arrangements be made that would permanently and reliably preclude hostile action against Israel's citizens from Lebanese soil.

125. Let me therefore state it once again: We fully support, as we have over the years, the restoration of Lebanese sovereignty—Lebanese sovereignty that has been eroded over the past 10 years, first by the terrorist PLO and subsequently by the Syrian army of occupation. We stand for the full restoration of

Lebanese sovereignty, of Lebanese independence, of Lebanese territorial integrity, of the unity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries, as well as for the restoration of the authority of the lawful Government of Lebanon within that country.

126. The resolution adopted by the Council tonight makes reference to its resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982). Our position with regard to those two resolutions is well known; we have stated it here in the Council and it remains consistent. I shall therefore only refer members of the Council to the letter which I sent to the Secretary-General on 7 June and which reads as follows:

"In the light of Security Council resolution 509 (1982), I am instructed to communicate to you the following:

"1. The "Peace for Galilee" operation was ordered because of the intolerable situation created by the presence in Lebanon of a large number of terrorists operating from that country, equipped with modern, long-range weaponry, threatening the lives of the civilian population of Galilee.

"2. Any withdrawal of Israel military forces prior to the conclusion of concrete arrangements which would permanently and reliably preclude hostile action against Israel's citizens is inconceivable.

"3. The inherent right of self-defence is one of the fundamental rights of sovereign States. Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations reaffirms the right of self-defence of all Member States.

"4. The Government of Israel reiterates its statement published on 6 June 1982 that "Israel continues to aspire to the signing of a peace treaty with independent Lebanon, its territorial integrity preserved" . . ." [S/15178, para. 5]

127. I wish to state that it is my Government's understanding that the resolution adopted by the Council tonight is not intended to change the existing mandate of UNIFIL—subject, of course, to the fundamentally altered situation referred to in the Secretary-General's report of 14 June [S/15194/Add.2, para. 17]. Should, however, any attempt be made on the basis of the resolution adopted tonight to bring about a *de facto* change in the UNIFIL mandate, irrespective of the nature of such change, I am authorized by my Government to state that any such attempt will be rejected.

128. In the course of our debate here tonight, a number of representatives engaged in all kinds of exaggerations, deliberate or otherwise, as well as distortions and falsifications of the true situation in that part of Lebanon that is currently under Israeli control. Some of those statements were quite predictable.

129. Mr. Maksoud's respect for the truth and adherence to it are, of course, notorious. Thus we all know how to treat his sermons—erroneously billed as statements. He told the Council a few minutes ago that Israel has prevented ICRC from operating in the territories that have come under Israeli control over the past two weeks. I have in front of me a press communication released by ICRC in Geneva today, 18 June. I do not wish to quote that statement in its entirety; I shall quote just a few sentences:

“In the medical field 300 wounded are receiving treatment. This figure differs from the initial estimates made at the height of the fighting.”

In other words, ICRC, known for its caution, is clearly telling us that the wild figures that have been floating around, in this building also, ranging from 10,000 to 1.5 million—it was not quite clear whether these were fatalities, other casualties, displaced persons—were all figures that exceeded the total population of that part of Lebanon. ICRC is telling us that all those figures were grossly exaggerated:

“In the medical field 300 wounded are receiving treatment. This figure differs from the initial estimates made at the height of the fighting.”

The press release goes on:

“In Tyre, as in Sidon, the principal task of the sub-delegation is dealing with displaced people, the medical situation being under control.”

Indeed, it is under control, so much so that there are empty beds in hospitals in various cities in south Lebanon. One contributing factor, of course, is the fact that we transferred some severe cases from the hospitals in Lebanon to Israeli hospitals to vacate beds for those injured in the hostilities. Let me give the true picture, not Mr. Maksoud's picture. The Israel Defence Forces have authorized the presence of ICRC representatives in the area to make an assessment of the situation and evaluation of the requirements of the Lebanese civilian population. Ten tonnes of ICRC supplies have reached the area. The chief medical officer of ICRC stated in a report after touring Tyre and Sidon that “all casualties have received the appropriate medical treatment.” That report also states that there is no need for additional medical aid to the area.

130. A Swedish medical team attached to UNIFIL has been authorized by the Israel Defence Forces to admit Lebanese civilians to the hospital in Naqoura. Eighteen ICRC auxiliaries have been given access to the area. As I have said, Israel's hospitals have been opened to Lebanese civilian casualties. Medical clinics have been set up in towns and villages in the Lebanese territory entered by the Israel Defence Forces. A team of 70 doctors, headed by the director-general of the sick fund of the trade union, the Histadrut, and the deputy chief army medical officer are now in Lebanon,

with medical equipment and 20 ambulances, to study immediate problems, including vaccination, infection and water pollution, sewerage and plague prevention. So much for the medical aid.

131. From the start of the “Peace for Galilee” operation, the Israel Defence Forces have been at pains to ensure adequate food supplies for the civilian population. To this end, the Israel Defence Forces distributed bread and milk powder, as well as a large quantity of tents, within 48 hours of entry into Lebanese towns and villages. The Israel Ministry of Energy has assumed responsibility for the allocation of fuel supplies. The Israel Defence Forces are repairing the water, electricity and communications systems where damaged, as well as carrying out road repairs.

132. The Government of Israel has appointed a member of the Cabinet to co-ordinate aid to the civilian population in south Lebanon and has also set up a committee on humanitarian aid to Lebanese civilians, headed by the Director-General of Israel's Ministry of Foreign Affairs. A joint United States-Israel committee has been formed to co-ordinate joint aid. Last, but not least, volunteer groups formed by Israel's civilians are collecting food, clothing and blankets for immediate dispatch to suffering Lebanese civilians. Volunteer fund-raising is being organized and sponsored by various organizations, women's groups, the Israel broadcasting service, newspapers and individuals.

133. The time has come for all those engaging in exaggeration, distortion and falsification to call a halt to this practice, especially when we are dealing with individuals and groups which have not found the opportunity over the past six years to lament the tragedy of Lebanon, which since 1975 has caused the deaths of 100,000 Lebanese, the wounding of a quarter of a million people and the displacement of more than one million people. Over all those years we have heard no statements even faintly resembling those made by various representatives tonight. I shall come to some of them individually later.

134. What is this if not cynicism and bigotry in the highest degree? I shall not respond to all the statements that we have heard tonight, but some of them I can characterize only as belonging to the nauseating procession of bigotry and cynicism.

135. Let us consider briefly the statement made by the representative of the Soviet Union. Of course, his country's role in destabilizing the Middle East all these years is well known. We also all know who the stooges of the Soviet Union have been in the Middle East all these years and who it has been that the Soviet Union has used in an attempt to destabilize our region—first and foremost, of course, the terrorist PLO. Now that some misfortune has befallen the Soviet Union's protégés we hear the bullying statements of the Soviet representative, threatening a sovereign and indepen-

dent State. It is true that it is a small State, but when it comes to sovereignty it is equal to that of the Soviet Union.

136. We have heard, not for the first time in the Council, thinly veiled threats against my country coming from the Soviet representative who said that Israel is going to pay dearly, and similar statements. We reject these bullying tactics. We are not impressed by them. We treat them with the contempt which they deserve. The Soviet Union certainly cannot lecture us—or anybody, for that matter—on international aggression. The Soviet Union's record on international aggression is too well known for me to elaborate. We are told that the Soviet Union's rights are affected by what happens in Lebanon. How many hundreds of miles, Mr. Ovinnikov, separate Lebanon from the Soviet border? Or is it thousands of miles?

137. What exactly are the Soviet rights and Soviet interests in what is happening in Lebanon? Are we not entitled to some clarification on this? Israel borders on Lebanon. Israel has no rights and no interests. When Israeli children are being massacred from across the Lebanese border and Israel responds, that is aggression. Mind you, those Israeli children were massacred by peace-loving Soviet Katyushas and peace-loving Soviet guns and peace-loving Soviet sub-machine-guns. And along comes the Soviet representative to bully us. Indeed, we treat these bullying tactics with the contempt that they deserve.

138. The Soviet representative spoke of the restoration of Lebanese sovereignty. It was your country, Mr. Ovinnikov, that was instrumental in destroying Lebanese sovereignty. You are not interested in restoring Lebanese sovereignty. You never were.

139. And if the Soviet representative speaks the way he does, his Polish colleague, of course, has to follow suit. So we heard a statement from the representative of Poland which I can only characterize as slightly ludicrous.

140. The representative of the martial law régime protested the destruction of political organizations, and I made a note of what he said: "the destruction of . . . political . . . organizations". I am not quite clear whether he was or was not oblivious of what he was saying. What about the destruction of certain political organizations in Poland these days?

141. We were told that Polish society had expressed its indignation—that is another quote. Which Polish society: the one that has been stifled by the martial law régime? And what exactly are the channels for expressing indignation in Poland these days?

142. And then, of course, we have the strange predilection of the Polish representative for talking of solidarity on every occasion. He did it again today. What is it that attracts him so much to that word?

143. The representative of the United Kingdom told the Council that he was horrified by the events of the past fortnight in Lebanon. I regret to have to point out to him that over the past few years we sorely missed expressions of horror on his part at the terrorist outrages perpetrated by the criminal PLO against my people.

144. On one occasion last year, if I may refresh his memory, we were even chided by him for calling the terrorists "terrorists". But, as has been rightly stated by a leading statesman of our time—I should say, rather, a leading stateswoman of our time—"A crime is a crime is a crime." By the same token, a terrorist is a terrorist is a terrorist.

145. We are not members of the Council, let alone permanent members of the Council. And because of that we are not in the position to block resolutions that are being adopted here and that we consider inimical to our vital national interests. But the fact that the representative of the United Kingdom has that ability does not confer on him any moral superiority over other Member States in the Organization.

146. I do not wish to respond in great detail to the representative of Ireland. On a previous occasion, and again today, he has engaged in a dubious attempt at book-keeping, which we totally reject. It has no moral or legal basis whatsoever.

147. For reasons that must by now be obvious in the light of the survey that I gave of the true situation in south Lebanon, we equally reject his description of the situation in those parts of Lebanon now under Israeli occupation. His statement today is yet another expression of his well-known tendency to adopt a blinkered, selective, one-sided and lopsided position on the matter before us, as well as on other issues affecting my country.

148. He raised the issue of proportionality within the framework of the book-keeping that he is suggesting here. Let me ask him a very simple question. On 23 April 1979, the PLO beasts perpetrated a particularly despicable crime in Nahariya, northern Israel, western Galilee, in the course of which they dragged a father and his four-year-old daughter to the beach, then clubbed the girl to death, smashing her head against the rocks in the presence of the father. And then, right after murdering the child, they murdered the father. Heaven forbid, not the other way around; PLO beasts are not that merciful.

149. I reported that outrage—one of the most despicable in the long catalogue of PLO crime—in my letter to the Secretary-General [S/13264]. Incidentally, that outrage occurred on Holocaust Day, which we in Israel and throughout the Jewish world mark to commemorate 6 million men, women and children—1.5 million children—who were exterminated during the Second World War.

150. I ask the Irish representative point-blank: What exactly is the price of that child? What is the proportionality? So let us stop this silly book-keeping.

151. To sum up, we strongly and categorically deplore and condemn the statement of the representative of Ireland. We deny his right, and indeed his constant practice, to lecture us on international law and morality.

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

153. Mr. THUNBORG (Sweden): Mr. President, I should like to extend my thanks to you and to the other members of the Council for granting me the right to speak in this debate.

154. It is not customary for my delegation to request to be invited to take part in debates of the Security Council. Since Sweden was last a member of the Council in 1976 we have, in fact, done so only once before, and then on a matter which had been initiated by Sweden as a member.

155. It is an indication of our very deep concern, therefore, that I have asked to be heard by the Council on this occasion. I have done so as the representative of a country that participates in UNIFIL with a medical military company and that over the years has contributed units or officers to practically every peace-keeping operation undertaken by the United Nations. In all, over 40,000 Swedish soldiers have served in those operations.

156. My Government views with the utmost concern the situation which has ensued from the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. The admittedly tenuous peace in the area has been shattered and the conflict threatens to escalate into an even wider war that could endanger peace even beyond the region. The invasion flagrantly violates not only the independence of Lebanon but also the political authority of UNIFIL and of the Security Council, which, in its resolution 425 (1978), instituted the Force, supposedly with the consent of all the parties.

157. To a Government as thoroughly committed to the concept of peace-keeping through the United Nations as my own, the open contempt displayed by Israel towards the UNIFIL operation is very disturbing indeed. The Israeli army has simply overrun the positions held by the United Nations forces to launch a major attack against another party. All previous encroachments and violations by the parties, and there have been many, are dwarfed in comparison.

158. I should like to underline in this context that the entire concept of peace-keeping rests on the assumption that the parties will co-operate in good faith with the peace-keeping forces.

159. Through its resolution 509 (1982), the Council has unanimously directed Israel to withdraw its forces "forthwith and unconditionally" from Lebanese territory. My Government has condemned Israel's refusal to implement that resolution as it is required to do under the terms of the Charter of the United Nations. Israel's invasion has caused, and continues to cause, vast suffering among the civilian Lebanese and Palestinian populations. To attempt to alleviate the plight of the victims, my Government decided yesterday to allocate 20 million Swedish kronor—corresponding to about \$3.3 million—to the relief operations of United Nations agencies and ICRC.

160. We fully expect Israel to facilitate the relief efforts of the international community and, in general, to honour its commitments under the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War¹ and the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War,² of 12 August 1949. It is also our view that members of the PLO taken prisoner should be treated in the humanitarian spirit constituting the basis for the third Geneva Convention and the Additional Protocols of 1977.³

161. As long as UNIFIL is in the area while the civilian population is suffering deprivations of all kinds, it is inconceivable to my Government that UNIFIL resources should not be put to such use as may be possible in providing relief to the population, in as wide an area as possible and not confined to what has been the Force's area of operations; this applies in particular to the UNIFIL hospital in Naqoura, which happens to be staffed by Swedish personnel.

162. My Government is convinced that the war in Lebanon will once again make it evident that the question of the future of the Palestinian people cannot be settled through the use of force. It will also become evident that Israel cannot secure its right to live within secure and recognized boundaries by military means. All parties must realize that the cycle of violence has to be brought to a halt. Only through negotiations can a lasting peaceful solution be attained.

163. It would seem that for some time to come the UNIFIL operation will find itself in a rather foggy political landscape. There might be no clear lead stars to indicate the course to take. As a troop contributor, Sweden will be guided by the following considerations: To the best of our knowledge, there has not so far been any call for the withdrawal of UNIFIL by any of the parties directly engaged in the military activities which arose out of the Israeli invasion, nor has any of the troop-contributing countries signalled an intention to withdraw from the operation. The history of United Nations peace-keeping in the Middle East has taught us a disastrous lesson of what a drastic and ill-advised removal of a United Nations peace-keeping force can entail.

164. As long as it is clear to us that the parties directly concerned, as well as the Council, are striving to find an acceptable formula for the continued presence of

UNIFIL, we believe it to be our duty to the United Nations to stay on under the present mandate.

165. We have no illusions about the arduous task ahead in trying to devise an acceptable formula. We take it for granted that a continued UNIFIL operation will not be construed in such a way as to confirm or secure, either directly or through a proxy, the advancement of positions which Israel has obtained through its aggression against Lebanon.

166. It is the firm belief of my Government that a new mandate for the continued existence of UNIFIL in southern Lebanon must be based on the three objectives laid down in the original mandate which, through paragraph 3 of its resolution 425 (1978), the Council gave to UNIFIL, namely, those of

“... confirming the withdrawal of Israeli forces [from Lebanon], restoring international peace and security and assisting the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area”.

167. I have already emphasized the strong views of my Government as regards the value of peace-keeping through the United Nations. Since the concept was evolved in the 1950s, it has proved to be an effective instrument at the disposal of the international community for the containment of conflicts. It is essential that peace-keeping in the form that has been developed within the United Nations be maintained as a function of the Organization. To us it is clear that it is in the broader interests of all States that the international community as a whole, acting through its universal organization, should assume responsibility for operations of this nature.

168. Let us not, however, forget what the acronym UNIFIL stands for: the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. I am certain that we, the troop-contributing countries, the members of the Council, as well as the parties and concerned Governments everywhere, are all anxious to underline the word “interim”. We do not wish to perpetuate indefinitely an interim arrangement. What we want to see is real progress towards a lasting and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict, a settlement that will make it possible for Israelis and Palestinians to live in peace side by side within mutually recognized and secure borders. A prolongation of the mandate of UNIFIL could be a contribution to this general goal provided that all parties involved respect the mandate and functions of UNIFIL.

169. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity 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.

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

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

171. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic): Ever since 1948 and earlier, Arab representatives and others have spoken in this forum informing the world of Israel's crimes against the Palestinians and warning of the dire consequences of the expansionist nature of the Zionist State. Time and again, and drawing from our bitter experiences, we have alerted the world to the perils Israel poses to our region, as well as to the world at large. Our warnings have always emphasized that Zionism is a negation of Arab existence, and all this while Israel was indeed proving the validity of our worst fears, first in Palestine before 1948 and up to the present, then in the Golan, and now in Lebanon. If some Westerners have, for one reason or another, remained deaf to our pleas, we are confident that this latest carnage, this latest blood-letting in Lebanon, will, we hope, dispel any remaining doubt as to whether Israel can abide by any norms of international behaviour or can overcome a birth defect which allows it to indulge in aberrations.

172. This gory human tragedy will be the final test for those who seek to justify this genocide as well as for those who remain silent. To those still hesitant or intimidated, we say: “Speak out, or else history will judge you as harshly as those who stood by while the Nazis committed their atrocities.”

173. Never before has an Israeli act of aggression been characterized by so much brutality; never before has an Israeli act of aggression assumed the proportions of a large-scale massacre, a genocide; never before has the world's conscience been so shocked, yet so passive, as while watching this wanton massacre. Figures indicate approximately 800,000 displaced civilians, the majority of whom have been forced to take shelter in the open, where they remain vulnerable to systematic onslaughts. Figures indicate tens of thousands of wounded, the great majority of whom are unattended. Figures indicate more than 10,000 dead, the majority of whom remain unburied. The Israelis have done and are still doing their utmost to kill off those still alive by sadistic methods which portray the congenital savagery in the Zionist mind. One United States columnist quotes in *The New York Times* of 14 June the novelist John le Carré, who wrote:

“Too many Israelis, in their claustrophobia, have persuaded themselves that every Palestinian man

and woman and child is by definition a military target, and that Israel will not be safe until the pack of them are swept away."

174. But this time, while sweeping away and massacring the Palestinians, the Israelis are also sweeping away and massacring the Lebanese, for the Lebanese are Arabs and all Arabs who stand in Israel's path must be liquidated by all possible means, particularly by the latest models of lethal United States weapons. This Zionist design is rooted in Hertzl's colonial dreams and those of his disciples and has been faithfully and systematically carried out in Palestine, Lebanon and the Syrian Golan Heights.

175. The Council has adopted two resolutions on the invasion of Lebanon [*resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982)*], neither of which has been respected by Israel. The United States veto against a third warning to Israel on a draft resolution [*S/15185*] consolidating resolution 509 (1982) has only helped Israel to intensify and escalate its bestial aggression against Lebanon and the Palestinian people. The draft resolution introduced by Spain was described by the United States chief representative as "not sufficiently balanced" [*2377th meeting, para. 27*]. We wonder if the United States still considers the wording more pertinent than the massacre committed by its friend and ally, that island of democracy; its friend and ally, the only democracy in the Middle East. This is their friend and ally. It is no longer a secret that the United States considers the Israeli invasion of Lebanon as a new and valuable asset for enhancing its strategic interest in the area. It is not aggression that must be halted, according to Mr. Blum and Mrs. Kirkpatrick, but that a diktat should be imposed upon Lebanese, Palestinians and Syrians alike, a diktat that will place the entire region under direct but joint United States-Israeli control.

176. The United States is flouting resolution 509 (1982), in which the Council "demands that Israel withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon". The United States is therefore condoning the Israeli occupation of Lebanon in order to exact conditions that reward the aggressor, whose territorial and political ambitions in Lebanon are all too well-known. What was not achieved by the tripartite Camp David conspiracy is to be accomplished by a two-pronged assault—an assault against the Arabs under occupation simultaneously or concurrently with genocide outside—in the hope that the use of unlimited force against Arabs—and particularly Palestinians—in our region will bring about the subjugation of the entire region. How shortsighted that doctrine is, and how dire the results will be. Has not the Arab nation throughout its long history repelled all aggressors, regardless of the cost and of the duration of the struggle against the intruders? Never have the Arab masses been more conscious of the contradiction between their own interests and those of the imperialist and reactionary circles. No enemy force can ever detract or diminish

their determination to withstand foreign encroachment upon their land or upon their own national interest, in a region of the world that is one of the most sensitive because of its strategic situation and its wealth.

177. The invasion of Lebanon, with its goal of eliminating Palestinians and Lebanese alike, is bound to backfire on Israel and its supporters. All the calculations in Washington and Tel Aviv, some of which we heard from Secretary of State Haig himself on Sunday, 13 June, are but empty dreams that will be buried under the rubble of Lebanon. The United States should not forget that the Palestinian revolution was born in refugee camps and that it has grown up as a result of the Israeli aggression and occupation carried out since 1967. The PLO, supported by the Arab nation and by the overwhelming majority of nations, embodies the rejection of oppression. But oppression remains the official policy of the United States and of its surrogate, Israel.

178. This massacre must stop immediately, even if the Council has to be called upon to meet night and day. At the same time, Israel has to withdraw all its forces unconditionally and immediately from all of Lebanon. Israeli war criminals must be brought to justice without delay. Israel must be expelled from the United Nations for its gross violations of its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and for its crimes against humanity. The massacre of its innocent victims demands that justice be done. The Council can no longer delay the application of mandatory sanctions against Israel under Chapter VII of the Charter.

179. The Syrian Arab Republic, whose destiny is so tightly linked to that of the Palestinian people and to that of the Lebanese people, reiterates that it will continue to exert all efforts in the fulfilment of its Arab national obligations and duties towards all its brothers. The Syrian Arab Republic will perform its declared national duty to preserve the unity of Lebanon, its independence and sovereignty. We shall spare no effort to stand by Lebanon and the Palestinian revolution during these tragic events, the responsibility for which falls upon the shoulders of the United States and its Israeli surrogate.

180. In conclusion, Lebanese, Palestinian and Syrian blood is being shed on Lebanon's soil, strengthening the bonds of kinship and paving the road to total liberation. On 14 June, President Hafez Assad told a delegation representing the Palestinian resistance:

"The Palestinian cause remains our major sacred cause which we shall continue defending with all means at our disposal, irrespective of sacrifice and suffering."

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

182. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): I suspect that I am expected to propose a motion of thanks to Israel and the Israeli representative for the paradise that prevails in southern Lebanon following the Israeli occupation and for the fact that there has been such a small number of casualties, such a small number of wounded, such a small number of people in hospitals. It is not my intention to engage in polemics over figures. I think the scope of the tragedy is there for all of us to see. Pictures have been printed here and film clips have been shown on television. It would be an insult to the memory of the dead and to the sacrifice of the wounded and displaced were I or the Council to transform this discussion into a petty piece of accounting, as has been suggested by the representative of Israel.

183. Perhaps Israel wants to ponder the following question: How is it that the whole world is always wrong and only Israel is right, not only on policy, not only on behaviour, not only in the matter of imperialism, but also on casualty figures of the dead, the wounded, the maimed and those dispersed? I should know, and when I was given the floor here I was wondering whether I would be speaking in the name of a Government or in the name of a displaced people, one that today, in their own country, consists of refugees roaming from camp to camp and from city to city, from destruction to destruction.

184. I wish to thank those who have spoken on this matter and I am sure that the noble sentiments that have prompted them to do so transcend the cynicism and black humour of the representative of Israel.

185. What has happened in Lebanon is not a tragedy; it is a cataclysm, a human cataclysm. My country was crucified. It was crucified politically; it was crucified socially; it was crucified economically. But above all, it was crucified in its soul and in its heart. It is very fashionable nowadays to draw up maps for Lebanon and constitutions for its future. Mr. Blum's colleague, Mr. Moshe Arens, the Ambassador to Washington, went so far as to write—not without cynicism—that perhaps an enclave in north-east Lebanon, no more than a quarter of the country, should be given to Syria to meet and accommodate Syria's security concerns. I refer to the *Wall Street Journal* of 11 June.

186. My country is not at the disposal of anybody. It is not for sale nor is it for hire, and I do not think our history warrants that we should today stand here before the world community prepared to be partitioned, divided or handed over as spoils to the various parties engaged in the invasion and the battle.

187. I know that Lebanon is a disrupted society today. I know that it is a territory almost destroyed. I know it is a martyred country. Almost five years ago, we came to the Council calling "let my people live" [2071st meeting, para. 16]. There was a response from the Council. It was not only a commitment, it was a challenge. Everybody met the challenge and the

world community, and particularly those countries that contributed their men to a gentle peace-keeping task, to use the Irish representative's words, all wanted Lebanon to live. All countries wanted Lebanon to live, except one, Israel, which has defied and is now defying the decisions and resolutions of the Council and the very arm that the Council has created to install peace-keeping in Lebanon.

188. Today's resolution—and I had thought that the debate was going to be only on that resolution—is another commitment. It is a challenge. But that very commitment, only an hour old, is also being defied by Israel, which has announced that it will not obey Council resolutions or abide by them.

189. The Council has taken a risk by asking UNIFIL to stay, to maintain positions, to ensure freedom of movement and to perform a humanitarian task. I need not remind members of the Council, who have all read the reports of the Secretary-General and other reports circulated in this house, that three, four, five convoys of UNIFIL carrying ICRC supplies and ICRC workers have day after day been prevented from entering the martyred city of Tyre, while, according to the United Nations reports, no less than 3,000 people has been stranded on the beach for more than two days with no water, no food and no supplies.

190. I think that international history will consider it commendable and I think it is beyond the cynicism displayed here, that those men should have tried and tried again and are still trying, and that they should be willing, as representatives of their countries have announced, to try again and to stay in south Lebanon in the hope that in due course they may be needed. No words can sufficiently express the tribute that we owe them and their Governments and countries.

191. We have been treated to lectures on the security of countries. My country is one that has always believed in peace through openness; we believe in an open society and we believe that democracy cannot be defended by force of arms and destruction. I think that the time may have come for us to ask the world community once more to recognize that what we are paying for today is precisely our attachment to peace and the fact that we have refused, although it is probably within our means, to become an aggressive country, a country that founds its unity and its system of Government on expansion and aggression.

192. While people are redrawing our map, I want to say that I am proud that the Lebanese have stayed together in unity, that despite all the gambles that have been taken here and there on their disunity, on the dismemberment of that small country that the world has loved, they have remained one and shall remain one.

193. While thanking our friends who are today worried about our future and willing to contribute to

assisting us, may we tell our enemies that the future of Lebanon shall not be constructed in the shadow of the guns of occupation and destruction. The Lebanese are mature enough to know what future Lebanon desires and deserves, and for them the commitment of the international community is sufficient encouragement and a sufficient source of confidence.

194. Lebanon is for the Lebanese and for the Lebanese alone, and the Lebanese and the Lebanese alone will know what future to construct for Lebanon.

195. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now speak as the representative of FRANCE.

196. In associating itself with the decision just adopted by the Council to extend for two months the mandate of UNIFIL, my delegation would emphasize that, despite the particularly dramatic situation in the region, the objectives set for the Force under Council resolution 425 (1978) remain fundamental, even though present circumstances in the region are different from those in which UNIFIL was established and has functioned since March 1978.

197. Since the legitimate authorities of Lebanon so desire, my Government is in favour of the interim renewal of the present mandate of the Force. This decision must, of course, be followed by a thorough review of the situation so as to redefine the modalities of the UNIFIL mission and enable it fully to discharge the duties assigned to it.

198. My delegation would recall, furthermore, that resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), which we supported fully, remain valid.

199. Finally, I should like to say how appalled France is by the sufferings being endured by the civilian populations in Lebanon. France knows that they are in dire need of help. It is most concerned at the gravity of the problems that have arisen in this regard, which obviously require attention urgently.

200. I now resume my functions as PRESIDENT.

201. The representative of Poland has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I call on him.

202. Mr. NOWAK (Poland): It was predictable that the representative of Israel would again indulge in his usual provocative remarks regarding, *inter alia*, the term "solidarity", although this time he did not try to speak Polish.

203. In this connection I wish only to state that we are not ashamed of the word "solidarity" or, in Polish, "solidarnosc", and that we shall continue to keep it in our vocabulary and to use it both internally and externally whenever necessary, and in particular when referring to such cases as the plight of the victims of the Israeli aggression.

204. So we reject the bullying tactics of Mr. Blum.

205. I regret that he has seen fit to leave the room. It seems that he is willing to dish it out but less willing to take it. If he were present I should like to ask him, using language similar to that used by him in one of his statements earlier this year, a simple question: Are there no limits to hypocrisy, Mr. Blum?

206. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of the Soviet Union has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I call on him.

207. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. Blum has acted today like the reckless driver of a car who collides with another car and, fearing the consequences, leaves the scene of the accident. Mr. Blum's absence does not, however, relieve me of the duty of giving him an appropriate reply, especially since today's statement by Mr. Blum is noteworthy for its new heights of hypocrisy. He tried to affirm here that the Israeli aggression against and occupation of Lebanon are almost boons to that country. One quality is needed to speak like that—a complete lack of conscience—and it is certainly true that Mr. Blum has no conscience whatever.

208. The reason why the Israeli representative chose to focus his attack primarily on the delegation of the Soviet Union, my country, is quite simple: in order to try to change the context within which the discussion here in the Council is taking place, namely, that here in the Council, if we listened carefully to all the statements made, we would notice that Israel found itself almost virtually isolated. One delegation, the United States, did of course take a special position, but there is nothing new in that.

209. Mr. Blum complained in vain that Israel does not have the right of veto. Mr. Blum, unlike other representatives, has a very rare quality: he does not have two hands, but three; and the third hand is right there. It is the hand of the United States, and it was raised in the Council when it was a matter of punishing Israel for the fact that it had annexed the Golan Heights. That hand of the United States was raised in its veto so as to prevent measures from being taken against Israel for all the horrors it has committed in the West Bank. The United States hand was raised in defence of Israel only recently, just a couple of days ago, so that the Council was prevented from taking effective measures against Israel, the aggressor, for its aggression against Lebanon. So the question arises: Why should the United States be so submissive? Why should the United States be so willing to use its veto for Israel? It is because the United States is in the hands of Israel and is trying to follow its own imperialist policy in the Middle East. It is for the sake of that, for its younger partner, that it uses its veto. That was the purpose of the strategic alliance between the United States and Israel in the Middle East.

210. We said that today Israel found itself isolated in the Security Council. Today Israel found itself isolated in another hall nearby, where the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament is taking place. Only 52 delegations remained to hear the statement made by Prime Minister Begin; over two thirds of the States Members of the United Nations were not present to hear that statement. Does that not show the extreme isolation of Israel in the United Nations? Does that not show how the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations respond to Israel and its aggressive policy in the Middle East?

211. And lastly, one final point: the Soviet Union does not threaten anybody just to give comfort to Mr. Blum. Israel's own expansionist policy in the Middle East threatens it itself. Israel, and the United States standing behind its back, is doing everything, using crude, brute force to reduce the Arab peoples and countries to naught so that they can impose on the Arab peoples and countries their own system and order in the Middle East. Israel is the anti-Arab executioner in the Middle East, and the axe it holds in its hand has been given to it by the United States. But that policy is, in fact, suicidal for Israel. Israel should think twice before it is too late, but perhaps it is already too late.

212. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Ireland has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I call on him.

213. Mr. DORR (Ireland): This is the first time that I have ever had to engage in a right of reply. I will keep it brief and non-polemic since I respect Mr. Blum and his people. I still think that what Israel has done in recent weeks is both wrong and dangerous, and I believe that that must be said.

214. Mr. Blum accused me of bizarre book-keeping because I talked of "disporportion". For my part, I agree that no one can weigh one human life against another. It was not I but he who began to count when he spoke here on 6 June and counted a total kill since July 1981 in PLO attacks of 17. He also mentioned 241 wounded [2375th meeting, para. 34]. I still think it is fair to say that there is a disproportion in Israel's response.

215. Mr. Blum reminded me today—as he did last week—of the sufferings of his own people throughout history. I did not answer him then; I cannot answer him now. No one contemplating the enormity of what the Jewish people, his people, have suffered throughout their history—and especially in Europe one generation ago—can ever answer that question.

216. Finally, Mr. Blum asked me a direct question about the price of a child killed in Israel in April 1979 [para. 149 above]. I will answer: I think it is priceless, absolutely without price. I have said here many times

that I and my country deplore every human life lost—Lebanese, Palestinian, Syrian and Israeli. We want to see an end to all bloodshed in the region and we want to see peace and security for all peoples in the region—Lebanese, Syrian, Israeli and Palestinian.

217. I will leave it to the judgement of others to say whether anything I have ever said here or anything I may ever say here could lead anyone to believe that I could ever think otherwise.

218. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States, wishes to make another statement. With the consent of the Council, I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make that statement.

219. Mr. MAKSOUD: I was accused of exaggerating. My knowledge of English betrays me because I do not know what the antithesis is when the Israeli representative says that there were 300 wounded. Semantic acrobatics may be tolerable at times, but when one tries to downgrade a tragedy that assumes the dimension of a holocaust I think that indicates a cynicism indicative of a very sinister plan and a sinister mind.

220. ICRC today issued a statement that it has medical supplies prepared at Larnaca, Cyprus, for aid ready to go to Lebanon for 250,000 wounded in the first month. Why should ICRC have so much medicine for so many people when there are only 300 wounded, unless it is in a conspiracy with Israel to plan the murder of the remaining 249,700? ICRC has also prepared aid at Larnaca for 100,000 wounded in the second month and 50,000 wounded in the third month. Even assuming that the 250,000 people are slightly wounded, and need only one month's treatment, that the 100,000 are a little more seriously wounded and need two months' medical supplies, and that the 50,000 are seriously wounded and need supplies for three months, 50,000 divided by 300 will show who is exaggerating—or whatever the opposite of "exaggerating" is. That covers the question of ICRC.

221. Mr. Langmade, Deputy Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, quoted in *The Washington Post*, has said that there are today 600,000 new refugees living in Beirut and southern Lebanon. The United Nations Disaster Relief Organization has said that in one city, Sidon, there are approximately 2,000 killed, 10,000 wounded and 200,000 homeless. The souks—the markets—have been almost completely demolished. The Labib Abou Taher Hospital has been destroyed—according to the definitions of the military leaders in Israel, that is supposed to be a PLO stronghold. The port installations have been severely damaged. There are numerous decaying bodies—I do not know what "numerous" means—throughout the city, and there is a considerable chance of spreading epidemics of plague and cholera. The estimated cost of the total damage in the city of Sidon alone is about \$2 billion.

222. I do not want to refer to the various United Nations statements and the statements of the representative of Sweden and others who can testify to who is the liar, who is covering up genocide.

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

224. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): When we arrived here this evening we understood that the Council would deal with the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL. That is why we thought that things would go smoothly, without any debate.

225. We are grateful to the representatives of those countries that have contributed to UNIFIL for their explanations of their position with regard to the atrocities committed by the Israelis in the latest of their invasions.

226. I have asked to make a statement in order to clarify two points. The criminals are apparently experts at creating misnomers. Some time ago we heard about an operation called "Bright Star", in which the American rapid deployment force was involved in planning aggression against the Arab countries and Africa. Now we have heard about something called the "Peace for Galilee" operation. I wonder where those concerned dug up that name.

227. When I read the Secretary-General's report on UNIFIL [S/15194], I, too, did some book-keeping. From the report I learnt that in the period December 1981 to May 1982, Israel committed 1,393 air violations and 384 sea violations against Lebanon [*ibid.*, para. 46], and that during the same period there were 17 incidents against UNIFIL positions [*ibid.*, para. 47.]. There is also a special section in the report on the barbarous attack of April and the barbarous attack of May [*ibid.*, paras. 49 and 50].

228. I looked through the report and did not find a single example of any action across the Lebanese border from the north to the south. That makes me wonder whether the people of Galilee were not living happily and securely, and whether it was the intention of the authorities in Tel Aviv that those people should not go on living happily and securely. Did they provoke the attack in order to bring us back to a state of war? Is that criminal mentality of the Nazis still there?

229. I ask that because this afternoon I recalled the description given by such people as Albert Einstein of the Irgun Zvai Leumi and the party called Herut, which is under Begin's leadership: "criminal", "Nazi", "Fascist".

230. People speak about the suffering. Cannot people think about suffering without numbers, be they 300, 3,000 or 30,000? There are victims of the unwarranted, unjustified, uncalled-for invasion of Lebanon. As my colleague the representative of Lebanon has said,

people were stranded on the beaches without water and without shelter [*para. 189 above*].

231. I hope that the Council is aware of the letter sent by Chairman Arafat to the Secretary-General requesting the immediate dispatch of a special commission to investigate the Israeli crimes and atrocities and the present situation in Lebanon [*see S/15226*].

232. I am talking about the hundreds of thousands of Palestinians in Lebanon who, as guests of Lebanon, still yearn for the day when they will return to their homes, no longer being forced to make Lebanon their abode.

233. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

234. Mr. LEVIN (Israel): It would of course be very comforting if I were to follow some of the declarations by representatives here and, just because Mr. Blum has left, were to leave many things without comment, especially things that referred to him personally.

235. But I feel compelled to reply to some of the remarks made here and comment on the cynicism, and in one case especially, the sheer gall and temerity we have witnessed here. The representative of Syria came here talking about mass murders and the conscience of the world having been shocked. That was said by the representative of a minority Government — of a Government which has instituted a minority rule, tyrannizing a much larger majority, razing one of the most ancient cities of its own country — not going out fighting Israel, but tyrannizing its own population. I think that is very characteristic of the representative of Syria and the kind of philosophy that he represents.

236. I should like to point out regarding Mr. Mak-soud's allegation, another falsification, regarding the so-called destruction of the hospital that goes by the name of Labib Abou Taher in Sidon. We have here before us an article written by *The New York Times* correspondent Shipler from that city, in which he describes his visit to the hospital and his talk with some of the people whom he found there. The hospital is functioning and everything is in order. I think Mr. Mak-soud has some of his signals mixed on that, as well as on some other things.

237. I should like to say to the representative of the Soviet Union that it is true that his country is not alone in its actions; it enjoys the phalanx of the numerous countries it has subjugated since the Second World War.

238. We know what has come about and we have remarked on the allegations made by the representative of the Soviet Union as well. But things stand out, and we know exactly what is happening today in the area under Israeli control in Lebanon, and facts speak for themselves. Israel is making a very great effort to take care of those who have suffered unfortunately

because of the situation that has developed. And we will not permit these allegations to go unanswered.

The meeting rose at 9.45 p.m.

NOTES

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973, p. 287.

² *Ibid.*, No. 972, p. 135.

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