

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR

UN LIBRARY

OCT 1 1989

USA COLLECTION

2387th MEETING: 3 AUGUST 1982

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2387)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 4 June 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15162);	
(b) Letter dated 28 July 1982 from the Permanent Representatives of Egypt and France to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15316)	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.

2387th MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 3 August 1982, at 11.45 p.m.

President: Mr. Noel DORR (Ireland).

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/2387)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Letter dated 4 June 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15162);
 - (b) Letter dated 28 July 1982 from the Permanent Representatives of Egypt and France to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15316)

The meeting was called to order at 11.50 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Letter dated 4 June 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15162);
- (b) Letter dated 28 July 1982 from the Permanent Representatives of Egypt and France to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15316)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [2374th, 2375th, 2377th and 2384th meetings], I invite the representatives of Lebanon and Israel to take places at the Council table; I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Egypt and Pakistan to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon) and Mr. Blum (Israel) took places at the Council table; Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organiza-

tion) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt) and Mr. Mahmood (Pakistan) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council have before them documents S/15334 and addendum 1, which contains the reports of the Secretary-General submitted in pursuance of Council resolution 516 (1982).

3. Members of the Council also have before them document S/15333, which contains the text of a letter dated 1 August from the representative of Lebanon to the Secretary-General.

4. I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to documents S/15332 and S/15336, which contain the texts of letters dated 1 and 2 August, respectively, from the representative of Jordan to the President of the Council.

5. Members of the Council have received photocopies of a letter dated 3 August from the representative of Jordan to the President of the Council; it will be published as a document of the Security Council tomorrow morning under the symbol S/15340.

6. Members of the Council have also received photocopies of a letter dated 3 August from the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General; it will be published as a document of the Security Council tomorrow morning under the symbol S/15341.

7. Following consultations with members of the Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on their behalf in connection with the present grave situation in Lebanon:

“1. The members of the Security Council are seriously concerned at the prevailing high state of tension and at reports of military movements and continued outbreaks of firing and shelling in and around Beirut, contrary to the demand in resolution 516 (1982), which was adopted at 1325 hours, New York time, on 1 August 1982, for an immediate cease-fire and cessation of all military activities within Lebanon and across the Lebanese-Israeli border. They consider it vital that these provisions be fully implemented.

“2. The members of the Security Council have taken note of the Secretary-General's reports

submitted pursuant to resolution 516 (1982) [S/15334 and Add.1]. They express full support for his efforts and for the steps he has taken following the request of the Government of Lebanon, to secure the immediate deployment of United Nations observers to monitor the situation in and around Beirut. They note with satisfaction from the Secretary-General's report that some of the parties have already assured General Erskine of their full co-operation for the deployment of United Nations observers and they call urgently on all of the parties to co-operate fully in the effort to secure effective deployment of the observers and to ensure their safety.

"3. They insist that all parties must observe strictly the terms of resolution 516 (1982). They call further for the immediate lifting of all obstacles to the dispatch of supplies and the distribution of aid to meet the urgent needs of the civilian population in accordance with previous resolutions of the Council. The members of the Security Council will keep the situation under close review." [S/15342.]

8. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): We should like, first, to express our satisfaction that, after long hours of work, the Council has found itself in a position to adopt the statement that you have just read out, Mr. President, in behalf of all the members of the Council.

9. At the same time, we must note that it is clear that this statement is not as strong as it should have been in order to meet the demands of the moment, the demands of a very serious situation. It is necessary for everyone to know what happens at times behind the scenes and why the statement on behalf of the Council is not the strong statement it should have been. Who bears the responsibility for that? Who is protecting the aggressor? The delegation of the United States.

10. The delegation of the United States said that it could not accept the words "absolutely imperative"—I repeat: "absolutely imperative"—to ensure observance of the cease-fire. But those are the very words used in public a few days ago by the highest authority in this country. Why, then, did the United States delegation categorically object to the words?

11. There are three possible explanations for this. The first is that the United States delegation does not follow the statement of its own President—but that is hardly likely. The second is that, in deciding to object to these words, the United States delegation consulted with the wrong capital. The third is that the United States says one thing in public to Israel, but it does something else.

12. Secondly, the United States is doing everything, behind the scenes of the Council, to protect Israel.

which is blocking the sending of United Nations observers to Beirut: the United States is doing everything to help Israel achieve that purpose.

13. And so, with one hand, in public, in the Council chamber, the United States votes in favour of resolution 516 (1982), but with the other hand, it in fact helps Israel to block the implementation of that resolution. Again there is this great gap between the words and the deeds of the United States.

14. Now, why should the United States and Israel be objecting to the sending of United Nations observers to the Beirut area? The Israeli representatives state that they are not the ones who are violating the cease-fire, that somebody else is doing that and they are only replying by way of, so to speak, self-defence. But, then, why should Israel be afraid of the establishment of the facts by United Nations observers? Why should it do everything to block the sending of observers? The answer to that question is simple: Israel is constantly violating the cease-fire. Israel is afraid of objective data about who in fact is violating the cease-fire.

15. And here we come to the main point. While the members of the Council were discussing the text of a possible statement by the President, the Israeli war machine again was carrying out an attack on west Beirut, a massive invasion. Why that has happened is more than understandable from what we have just said: because Israel has a protector. The United States could have stopped the Israeli aggressor—both yesterday and today. It deliberately did not do that.

16. Moreover, the entire United States policy is aimed at using Israel to impose United States policy in the Middle East. The world has certainly seen with its own eyes the extent to which Washington supports the aggressive plans of Tel Aviv and how unlimited are the ambitions of the Israeli leaders, who are prepared to pave the way to the implementation of their age-old idea of the establishment of "Greater Israel" on the ruins of an entire country, on the corpses of thousands and thousands of persons.

17. Facts are facts. The blood of Lebanese and Palestinians, the blood of Arabs, stains the hands today not only of Israel but of the United States.

18. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

19. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): After eight hours of labour, the Council arrived at the statement read out by the President. I can well understand the labour that must have gone into the production of such a paper, which, to say the least, is not at all consistent with what the Secretary-General has told the Council in his reports [S/15334 and Add.1]. Those reports are very clear about which parties have responded positively to resolution 516

(1982) and to the Secretary-General's endeavours to carry out the Council's request that United Nations observers should be deployed. Yet the Council has not seen fit to quote what the Secretary-General reported; we are left to use our judgement as to who are the "some" that have already assured General Erskine of their full co-operation—and "some" implies at least two—and which was the other party that presumably told General Erskine that it is not willing to co-operate.

20. In paragraph 1 of the report contained in document S/15334/Add.1, the Secretary-General tells the Council that the Israeli Cabinet will discuss the subject on 5 August, following the return of the Foreign Minister from abroad. Now what does that mean? Despite the fact that resolution 516 (1982) calls for an immediate reply—within four hours in fact—Israel, in total contempt, says, "Wait until we have met on 5 August." It may be understandable that a democratic Government cannot take a decision owing to the unavailability of the Minister; in a democratic Government there is no one who could replace that Minister, who was democratically elected to assume the full responsibility and exclusive authority to decide on such affairs. That I can understand. But what I cannot understand is that since resolution 516 (1982) was adopted on Sunday, Israel has escalated its aggression and its attacks.

21. The President has referred to documents circulated by the representative of Jordan; I should like to cite one of them: the latest letter, circulated this evening in photocopied form, describing the Israeli onslaught which started on 3 August and which still continues [S/15340, annex]. The latest news that has come to us about that onslaught—or assault, as some may prefer to call it—is that a column of Israeli tanks and armoured vehicles, 20 to 25 in number, have crossed what is known as the Green Line in Beirut and have started an invasion of the heart of Beirut. That was preceded by an advance on Museum Road in Beirut and an Israeli attempt to gain control of the Mansour Palace, which houses the Lebanese Parliament; I am certain that the Parliament building in Beirut has not become a PLO stronghold. It is still the Lebanese Parliament, and it should have been respected, especially by those who claim that they are there to ensure that there is democratic Government in Lebanon. So the first act of a democratic Government is to destroy the very structure of the Lebanese Parliament. That was preceded by very intensive shelling and by clashes on all the axes.

22. All this was made possible by the deliberate intervention of the representatives of the United States—and Israel made good use of it. United States representatives are very keen on semantics. While they were playing around with semantics, Israel was trying to achieve its purpose: to advance within Beirut, to bring about more and more destruction in the city and to cause more and more victims, both Palestinian and Lebanese civilians living in Beirut.

23. With all due respect, the least that one could have expected of the Council was a call for a prompt return to the cease-fire position by troops which may have moved forward subsequent to 1.25 p.m., New York time, on 1 August, when resolution 516 (1982) was adopted. That would not have been an innovation; in the past, violators of a cease-fire have been called upon, as an immediate step, to return to the positions they occupied when the cease-fire resolution was adopted. But, of course, playing for time is a very well-known part of Israel's way of doing things.

24. The occupation and destruction of Beirut and the elimination of the Palestinian people and the PLO are well-known intentions of the Israelis. Beirut is being taken and devoured by the slice—a sort of "salami approach".

25. We are sorry that the Council was unable to take any stronger action against the criminals who attacked and continue to attack Beirut. But we do hope that the full implementation of resolution 516 (1982) in the shortest possible time will be the prime responsibility of the Council and that it will make use of all the powers vested in it by the Charter of the United Nations to see to it that a so-called Member State of the Organization will comply with the Council's resolutions and implement them.

26. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America): As is well known, the United States Government has been deeply and intensively involved in the search for a peaceful resolution to the conflict in Lebanon. Mr. Philip Habib has been working tirelessly to find a solution that will restore territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty to the Government of Lebanon, and indeed to achieve peace in the entire region. As part of that search, the United States has joined in the statement read out by the President tonight [S/15342].

27. The United States obviously rejects the intemperate and unfounded statements made by the Soviet representative. I might add that it is, in our view, inconsistent with the spirit of confidentiality for the Soviet representative to comment in a formal meeting of the Council on statements made in informal consultations. Such indiscretion by the Soviet representative is, regrettably, not uncommon.

28. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of the United States has said that the Soviet representative is, so to speak, "disclosing" confidential information put forward during consultations among Council members. But it is precisely the United States delegation which acts as the main source for the dissemination of confidential information from our informal consultations. It is precisely on the basis of that source that American journalists write about what the United States delegation does during meetings, what amendments it makes, what amendments it rejects. Such disclosures cannot be blamed on the Soviet delegation.

29. Furthermore, there is a gap between the positions of the United States and the Soviet Union with regard to what is done in open meetings as opposed to what is done in informal consultations. The Soviet delegation defends in informal consultations the very same positions it defends in open meetings. But there are two edges to the United States policy: the United States says one thing in open meetings of the Council and something else behind the scenes, because it fears publicity.

30. In addition, I note with satisfaction that the United States representative has not rejected a single specific accusation put forward by us against the United States delegation.

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

32. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The representative of the Soviet Union told us in his first statement that facts were facts. I agree. I would only add that truth is truth, lies are lies, and the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union belongs to the latter category.

33. The representative of the Soviet Union alleged that the Israel Defence Forces were moving into west Beirut. It is not quite clear to me what this statement was based on; presumably, on a report from the TASS news agency. The veracity of the statement would strongly indicate that.

34. The facts are different. My Mission was in contact with Jerusalem 10 minutes ago, and I am authorized to say that the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union is untrue. The Israel Defence Forces have not been moving into west Beirut.

35. It is gratifying, at the same time, to note that the Soviet Union now supports a United Nations presence in Lebanon, which it has consistently opposed over the years, from the day of the establishment of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). And, as is well known, the Soviet Union has never voted for any of the extensions of the UNIFIL mandate. Since the representative of the Soviet Union is so much in favour of a United Nations presence at flash-points around the world, the time has surely come for him to sponsor a resolution for the deployment of United Nations observers in Afghanistan to monitor the ongoing genocide of the Afghan people by the Soviet forces, as well as the chemical and bacteriological warfare which the Soviet forces conduct against the people of Afghanistan. I invite the representative of the Soviet Union to sponsor such a resolution.

36. Mr. NOWAK (Poland): With regard to what we have heard from the representative of Israel, I should like only to read out this brief dispatch just received from United Press International (UPI):

"Israeli tanks rolled into west Beirut early Wednesday and advanced into the heart of the PLO stronghold in the besieged Lebanese capital, eyewitnesses and Lebanese security forces said. Witnesses said a column of Israeli tanks crossed over the Green Line from Christian east Beirut into Muslim west Beirut through the Museum crossing-point."

The dispatch continues, but I think that what I have read out is self-explanatory.

37. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel.

38. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I was gratified before at the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union. It is equally gratifying to note the solidarity displayed by the representative of Poland with his Soviet colleague. The fact that two persons maintain something that is untrue does not make it become true. At least here we have a subject on which the representative of the Soviet Union and of Poland can wholeheartedly agree: their common assault on Israel. Is it that some atavistic feelings are at work for both of them?

39. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Israel is not pleased that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are subjecting Israel to harsh criticism and condemnation. He made some dirty innuendoes in this connection, but it is not the Soviet Union, nor is it any of the socialist countries, that has ever challenged Israel's right to exist. If we criticize Israel, it is that country's aggressive policy we criticize and the viciousness with which the Israeli aggressors, the Israeli occupiers are carrying out their aggression against and occupation of Arab land. Until Israel withdraws its forces from all the territories occupied in 1967, until Israel withdraws its forces from the newly occupied territory of southern Lebanon, we will continue to direct merciless criticism against the aggressor. We will harshly condemn the aggressor and we will unmask its horrid and true face before the entire world.

40. Mr. NOWAK (Poland): The representative of Israel has indulged in his usual habit of making inadmissible and uncivilized remarks of a personal nature. This is nothing new and is done only to provoke discussion on other subjects and thereby divert the attention of the Council from what is going on in Lebanon, which is aggression and more aggression.

41. I would make one further point. When we speak here, it is because we are also expressing the common feeling that now prevails in Poland among the Polish people when they watch television and when they look at news photographs, because those images remind us of what happened in 1939 and afterwards, namely, the destruction of our own capital by Nazi forces.

42. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel.

43. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The representative of the martial-law régime in Poland wishes to teach us about civilization and civilized behaviour. We all watch television these days, and it is not difficult for us to ascertain the feelings of the Polish people with regard to the martial-law régime that the representative of Poland represents here and with regard to the Power that is behind it. So much for the feelings of the Polish people these days.

44. Are you really sure, Mr. Nowak, that you speak for the feelings of the Polish people?

45. The representative of the Soviet Union very kindly acknowledged Israel's right to exist as an independent State. I would refer him to my observations in this regard in the Council last week.

46. Let me tell him very clearly that we have no opposition to the existence of the Soviet Union, only to the products of Soviet aggression world wide.

47. Let the representative of the Soviet Union announce here in the Council that his country is now willing, after three decades and more, to give up the fruits of aggression in eastern Czechoslovakia—or, as it used to be called, sub-Carpathian Russia; in Romania, Bessarabia and Bucovina; in eastern Poland; in eastern Prussia, Königsberg—whose name they changed to Kaliningrad; in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, three formerly independent countries which they subjugated; in eastern Karelia, which they detached from Finland; in the Far East, where they

annexed without a peace treaty islands that did not belong to them; in Afghanistan; as well as in other countries.

48. What right has the representative of the Soviet Union to teach anybody on matters of aggression? Only one right: the right of pure and unadulterated arrogance, the right of the strong, the right of a permanent member of the Security Council that enjoys a veto in this body and can block any resolution it regards as unfavourable to its interests. Beyond that, it is only the right of immorality, the right of shamelessness, for the Soviet representative to pontificate here on matters of aggression and self-defence.

49. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I agree that no one has the right—and, I would add, any reason—to teach Israel how to practice aggression. Israel knows how to practice it.

50. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

51. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): I would like merely to reiterate that the Council was told by the spokesman of the invasion forces that the Israeli army has not moved tonight and that what UPI has reported is untrue. We shall hold the Council responsible for seeing to it that that statement is true; and if it is not true, the Council should then invoke any powers in it by the Charter of the United Nations in order to deal with the spokesman of the forces of invasion.

The meeting rose at 12.30 a.m., Wednesday, 4 August.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

如何购取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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