

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR

**2388<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 4 AUGUST 1982

NEW YORK

JAN 1 1990

UN/SA COLLECTION

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2388) .....	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.

## 2388th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 4 August 1982, at 10.45 a.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/2388)

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 11.20 a.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 Coun-*

*cil table; Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Moussa (Egypt) and Mr. Mahmood (Pakistan) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

2. The PRESIDENT: This meeting has been convened in response to a request made by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

3. Members of the Council have before them document S/15343, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Jordan and Spain.

4. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): A few hours ago, at a meeting of the Council held last night and during the first half hour of today, 4 August, the Soviet delegation drew the attention of the members of the Council to the fact that Israeli military forces had once again undertaken large-scale attacks against west Beirut.

5. In this connection, the representative of Israel stated the following:

"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.

"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." [2387th meeting, paras. 33 and 34.]

6. In the light of what is now well known to the entire world, I could say that the statement by the representative of Israel which I have just quoted was simply a lie on his own, personal level. But the representative of Israel said that he had just consulted with his Government. Therefore, it would be more correct to say that that statement by the representative of Israel was an Israeli lie on a State level. Now, the facts of the new Israeli acts of aggression in west Beirut are widely known. Only those who are blind, only those who have deliberately amputated their consciences could fail to know them.

7. The Council is now faced with an extremely serious and dangerous situation, and in the view of the Soviet delegation it must take effective and decisive measures. It is necessary firmly to condemn Israel for the flagrant violations of Council resolution 516 (1982), which was adopted unanimously on 1 August. It is necessary to demand an immediate and full cease-fire, which must be fully observed by Israel, and Israeli troops must be returned to the positions they occupied at the moment of the adoption of resolution 516 (1982). It is necessary to propose to the Secretary-General, as an immediate measure, an increase in the number of United Nations observers in and around Beirut. It is important to request that the Secretary-General continue to report to the Council on a daily basis, regarding the situation in and around Beirut, and perhaps even more frequent reports will be necessary. In our view, those reports should reflect the situation regarding the implementation of Council decisions.

8. Finally, we cannot any longer postpone taking effective measures to put an end to aggression. By its crimes—and it is extremely important to remember this—Israel is for practical purposes putting itself beyond the pale of the international community. It is necessary for the Council most urgently to consider and to take all possible measures, as regards the aggressor, provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

9. The Israeli acts of aggression must be halted, and immediately.

10. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): Since this is the first time I have spoken at a formal meeting of the Council this month, it is my pleasure and privilege to extend to you, Mr. President, my heartiest felicitations on your accession to the presidency of the Council for this month. We have all known Mr. Dorr to be one of the most versatile and outstanding of diplomats, both inside and outside the Council, and we are certain that in the tumultuous days we are facing he will perform his arduous duties in his usual exemplary manner.

11. I should also like to take this opportunity to extend my delegation's appreciation to his predecessor, Mr. Noel Sinclair, of friendly Guyana, who had to grapple with equally serious tribulations during the month of July. His performance was outstanding.

12. This is one of the most momentous meetings the Council has convened in its crisis-ridden history. Before our eyes and the eyes of the world, the Israeli Nazis are at present continuing to perpetrate their barbaric assault on and genocide against the independent sovereign State of Lebanon and its capital Beirut, its civilian population and its Palestinian refugee guests.

13. The casualties are staggering; the devastation is almost complete. Hardly a single building has escaped

the destructive, illegal and internationally forbidden weaponry which the Israelis' ally, the United States, has been providing to them year after year, month after month and day after day.

14. I still recall that during the 1973 war, when four Arab Ministers for Foreign Affairs met the President of the United States, he told them that he had received a message from the Prime Minister of Israel, Golda Meir, that if the United States did not come to the aid of Israel and supply it with arms and ammunition, then Israel would have no alternative but to surrender. Given the incalculable amount of ammunition that Israel has been showering on small Lebanon, the Israelis have apparently been regularly supplied with weaponry so that they could commit the present genocide. I must say that that surprises me.

15. The United States must therefore share equal responsibility with Israel for this carnage. The Israeli top officials have publicly stated that they are in total accord with the United States on the abominable objectives which the bloodthirsty and terrorist clique governing Israel has been perpetrating for two months, since 4 June, when they launched their massive air attack against Lebanon.

16. In yesterday's edition of the reputable *Christian Science Monitor*, it was reported that last Sunday alone—which the Lebanese victims in Beirut have dubbed "Black Sunday"—180,000 rockets and shells from land, sea and air were showered on west Beirut, a mere 10 by 5 blocks, less than 10 square miles. One can well imagine what the share of every man, woman and child was in that deadly dispensation in proportion to the half million Lebanese civilians.

17. The Israeli representative made a beguiling statement on television today that, after hours and hours of meeting and informal consultations, we had agreed on a consensus statement to be read by the President and that not a single Arab Government had spoken a word for the Palestinian cause or the resolution. I do not know how many lies the Council must hear from the representative of Israel. He knows full well that the consensus statement [S/15342] was made on behalf of the entire Security Council, collectively, and that it had been agreed that there would be no discussion because, as members of the Council, we were in complete agreement on the contents of the statement, after having made all sorts of compromises—which we did not like but accepted so as to have a consensus statement.

18. What is more, the Israeli representative's Minister for Foreign Affairs, in another piece of deception, has been telling the United States media that his Government has no intention of launching an all-out assault on west Beirut. He is so peace-loving that he seems to have forgotten that in 1948 he was the murderer of Count Folke Bernadotte, the Secretary-General's Mediator, in the streets of Jerusalem. So

he is law-abiding, and he wants a peaceful settlement, and he has been telling that to everybody.

19. His representative here told the Council yesterday that he was authorized at the highest level to inform the Council that Israel was not planning to launch an attack on west Beirut. That was at a time when the Israeli army was going in with hundreds of tanks and troop-carriers, and a naval bombardment sparing no buildings was under way.

20. The Prime Minister's house was shelled with rockets and received direct hits today, so that Mr. Tuéni, the representative of Lebanon, was unable to talk to him. A couple of days ago, as Mr. Tuéni was talking to Mr. Saeb Salam, the former Prime Minister of Lebanon and the intermediary in the negotiations that have been taking place between the various parties and Mr. Philip Habib, Mr. Salam's house was struck by two rockets.

21. Incidentally, the barbaric Israeli assault is continuing. The latest that I heard was that there is indiscriminate shelling and bombing. I heard a CBS correspondent reporting from the Commodore Hotel, which houses the foreign correspondents in west Beirut; he was breathless. Indeed, a shell or rocket was being dropped on that tiny area every second; that means 60 shells or rockets every minute. Those are acts of the Israel that the Israeli clique would have us believe is peace-loving.

22. If the Israeli ruling clique believes that it can kill the rights of the Palestinian people by the present carnage in the capital of Lebanon, a sovereign, independent State, then I should tell its representative that it is wrong, for the Palestinian question is not represented merely by 5,000 or 6,000 heroic fighters. It will last for ever in the heart, soul and mind of every single Palestinian—man, woman and child—born and unborn. No matter what the outcome of this Beirut carnage, the struggle will continue relentlessly and undiminished.

23. Why did the Israeli authorities decide to launch this onslaught? Quite obviously for those who know, they have done so because the tripartite discussions going on in Beirut among Mr. Habib, the PLO and the Lebanese Government were on the verge of success. There was only one point that still had to be resolved. Of course, the Israelis would not wish to see such a diplomatic solution reached. Also, the onslaught came a few days after a conference of six Arab Foreign Ministers, held at Jeddah, in which the basic principles for withdrawal were adopted [see S/15329, annex]. Therefore, the Israelis found themselves impelled to advance the hour so as to abort any chance of a diplomatic and peaceful solution to the agony of the half million inhabitants of Lebanon.

24. The present carnage is taking place in Lebanon, which is not a direct party to the Palestinian-Israeli

conflict. It so happened that 600,000 refugees, forcibly expelled from Palestine at the point of the bayonet, had been living there as refugees for the past 34 years.

25. What, then, is the objective, apart from the bloodthirsty butchery of another Arab State and the occupation of another Arab capital? What is really behind all this madness? I should like to cite a statement made by the Mayor of Bethlehem, Mr. Ilyas Freij, in which he declared that the occupied West Bank is now facing the most extensive act of confiscation and sequestration of Palestinian lands ever committed. The Israeli military authorities—or are they civilians, for they have doffed their khakis and put on ties or dresses, as the case may be?—are making use of the war in Lebanon to cover up this foul deed, this high robbery of the West Bank. That is the objective of what is now going on in Lebanon: once and for all to take over the West Bank, East Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip.

26. London's *Sunday Times* reported the Mayor of Bethlehem to have said that the Israelis have launched a war to confiscate the land of the West Bank under the smoke-screen of the war that is now taking place in Lebanon. The *Sunday Times* added that Israel has actually begun intensifying the implementation of its plans without any impediment from the outside world, for the eyes of the outside world are occupied elsewhere: by the carnage that is being perpetrated, primarily against innocent civilians in Lebanon. The Mayor went on to describe the very extensive areas which have been confiscated and colonized in the West Bank. These include the entire, expanded city of Jerusalem, the Jordan Valley, five big towns and numerous villages all over the occupied territories. He added that, in accordance with the Israeli plan, 40 per cent of those areas have been allocated for the establishment of Israeli colonies and are indicated on the map in yellow, the colour used to denote colonies. Fifty per cent of the area has been earmarked for Israeli agricultural use, and extremely stringent laws have been imposed to prevent the Arabs from building homes or engaging in any development. Only 10 per cent has been left for Arab towns and villages in the confiscated area. Finally, the Mayor described the intensified implementation of these Israeli plans as the greatest catastrophe to have faced the West Bank to date.

27. I apologize for having digressed from the main theme of the Council's discussion. As I speak, several hundred heavy tanks and heaven knows how many hundreds of heavy guns, including naval guns, are showering shells on the tiny area of west Beirut. The Israelis are attempting in the face of determined resistance to advance and to take over the capital of Lebanon. This poses one of the most serious challenges ever faced by the Council in its long history.

28. It is my firm belief that if the Council is to maintain its credibility in the eyes of the world it must take

the firmest and most determined measures to let Israel know that it cannot do what it wishes and remain a Member of the United Nations. As a Member it is obligated to abide by the mandatory injunctions of the Council. The international community has the right to pass judgement on the behaviour of any State.

29. This is not the time for speeches, so in the light of what I have said I should like to present the following draft resolution, sponsored by Spain and Jordan [S/15343]:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Deeply shocked and alarmed by the atrocities committed by the Israeli forces and the invasion of Beirut on 3 August 1982,*

*"1. Reconfirms its resolutions 508 (1982), 509 (1982), 512 (1982), 513 (1982), 515 (1982) and 516 (1982);*

*"2. Confirms once again its demand for an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon;*

*"3. Condemns Israel for its failure to comply with the above resolutions;*

*"4. Calls for the prompt return of Israeli troops which have moved forward subsequent to 1325 hours EDT on 1 August 1982;*

*"5. Expresses its appreciation for the efforts and steps taken by the Secretary-General to implement the provisions of Security Council resolution 516 (1982), and authorized him, as an immediate step, to increase the number of United Nations observers in and around Beirut;*

*"6. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the implementation of the present resolution as soon as possible and not later than three hours from now;*

*"7. Decides to meet in three hours from now in order to consider the report of the Secretary-General and, in case of failure to comply by any of the parties to the conflict, to consider adopting effective ways and means in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations."*

30. Now is the time to invoke Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, for if we do not the floodgates of international licence will be opened.

31. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Since this is the first time I have had an opportunity to express to you, Mr. President, our pleasure at seeing you assume your post for this month, I should now like to do so. We are familiar with your ability, which was demonstrated when you

presided over this body last year, but your activities this year have been extraordinary. We hope that they will enjoy the support of members and non-members of the Council alike.

32. We would also like to thank the representative of Guyana for the manner in which he conducted our deliberations during July, a month that was, unfortunately, a very eventful one.

33. We have heard the presentation made by Mr. Nu-seibeh, on behalf of his country and my own, of the draft resolution that has had to be submitted to the Council because of Israel's rebellious attitude towards the decisions of the United Nations.

34. As is well known, my delegation was the sponsor of the draft that became Council resolution 515 (1982) and a co-sponsor of the draft that became resolution 516 (1982). Of course, if the Government of Israel had complied with all the resolutions the Council has adopted in connection with its aggression against Lebanon, we would not be meeting now, nor would we have the large toll of victims that has alarmed the international community and filled it with indignation.

35. In the opinion of my delegation, the fact that the United Nations observers must wait until the Government of Israel can meet to authorize their deployment is an act of mockery of the Council. Reference has even been made to misunderstandings between General Erskine and certain Israeli authorities, whereas there can be no doubt that one of the facts noted in the report of the Secretary-General [S/15334, para. 3]—namely, that it is indispensable to obtain a cease-fire and the co-operation of the parties in order to proceed with the deployment of United Nations military observers—has once again served as a pretext for Israel to distort the truth to the extent of saying that on 2 August it could not authorize the deployment of United Nations observers because that could not be done until the Israeli Cabinet had met [S/15334/Add.1, para. 3].

36. What about the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon? What does that mean to the Government of Israel? Obviously, nothing.

37. The Israeli war machine must be brought to a halt; a stop must be put to such arrogance. The Council must take action to achieve that goal. Enough of this total disregard for the resolutions of the Council! Enough of this death and destruction reported to us daily by the American media!

38. All I wish to say now is that the news that was denied last night with regard to the invasion of Beirut has, unfortunately, been confirmed this morning.

39. My delegation hopes that the draft resolution the representative of Jordan has introduced on behalf

of his country and mine [S/15343] will be adopted unanimously by the Council.

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

41. Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt): My delegation has had occasion at an earlier meeting to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency. Today, I wish to congratulate you once again on your effective handling and prompt action with regard to the serious situation facing us, one that is fraught with grave consequences.

42. Yesterday—or rather, in the early hours of this morning—we heard in this very room assertions to the effect that what the news agencies had reported about the situation in Beirut and the violation of the cease-fire was no more than allegations and slanderous exaggerations. Minutes afterwards, that news was confirmed: the Israeli forces had violated the cease-fire, moved forward and occupied new positions.

43. The Israeli forces have intensified their aggression against the capital of Lebanon, the civilians of Beirut, the refugees of Palestine and the freedom fighters of the PLO.

44. It is upon instructions from my Government that I have asked to speak today to condemn the new Israeli assault in the strongest terms. In this respect, I wish to state that Egypt is a solid party to the international consensus which unanimously and strongly condemns the Israeli policies and practices in Beirut, in Lebanon, on the Palestinian question and in the Middle East in general. We in Egypt wonder what kind of peace could emerge as the result of such irresponsible policies. We wonder what kind of peace process could be pursued under the point of a gun. We wonder what kind of normal relations could be accomplished under such horrible circumstances and in the shadow of such irresponsible policies. We wonder what is the use or what are the effects of the diplomatic efforts that are taking place in the area today if Israel is permitted to flout all rules, disregard all efforts and foil all attempts to reach an honourable and viable settlement of the problem before us.

45. The Government of Egypt is of the view that the exit of the Palestinians from Beirut should be a step in a package towards a comprehensive and just solution and should take place together with, first, security guarantees for the Palestinians, secondly, simultaneous withdrawal by Israel from the Beirut area as a step towards the total withdrawal of Israel from Lebanon and, thirdly, a clear and concrete step towards the recognition of Palestinian national rights, especially the right to self-determination.

46. Bearing in mind the serious situation we are faced with, we welcome the draft resolution sub-

mitted by Jordan and Spain [*ibid.*]. We are deeply shocked and alarmed by the atrocities committed by the Israeli forces and the invasion of Beirut on 3 August. We call for the reconfirmation of Council resolutions 508 (1982), 509 (1982), 512 (1982), 513 (1982), 515 (1982) and 516 (1982). We call on the Council to confirm once again its demand for an immediate and sustained cease-fire and the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon. We do condemn Israel for its failure to comply with the above resolutions. We call for the prompt return of the Israeli troops which have moved forward subsequent to 1325 hours EDT on 1 August. We share in expressing appreciation for the efforts and steps taken by the Secretary-General to implement the provisions of resolution 516 (1982) and support the call to authorize him, as an immediate step, to increase the number of United Nations observers in and around Beirut. We call upon the Council to consider, in case of failure to comply by any of the parties to the conflict, to consider whatever steps it deems necessary and appropriate under its responsibilities and powers.

47. Mr. LING Qing (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): First of all, Sir, in the name of the Chinese delegation I wish to extend sincere congratulations to you upon your assumption of the presidency for this month. Your sense of responsibility and your diplomatic skills are well known to all of us.

48. I wish also to express our appreciation to Mr. Sinclair for the outstanding and effective results achieved by him in presiding over the work of the Council.

49. Since 4 June, when the Israeli forces, aided and abetted by the United States, launched a large-scale invasion against Lebanon, the Israeli authorities have all along disregarded the resolutions of the Security Council and of the resumed seventh emergency special session of the General Assembly, which call upon Israel to withdraw its forces from Lebanon immediately and unconditionally. They violate the sovereignty of Lebanon at will, occupy by force vast territories in southern and central Lebanon, attempt to encircle and destroy the PLO and deploy tens of thousands of troops to lay siege to Beirut, the capital of Lebanon.

50. In the small hours of this morning, the Israeli aggressor forces once again violated the cease-fire and launched an attack against west Beirut by three different routes, with large numbers of tanks and under heavy artillery cover. All of west Beirut is now engulfed in smoke and flames, and countless innocent inhabitants have been brutally massacred.

51. The Chinese Government and people most strongly condemn the Israeli authorities for this new barbarous crime against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples.

52. Three days have passed since the Council adopted resolution 516 (1982). The Israeli authorities

have completely disregarded the demands contained in that resolution for an immediate cease-fire and the cessation of all military activities. They are also procrastinating in replying to the decision on deploying United Nations observers to supervise the cease-fire. The reason the Israeli authorities are resorting to such delaying tactics, obviously, is that they are determined to launch a large-scale attack against Beirut.

53. The Chinese delegation is of the view that, faced with such lawlessness on the part of the Israeli authorities, as shown by their open violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, their contempt for the authority of the Council, their wilful trampling upon the sovereignty of Lebanon and inhuman massacre of the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples, the Council should put an end to this by immediately adopting forceful measures and, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter, consider applying severe sanctions against Israel.

54. The entire international community has taken notice that while the aggressor troops of Israel continue to tighten their stranglehold on the city of Beirut, the United States, a permanent member of the Council, has time and again obstructed the Council from adopting resolutions condemning Israel for its aggression and has, on all sorts of absurd pretexts, prevented the applying of any pressure on Israel. Such behaviour on the part of the United States Government in openly shielding the aggressors has been—as it should be—severely condemned by all peoples of the world, including the American people.

55. The Chinese Government believes that the Israeli authorities must implement the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, immediately put an end to its aggression against Lebanon and unconditionally withdraw all its forces from Lebanon, and from all Arab territories they have occupied since 1967. The independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon must be respected; the national rights of the Palestinian people must be restored. The PLO, the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, is entirely entitled to participate in the solution of the Middle East question. The most pressing task at present is to put an end to the attack against Beirut by the Israeli forces, to lift the siege of Beirut and to compel the Israeli forces to withdraw completely from Lebanon.

56. It is in that spirit that the Chinese delegation is in favour of the draft resolution in document S/15343.

57. Mr. NOWAK (Poland): At the outset, Sir, let me say how pleased my delegation is to see you as the President of the Council for this month. We have full confidence in your wisdom and in your outstanding diplomatic skills, and we pledge our full co-operation in the discharge of your onerous duties at this difficult juncture in the international situation.

58. We wish at the same time to say how much we appreciate the efforts made and the skilful work done by last month's President of the Council, the representative of friendly Guyana.

59. We are meeting today under very specific and dangerous circumstances. The Israeli aggression is proceeding in west Beirut in flagrant violation of all the relevant Council resolutions. It is causing massive loss of life and material destruction comparable to Warsaw's annihilation by Nazi troops during the Second World War. The path of the Israeli troops is strewn with the blood and suffering of the population of the besieged city. The Polish Government strongly condemns the Israeli Government for these new crimes against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples.

60. These developments are creating a quite intolerable political situation, in which an aggressor is able to continue its actions unpunished and in defiance of the Council. At the same time, we are witnessing openly delaying tactics by one member of the Council, the ally of Israel, which is impeding swift action by the Council to stop the aggression and to establish peace in the Middle East. Let us be frank: this is harming the overall image of the Council and its future credibility.

61. What is also intolerable is that the representative of Israel repeatedly distorts facts in his statements, causing confusion in the work of the Council. Today—at 15 minutes past midnight—the representative of Israel said that "the Israel Defence Forces have not been moving into west Beirut" [2387th meeting, para. 34].

62. When my delegation read out a dispatch by United Press International [*ibid.*, para. 36], he not only maintained his position but also indulged in brutal personal remarks affecting the dignity of the Council—remarks, by the way, repeated many times, *ad nauseam*. We understood his rage, because the facts were brutal and the truth was painful. In other words, the Israeli Government and the Israeli representative lied to the Council. This fact puts in question his credibility also.

63. In this situation, it is my delegation's opinion that the Council should act most promptly and decisively. I shall not dwell longer on the substance, since my delegation is ready to subscribe to what was said by previous speakers, especially the representative of Spain, and also to lend its support to the draft resolution submitted by Jordan and Spain [S/15343].

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

65. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Truth is truth and lies are lies; we have been hearing that very often in this chamber. But exactly who is going to determine what is the truth and what are lies?



66. Early this morning, in this chamber, Goebbels II told the Council that he had been authorized to say that the Israel Defence Forces had not been moving into west Beirut [2387th meeting, para. 34]. Of course, Goebbels II might have been right had he been making that statement at 12.10 or 12.15 yesterday, in the early afternoon. But he told us that he had been in contact with his boss 10 minutes earlier. The onslaught had at that time been under way for at least 10 hours. But tangible facts are the truth, and Goebbels II is only a henchman and the liar is his boss. So all this comes as no surprise: lies, distortions, falsifications and misrepresentations—all are intrinsic ingredients in racist ideologies.

67. The members of the Herut Party and the Irgun Zeva'i Leumi are known for their close identification with Hitlerian doctrines and policies. I shall refer to that at some other stage, but I believe that it is very relevant to mention it now.

68. The facts have become public knowledge and I shall not use up the valuable time of the Council by reading out military communiqués or press reports. I must state, however, that two full divisions of the Israel Defence Forces—one armoured and the other mechanized—were deployed in this latest criminal attack by the Tel Aviv junta against Beirut. Shells and internationally banned arms such as phosphorus, fragmentation and cluster bombs were directed by Israeli land and sea artillery against residential Beirut. Israeli artillery scored direct hits on some major hospitals in Beirut, namely, the Barber, Lahoud and American University hospitals. Of course, the number of casualties is not yet known, but the damage is extensive and the continued operation of these vital institutions is in jeopardy.

69. A spokesman of the PLO issued a statement in reply to the claims of an Israeli military spokesman and Minister for Foreign Affairs Shamir that the attack was not aimed at occupying west Beirut but only at tightening the siege of the Palestinians there. Of course, we have to reflect a little about whether the areas of the port of Beirut, the race track and the museum are "PLO strongholds", or even whether Palestinians live in those areas. To the best of my knowledge, those areas are residential and their inhabitants are mostly Lebanese.

70. But, again, these are lies and they are an indication of the failure of the Israeli attack and show the emptiness of their threats to have recourse to the military option.

71. I now quote from that statement by a spokesman of the PLO:

"The Lebanese Government, Mr. Habib, the French and all our friends know that the attack comes at a time when Israel has refused Council resolution 516 (1982) and the sending of interna-

tional observers and when the enemy"—Israel—"feels there is progress in political negotiations for a solution to the Beirut crisis, as was admitted by the United States envoy and noted by the Lebanese, French and Saudi Governments."

The spokesman added:

"The aggression of Israel is an irresponsible and barefaced attempt to head off a political solution and to make good on the enemy's claims that Israel was capable of imposing a military solution. In this they have failed."

72. Frankly, we are proud of the achievements of the freedom fighters, the defenders of Beirut and the other heroes who have shattered the myth of Israeli military superiority.

73. Several residential buildings, hospitals and tourist hotels have received direct hits from Israeli shelling. Fire-fighters in Beirut are short of water; they are battling flames which are consuming residences.

74. The representatives of Jordan and Spain have submitted a draft resolution in document S/15343. We believe that this is a very serious attempt to have the Council meet its responsibilities and take immediate action. I should like merely to recall that earlier today we suggested here that the Council was responsible for seeing to it that all powers vested in it by the Charter are invoked in order to deal with the aggressor and the spokesmen of the invasion forces. Our trust in the Council still stands.

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

76. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The representative of Jordan, in concluding his remarks, told us that this was not the time for speeches. For some reason, he made that statement at the end of his long speech. He also apologized to the Council and to you, Mr. President, for having digressed from the theme before us. Well, this is not uncommon in the statements of Mr. Nuseibeh. Over the years we have got accustomed to that. I promise to bring him back to the theme in a few moments.

77. The representative of the Soviet Union has again led the assault against my country, as he did last night. That in itself is revealing, because he has made evident here in the Council, through his behaviour, what has been evident to observers of the Middle East scene all these years: that the terrorists are but a stooge in the hands of the Soviet Union and are being used and exploited by the Soviet Union in the Middle East in the same manner in which the Soviet Union uses and exploits its stooges in other parts of the world. I should like to thank the representative of the Soviet Union for having made this fact so evident to all of us.

78. The representative of the Soviet Union was kind enough to quote from my statement of last night. I wish to reciprocate his courtesy in kind. This is what the representative of the Soviet Union had to say:

“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.” [2387th meeting, para. 15.]

Surprisingly, the representative of Poland dutifully parroted his master's voice and made a similar statement in the Council last night, and he has again dutifully parroted his master's voice today.

79. This statement of the Soviet representative and the similar statement of the representative of Poland are untrue. That is what I said last night, and that is what I repeat now—and the fact that these two representatives have seen fit to repeat their untrue statements does not make them any truer.

80. Obviously, the representative of the Soviet Union would like to draw me into a discussion on this point, and he seeks some clarification from me. I shall confine myself to saying that his statement was and is untrue. I shall not go beyond that because I do not feel I should oblige him. At the proper time it will become obvious why his statement is untrue and why my refutation of it is true.

81. The representative of the Soviet Union has again repeated his call for the stationing of observers in and around Beirut. He knows, and the other members of the Council know, that the matter which arises out of Council resolution 516 (1982) will be discussed at a special meeting of the Israel Cabinet scheduled for tomorrow. But I should like to be able to inform my Cabinet in anticipation of that meeting that the Soviet representative whole-heartedly supports the principle of the stationing of observers at every flash-point around the world. Let us start with Afghanistan. I have already, last night, suggested that to the representative of the Soviet Union. For some reason I have not had a response. It is high time that the United Nations, through a group of observers, should be able to monitor the ongoing genocide by the Soviet army of occupation of the people of Afghanistan as well as its barbarous and inhuman practices of conducting bacteriological and chemical warfare against the people of that country, whom they apparently use as guinea-pigs, as a testing-ground.

82. I invite the representative of the Soviet Union once again to indicate to us his country's willingness to accept the stationing of such observers. He would then be in a much better position to make calls with regard to other parts of the world.

83. The representative of the Soviet Union also asserted that my country was putting itself beyond the

pale of the international community. I would invite him to be very cautious with remarks of that kind. Admittedly, as I have had occasion to observe, my country does not enjoy the veto power in the Council. The Soviet Union does, and as a result it has been able over the years to block any resolution that would have given expression to the international outrage over the behaviour of the Soviet Union world wide since the end of the Second World War. I would suggest, Mr. Ovinnikov, that you had better not raise the question of who is putting himself beyond the pale of the international community.

84. The representative of Jordan did me the honour of watching my television appearance earlier today. I thank him for that. I am sorry to see that—perhaps because of the early hour—he could not accurately reflect in his statement what I said there.

85. We are all aware of the need to bring peace, long overdue peace, to our war-torn region, and it was with that in mind that we became a party to the Camp David framework accords for peace in the Middle East, which charted the course for peace in the Middle East.

86. Your country, Mr. Nuseibeh, was invited to join in the peace process and your country, being the Palestinian Arab State, should have been there; but your country has decided to boycott that peace process, so you come here before the Council and pretend to be unaware of events of recent years—not only the peace process in the Middle East but also events that preceded that peace process.

87. You said it so happens that there are in Lebanon 600,000 Palestinian refugees. What you forgot, Mr. Nuseibeh, is the fact that there are also in Lebanon, and there have been for some 12 years, a large number of armed PLO terrorists. Where did they come from? I would gladly yield the floor now if you would be willing to tell the Council where they came from. You know it full well. There were some slight misunderstandings in September 1970, as a result of which they decided that they no longer wanted to enjoy the hospitality of your country. I know that. And you were terribly offended when they left. You dumped them on Lebanon and thereby saved your own country. That is basically what I said earlier today on my television appearance.

88. You, your country and your Government know exactly who the terrorists are and what they are capable of, and so do the other Arab countries. Lebanon was too weak to resist their visit and has paid a heavy price for that.

89. What kind of cynicism is it for you to come here and speak in support of the terrorists who almost brought down your Government and whom you drove out from your country, thereby saving its stability? That is the naked truth; everybody knows it; and no

amount of posturing and rhetoric will change those facts.

90. You were also outraged at the fact that certain hotels in Beirut have been shelled in the course of the hostilities. Of course, when, in times of war, civilians get involved through no fault of their own in those hostilities and are caught up with them, that is regrettable everywhere, just as it was very regrettable in September 1970, when the Jordanian Arab Legion shelled the Intercontinental Hotel in Amman, where hundreds of journalists were at the time. That was done because the hotel was one of the strongholds of the terrorists. We did not blame your Government for that. We understood the constraints under which your Government was operating at the time: it was dealing with criminals who had hijacked those civilians, as they are hijacking the people of west Beirut.

91. The representative of Spain made a passionate plea and posed as a genuine humanitarian. I think his indignation would not sound so hollow were it not for the fact that he somehow failed to give expression to his humanitarian concerns for the people of Lebanon all these years. If I am wrong, I should like to stand corrected. I invite the representative of Spain to indicate to the Council, chapter and verse, when and where he has bewailed the plight and predicament of the people of Lebanon since 1975—with 100,000 of them massacred by the Syrians and the terrorists, 300,000 wounded and more than 1 million displaced. I, for one, do not recall any humanitarian statement by the representative of Spain in the Council condemning those outrages.

92. The representative of Spain spoke of arrogance. One wonders where is the arrogance. Let me just say that I do not believe that bigotry and hypocrisy and cynicism should be made the pillars of foreign policy and of statements in the Council.

93. The problem before us is a very simple and straightforward one, despite the fact that some members of the Council try to obscure it and are carried away by their own rhetoric. The problem is, as has been rightly pointed out on many occasions in this country and elsewhere, that the terrorists have hijacked the civilian population of a major city in what must be considered the biggest hijacking operation in history. The time has come for the terrorists to realize that the game is up. They have got to leave Beirut and they have got to leave Lebanon. That is also the wish of the Government of Lebanon and of the people of Lebanon. And everybody who has visited those parts of Lebanon that have been relieved of the terrorists' presence in recent weeks knows full well what kind of suffering lies behind those civilians who were forced to extend their hospitality to the terrorists for seven years. But the terrorists do not want to leave Beirut and they are devising all kinds of delaying tactics to avoid what is unavoidable.

94. We made an extremely generous offer: we are prepared to let them go. It is an offer unprecedented in the annals of mankind. Any other country, including those represented around this table, would not have permitted such criminals to go free. We are prepared to do it not because they deserve it—they do not. They, Mr. Ovinnikov, have put themselves beyond the pale of the international community; they do not deserve it. But this generous offer was made for one reason and one reason only: to spare as many lives—on both sides of the Green Line: Lebanese lives, the lives of Palestinian Arabs, and the lives of Israelis—as possible. This is a truly humanitarian approach, and not the cynical and bigoted approach that has become so manifest here.

95. But the terrorists must go, and the sooner the better, for all of us. They must not lay down conditions; they are in no position to lay down conditions. They should be grateful for the fact that we are willing to go through with this generous offer of letting them go and sparing their lives.

96. That is the real problem and it should not be obscured and obfuscated here through all kinds of acrobatics and exercises and delaying tactics. Members of the Council realize this. Why then, I should like to ask, do they hide behind all kinds of smoke-screens.

97. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am not surprised by the statements made by the representative of Israel; we have become used to them. I should like the representative of Israel to reread earlier statements made by the representative of Egypt; he would learn a lot about a State which maintains relations with Israel.

98. I would remind the representative of Israel that there is no need to disguise the truth behind smoke-screens. The Government of Israel is in Lebanon as an invader. My delegation has maintained, maintains and will continue to maintain excellent relations with all the Arab countries. There is absolutely no need, Mr. Blum, for you to try to drive a wedge between them and us: it will do you no good and will be a miserable waste of time. I should like to tell you that, if the Palestinians are in Lebanon, it is quite simply as a result of your massive expulsion of a people. You stole their houses and their homes and expelled them from their own territory.

99. I should thus like to remind the representative of Israel that it is not a matter of the Palestinian people—having been expelled from their home, which was sequestered—being forced to turn to their brothers for asylum. The Palestinian people has every right to return to its territory, and however much you persist in calling that territory Judea or Samaria, or whatever you want to call it. I assure you that those Palestinians, on that territory, will form a State tomorrow.

100. As the representative of Israel has forgotten Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations, I should like also to remind him of Article 24, which states in part that:

“In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its Members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf.”

101. That means that when we speak collectively here we are speaking on behalf of the representative of Israel. Be clear about that, Mr. Blum, and do not forget Article 24 of the Charter, which is very important in these matters.

102. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Jordan, who wishes to make a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

103. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): The representative of Israel recalled that I stated earlier that I had digressed from the theme—the extremely grave theme—being discussed right now. I should like to retract my description of what I had said as a “digression”: I simply wanted to give higher priority to the holocaust which Israel has been perpetrating against the Lebanese and the Palestinian peoples over the past two months. They have already destroyed all the important ancient cities of Lebanon and have now almost completed the destruction of its capital, Beirut.

104. I referred to what the Mayor of Bethlehem said because it is so relevant to the second holocaust—I mean the Israeli-Nazi holocaust—which is being perpetrated right now. It is so relevant because, while the holocaust is being perpetrated on this massive scale in Lebanon, the main immediate objective is to deflect world attention and world opinion from the ongoing and relentless cannibalization and obliteration of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories and in dispersal. There are 4 million Palestinians either under occupation or in dispersal.

105. The representative of Israel must know that Israel came into being as a result of a United Nations resolution [*General Assembly resolution 181 (II)*], even though we constituted a two-thirds majority in Palestine. He must know that this was given as a gift to the Israelis by the United Nations as it was then, a United Nations which represented a minority of the community of nations. That gift was made contingent on the establishment of a Palestinian Arab State, which would have included not only what is now called Arab Jerusalem—a dwarfed part of Jerusalem—but also all the Arab quarters of West Jerusalem, which constitute two thirds of West Jerusalem.

106. If the representative of Israel would only read the report of Chief Justice Fitzgerald he would know what was allocated to the indigenous Palestinians of

Jerusalem. Furthermore, that Palestinian State should have included western Galilee, that same Galilee from which the 600,000 refugees who are now being chased and butchered in Lebanon were forcibly thrown out. He surely must know that.

107. The United Nations took a decision as far back as 1948 in General Assembly resolution 194 (III), which made it mandatory for the Palestinian refugees, whether in the Palestinian State or in the Jewish State, to have an inalienable right to return to their homes and their homelands, and for compensation to be paid to anyone who, for one reason or another, might not opt to return. I do not believe that there is any significant number of them who would not wish to go back to their homes.

108. The representative of Israel has chosen to talk about the Camp David accords. I am not going to discuss here the part of the Camp David accords that pertains to the Egyptian-Israeli problem. I am talking about that part of the Camp David accords that pertains to a solution of the Palestinian problem. What do we find there? It is not only in flagrant violation of General Assembly resolutions to which I have already referred, but equally in flagrant violation of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which mandate the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the territories they occupied in 1967. The Council is fully aware that at that time the Secretary-General appointed a special envoy, Mr. Gunnar Jarring, who conducted a dialogue with the deaf, because the Israelis would not give back an inch of that occupied territory. Instead, they came up with an ingenious idea. Because they did not know what to do with those Palestinians who remained in the occupied territories and did not want to allow them into the mainstream of life because they would then have the right to vote, they came up with the ingenious idea—and in 1974, even before Begin—of giving to those Palestinians who were still there, until the time when they would pass away through natural attrition, what Begin has since described as self-rule, meaning by that that they would have municipal autonomy—and not even that, since most of the mayors of the municipalities have already been sacked because they were opposed to Israel's policy of *de facto* annexation.

109. The Camp David accords maintain for Israel all rights over the people, the land, the water, foreign policy—over practically everything. They would perpetuate Israeli occupation of those occupied territories, in flagrant violation of Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

110. At this juncture, I would inform the representative of Israel that after the Camp David accords were arrived at, I spoke to Ambassador Esmat Abdel Meguid about this problem, and he told me that the Israeli negotiators had tried to bargain over Egypt's territorial integrity. Mr. Esmat Abdel Meguid's reply to that was that if they were going to start playing

those tricks, they might as well call it quits. That is how Egypt impelled Israel to withdraw from every inch of the internationally recognized territory of Egypt.

111. Where do we find a similar provision in the Camp David accords pertaining to the Palestinians? I would tell the Israeli representative that for 14 centuries, even under the Ottoman Empire, we have been legislators and commanders of armies. Even under the Empire, every single town and every single city of Palestine was represented in the Mabusan, the Congress in Istanbul, and that three quarters of the establishment governing the Empire were from our territory. Are we now going to be reduced to municipal officers to look after the sewage system and the water system and street cleaning? That is what Begin wants, because he wants those people, the elder generation, to pass away. He wants the younger generation to be left with no opportunities for any gainful employment so that they will have no alternative other than to leave rather than remain with their grandmothers doing nothing. It is clear to everybody what the Israeli intention is. I have quoted the Mayor of Bethlehem, who is called a moderate, whose words prove beyond any shadow of a doubt that even the five-year transition period is designed to increase the Israeli confiscation of Palestinian lands from almost 40 per cent to 70 or 80 per cent.

112. The present carnage and holocaust in Lebanon, therefore—apart from wreaking havoc on an Arab country—are designed to deflect world attention from the core of the Middle East crisis, namely, the plight and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Has Israel granted an iota of those rights over the past 33 years? Has it ever observed any resolution of the Council, including resolution 242 (1967)? Where is the Israeli army now? It is in every street, in every corner, on every mountain, in every road, at every junction of the occupied West Bank, Gaza and East Jerusalem. This is not the way to solve a problem—unless, of course, Israel wants the struggle to continue for generations.

113. We have done everything we could to cooperate, not only with Mr. Jarring, but with all the envoys, United Nations and others, who have come to us. We have said to them: "Let us have an honourable and just peace, but not at the price of forfeiting inalienable Palestinian rights and maintaining the Israeli occupation."

114. Mr. Blum has once again raised the question of 1970. As I have explained a hundred times, here and in other forums, this was a family quarrel, and Israel has absolutely nothing to do with anything that happens within any Arab country. Israel is an intruder and this is our business.

115. Besides, the people who are fighting in Beirut now are overwhelmingly the indigenous Palestinian

refugees who have been living in Lebanon for 34 years. If there were some who went to their assistance or joined them, whether from Jordan or from Syria or from any other Arab country, it is only natural that they should have done so.

116. The allegation about hijacking is another one of those allegations which the representative of Israel thinks will become credible by repetition. As I have asked a number of times: who has hijacked whom? Those whom his country is bombarding and shelling now have been living in those same camps for over 30 years, since they were expelled from their ancestral homes 33 years ago. How can they have hijacked the camps in which they have been living? It is the Israeli army, which conquered Lebanon, that is trying to hijack Beirut, after having hijacked almost the whole of the south. And God alone knows if they will also hijack the north of Lebanon. Begin has said he would. Now it is Lebanon's turn; tomorrow it could be Syria's turn, and then Jordan's turn. This is the expansionism to which the world community will have to respond—and respond effectively.

117. Finally, I should like once more to tell the representative of Israel that Jordan has its official name, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, and that when he refers to Jordan he is not entitled to call it "the Palestinian Arab State". I think he was warned once before by a former President, and I think he should abide by that ruling.

118. The PRESIDENT: There are still two representatives who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply. I call first on the representative of the Soviet Union.

119. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I really felt sorry for the representative of Israel when I listened to his statement today, because of those futile and cheating devices to which he resorted as he was carried away by lies and tried to worm his way out of this extremely unpleasant situation.

120. The statement today by the representative of Israel reaffirms yet again the truth that when one is dealing with an unjust cause one cannot defend it with clean hands. It is only by using dirty devices and dirty hands that one can defend an unjust cause. That is precisely what the representative of Israel tried to do today, with the assistance of dirty devices and with hands which not only are dirty but are dripping with Arab blood.

121. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

122. Mr. BLUM: Because of the lateness of the hour this indeed is not the time for long speeches, and I promise to be very brief.

123. I am deeply touched by the compassion the Soviet representative expressed towards me. I would

like to tell him that I am equally compassionate with regard to him. So let us be sorry for each other.

124. I would also suggest, Mr. Ovinnikov, that we leave alone the question of who does and who does not come here with clean hands. I hope that is agreeable to you.

125. I listened with the utmost attention to the statement made by the representative of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan—which is the Palestinian Arab State—

126. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Jordan on a point of order.

127. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I request that the representative of Israel call the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan by its name, without any adjectives, because such use of adjectives is in violation of the Charter of the United Nations.

128. The PRESIDENT: I note the point of order of the representative of Jordan.

129. As President of the Council, I have no wish—and, I believe, no right—to curtail the right of free speech here. I believe, however, that I would have the strong support of members of the Council in asking all representatives who speak at the Council table to observe due courtesy and, in particular, to address all States by the names by which they are customarily known in United Nations practice. I express this as a hope on my own behalf and on behalf of members of the Council.

130. At this stage I call again—noting that he had said he would speak briefly—on the representative of Israel.

131. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I thought I had used the full and official name of the State which Mr. Nuseibeh represents—fuller than the name indicated on his name plate, which says only “Jordan”. I said “the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan”, and then I gave a characterization that I believe to be true—that it is the Palestinian Arab State—but I used the full name.

132. I do hope, Mr. President, that the hope that you have just expressed will find a favourable echo among all our colleagues here who have a habit of using all kinds of epithets and paraphrases when it comes to the name of my country.

133. I cannot quite understand why the representative of Jordan—the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan—is always upset when I characterize his country as the Palestinian Arab State. In his statement here today there was a very revealing passage. He asked: Are we going to be reduced to street cleaners—“we”: first person plural—in referring to the autonomy régime, which underlies the Camp David framework for peace in the Middle East. Whom was he talking about? It is quite obvious, and reasonable and justified, that

he was referring to the Palestinian Arabs. I do not agree, of course, with the tenor of the question, but I do agree with his assertion that he, as the representative of Jordan, speaks on behalf of the Palestinian Arabs.

134. Well, if he may say it, why should I be prevented from saying it? It is the truth.

135. Then we were told that what happened between the Government of Jordan and the PLO terrorists in Amman and elsewhere in Jordan in September 1970 was a “family quarrel”; it was “our business”. I quote the representative of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan: “our business”—others should not meddle in it.

136. Mr. Ambassador—and I am sorry that we always have to converse across the table; it would be nicer if we could engage in direct negotiations, as befits good neighbours—I wish it were a family quarrel. But it is not. The terrorist organization which you created is a problem for the entire world. This little Frankenstein that goes under the name of the PLO, which was created by you, by the Arab League and not by the Palestinian Arabs, has become a major source of international tension mainly because it enjoys the support of a major Power, which has been financing it, training it, equipping it with all the arms that it possesses and supporting it diplomatically or otherwise.

137. So, unfortunately, this linchpin of international terrorism is no longer a family quarrel. I wish it were.

138. You came back once again to the United Nations resolution of 1947 [*General Assembly resolution 181 (II)*]. You know, Mr. Ambassador, that at that time the countries of the Arab League, including your own, which at that time was called Transjordan, rejected that resolution and set out by force of arms to destroy it. There are official Arab League resolutions to that effect; and there is United Nations documentation available which fully bears out my point.

139. So why try to rewrite history? Let us agree that this is the domain of the representative of the Soviet Union. In his country, history is being constantly rewritten and even the pages of the *Bolshaya Sovietskaya Encyclopaedia*—the great Soviet encyclopaedia—are periodically torn out and replaced by new pages to suit the changing needs of Soviet foreign policy—and, I might add, Soviet domestic policy. We do not have to indulge in such practices. We know the truth; I am sure you know it: your country was among those that destroyed by force of arms the General Assembly resolution of November 1947.

140. You also mentioned the figure of 600,000 Palestinian Arab refugees in Lebanon. To the best of my knowledge, no census has been taken. I quoted you, fully knowing that the figures were apparently inflated, as they are elsewhere. But this is not relevant now to

our discussion. The problem before us is not the presence of Palestinian Arab refugees in Lebanon, irrespective of their numbers. The problem has all along been the presence of upwards of 15,000 armed terrorists. And let us draw a clear distinction between the two, despite the fact that the terrorists try to identify themselves with the Palestinians Arabs. To what extent that identification is justified was clearly evidenced last week when the United Nations issued a press release that the PLO was barring food supplies to the Palestinian Arab refugees [2385th meeting, para. 167]. So much for the identification between the two.

141. I should like now to say a few brief words to my distinguished and esteemed colleague from Spain. I am profoundly grateful to him for having drawn my attention to Article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations. As he no doubt knows, we are not totally ignorant of the Charter provisions. After all, our country became a Member of the United Nations a few years before his country did. He has tried in two or three sentences to rewrite the history of the Arab-Israel conflict. I would invite him to refrain from doing that. It does not befit him; it does not befit his great country. The question I asked him, though, still stands: where were you, Mr. de Piniés, over the past eight years, when the agony and tragedy of the people of Lebanon was being played out in front of a callous and indifferent world? I should hate to think that you were on a continuous siesta all those years.

142. The PRESIDENT: I was clearly optimistic a little while ago when I spoke of two remaining speakers. At this stage I now have three further names. But, before calling on them in order, I have had a request from a member of the Council to speak on a point of order. I therefore call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

143. Mr. WHYTE (United Kingdom): Forgive me, Mr. President; I am not sure whether this is really a point of order. But what my delegation has been listening for in this debate is what we thought was originally requested, and that was some sort of clarification or some sort of elaboration of the statement that was made to us in the Council in the early hours of this morning by the representative of Israel that the Israel Defence Forces has not been moving into west Beirut. But that is what we have not heard—no clarification and no elaboration.

144. The PRESIDENT: I note the point of the representative of the United Kingdom. He has not asked for a ruling by me on a direct point of order. Therefore, I now return to the list of speakers and call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

145. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Mr. President, with your permission, I shall yield in order for us to get a reply to the question raised by the representative of the United Kingdom.

146. The PRESIDENT: I note the willingness of the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to yield. But I feel that, in the interest of due order—since I have not been asked to rule on a point of order—if he wishes to yield his place at the moment, I shall then be obliged to call on the next speaker whose name is on the list, the representative of Jordan.

147. Therefore, if it is the wish of the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization in these circumstances to yield, I shall then call on the representative of Jordan.

148. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): I do, Sir.

149. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I know that what the representative of the United Kingdom has referred to is the overriding problem facing us today, namely, whether Israel is launching an all-out attack against Beirut or not. Still, I feel that I must clarify a few points.

150. Now, the representative of Israel says that Jordan is the Palestinian Arab State and that I know that this is true, but I must tell him very firmly that he is very, very badly mistaken. Jordan has been in existence, with its own people, for 3,000 years. The reason why I said "we" was that after Israel had devoured four fifths of Palestine, the inhabitants of the West Bank and the East Bank entered into a unity on totally equal terms, and that law of unity of 1950, adopted unanimously by Parliament, said that this unity was there pending a solution to the question of Palestine in accordance with United Nations resolutions, international law and the redemption of Palestinian rights. So that when I talk about the West Bank I am talking within the context of that unity, before it was occupied in 1967.

151. This same statement is contained in the General Armistice Agreement.<sup>1</sup> It says that nothing in the General Armistice Agreement of 1949 should in any way prejudice the ultimate solution of the Palestinian problem.

152. The representative of Israel has said that it was the Arabs who torpedoed the 1947 resolution [General Assembly resolution 181 (II)]. It is true that Arab representatives here at the United Nations made statements in which they objected to the dismemberment of Palestine, as any representative of any unified country would. But those who torpedoed the implementation of that resolution were the Hagannah, the Irgun and the Stern gangs, which started launching savage attacks against the Palestinian people and forced almost a million to leave their homeland after barbaric massacres with which members are all too familiar.

153. The representative of Israel has spoken of the PLO, saying that it was not established by the Palestinian people. He is wrong. It was established by the

representatives of the Palestinian people in 1964, and it was established in Jerusalem, at the Intercontinental Hotel, on Mount Scopus. Its purpose was to pursue the Palestinian question and to redeem Palestinian rights in accordance with United Nations resolutions, international law and the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Half the Jordanian Parliament then, people of the West Bank, were members of the Palestine National Congress. I attended that Congress. Everybody there was Palestinian, and it was started by the widest spectrum of Palestinian society and people.

154. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to answer the representative of Israel: I ask him to submit a complaint to the Council one day about an act of aggression committed against Israel.

155. As a result of the violations and the acts of aggression perpetrated by Israel against neighbouring States, there have been continual meetings of the Council. Recently, indeed, I have not had time for a siesta.

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

157. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The representative of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan referred to the Intercontinental Hotel. I should like to correct him: it is on the Mount of Olives, not Mount Scopus. As he knows, the Intercontinental Hotel was established on the site of Jewish tombs in the ancient Jewish cemetery of the Mount of Olives during the Jordanian occupation of the eastern part of Jerusalem between 1948 and 1967.

158. I was startled to hear that the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan has been in existence for 2,000 years. To the best of my recollection, Transjordan was established as an independent State in 1946. It subsequently changed its name to Jordan. It was established on 77 per cent of the territory of Palestine.

159. I have very little to say in response to the query of the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, which he characterized as a point of order. I think the answer to his query is to be found in my first statement today, in which I made it very clear that the allegations contained in the statements of the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Poland last night and today are untrue.

160. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): The Intercontinental Hotel, on the Mount of Olives, was not built on a Jewish cemetery. It so happens that 110 years ago the Islamic Foundation leased a piece of land just beneath it. That lease lapsed 15 to 20 years ago. Therefore, the spot on which the Intercontinental Hotel is built was never a Jewish cemetery.

161. The representative of Israel talked about Jordan. Regardless of its name, Jordan, as he well knows, established a great State, the Nabataean State. In Arabic it was always known as Ajnad al-Urdun. In other words, it was a province. All of us were provinces of larger conglomerates. The entire area—Palestine, Jordan, Lebanon or Syria—was called Syria. In other words, whatever conglomerations we established—as the rest of the world has, as the United States has—the land belongs to the people of Jordan. It has been there in various forms, whether or not in unity—and we are always for unity; we all aspire to Arab unity. It was always there, and its people are its people. And the Palestinian people are the people of mandated Palestine. The representative of Israel knows exactly where it lies.

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

163. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): At least the Council has been reminded of the *raison d'être* of one of the Members of the United Nations. That same *raison d'être* applies also to the independent, sovereign Palestinian State.

164. It was not necessary to send 120,000 Israeli troops to commit an act of aggression against the sovereign State of Lebanon. The Palestinians are not there by choice, and they are willing to go. I will only quote what the representative of Lebanon told the Council on 29 July:

“If asked where the Palestinians should therefore go, we and the Palestinians have and can only have one answer: back to Palestine.” [2385th meeting, para. 12.]

165. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Lebanon.

166. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): This is intended as a point of order, Mr. President.

167. I am extremely grateful to all those who spoke today. However, since this debate is going to be resumed later this afternoon, I should like to remind those who may take part in it that the item on our agenda is Lebanon and the situation there, not Bessarabia, Nabataea or eastern Prussia. My country still deserves to have attention focused on its plight and problem.

168. The PRESIDENT: I am sure that the words of the representative of Lebanon have been duly noted.

*The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.*

NOTE

<sup>1</sup> Hashemite Jordan Kingdom—Israel: General Armistice Agreement, *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 1*, art. II, para. 2.