



# SECURITY COUNCIL

## OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR

**2390<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 6 AUGUST 1982

NEW YORK

### CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2390) .....	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.

## 2390th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 6 August 1982, at 1 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/2390)

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 1.50 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, 2385th and 2389th 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 Cuba, Egypt, India 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 Organization) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Roa Kouri*

*(Cuba), Mr. Moussa (Egypt), Mr. Krishnan (India) and Mr. Mahmood (Pakistan) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

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

3. Members of the Council have before them documents S/15345 and S/15345/Add.1, which contain the report submitted by the Secretary-General in pursuance of resolution 517 (1982).

4. Members of the Council also have before them document S/15347, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

5. Members of the Council have received photocopies of a letter dated 5 August from the representative of Jordan to the President of the Council. This letter will be circulated later today as a document of the Council under the symbol S/15348.

6. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Exactly two months ago, Israel unleashed broad-scale aggression against a sovereign Arab State, Lebanon. The victims of that aggression are the tens of thousands of killed and wounded, Lebanese and Palestinians alike. Hundreds of thousands of persons remain without shelter; towns and villages have been destroyed; the Palestinian refugee camps have been devastated. Those are the results of the actions of the Israeli military forces on Lebanese soil.

7. The Israeli forces are making one bloody attempt after another to storm the besieged capital of Lebanon, Beirut. Against those who are courageously defending the city, the aggressor is using the entire gamut of the most modern, sophisticated forms of weaponry, including barbaric cluster bombs, fragmentation bombs and phosphorus bombs.

8. Of course, the Israeli aggressors would have been unable to do all that if they had not been sure that they could rely on the economic, political and military assistance of their overseas protector. That is the main reason for the arrogance of the aggressor.

9. It is well known that, for all this time, Israel has been provocatively disregarding the will of the entire

international community, as reflected in Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), which demand an immediate cease-fire, an end to all military activities within Lebanon and the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli military forces from Lebanon.

10. Moreover, Israel has stubbornly refused to comply with even those minimum steps approved by the Council, steps aimed at putting an end to the bloodshed in Beirut. This demonstrates the unlimited ambitions of the Tel Aviv Zionists, 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.

11. Fresh proof of the growing arrogance of the aggressor has been furnished by the official reply given by the Government of Israel [see S/15345/Add.1], in which it states its refusal to carry out the demands contained in Council resolutions 516 (1982) and 517 (1982). This is a challenge which Israel hurls not only at the fundamental provisions of the Charter of the United Nations but also at the elementary rules of human morality, which require respect for the lives of innocent persons, as the highest value on earth.

12. In these circumstances, the Council cannot and should not—nor, indeed, is it entitled to—acquiesce in such arrogant, provocative and inhumane activity on the part of the Israeli rulers, who have finally lost any feeling of conscience or reason.

13. In view of what I have said, the Soviet delegation requested yesterday evening an urgent meeting of the Council and is officially introducing the following draft resolution:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Deeply indignant at the refusal of Israel to comply with the decisions of the Security Council aimed at terminating the bloodshed in Beirut,*

*"1. Strongly condemns Israel for not implementing resolutions 516 (1982) and 517 (1982);*

*"2. Demands that Israel immediately implement these resolutions fully;*

*"3. Decides that, in order to carry out the above-mentioned decisions of the Security Council, all the States Members of the United Nations should, as a first step, refrain from supplying Israel with any weapons and from providing it with any military aid." [S/15347.]*

14. At this stage, therefore, this is the absolute minimum necessary in order to wrest the weapons from the hands of the crazed Israeli aggressors. If the aggressor does not come to his senses, of course, and particularly if he becomes even more crazed, the

Council should and will have to take additional, more severe measures in accordance with the Charter in order to put an end to Israel's aggression in Lebanon, to punish the aggressor and to place him totally outside the boundaries of civilized society.

15. At this stage, however, one thing is of vital importance. We cannot allow the hands of Israeli barbarians to make the name of Beirut one that will join, in the pages of history, the sinister list of such European cities as Warsaw, Lidice, Coventry and Oradour, cities that were mercilessly destroyed by Hitler's Fascists during the Second World War. We are certain that the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union, containing as it does urgent measures towards that end, will find support among the members of the Council and among all people of good will and clear conscience who do not wish to acquiesce in the replacement of the laws of right and justice by the laws of the jungle and brute force.

16. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I do not believe that words can adequately express the profound feelings we have at this hour because of the anguish and suffering the besieged people of Beirut have been experiencing for the past 6 or 7 weeks. It is natural that we should meet at this early morning hour as a concrete expression of the very deep concern I am sure every member of the Council feels at the extremely grave situation that prevails in Beirut, one that is reaching the most alarming, catastrophic and intolerable dimensions, one that is created by the deliberate genocidal policy of Israeli invasion. No human being worthy of the name would or could watch the enormous suffering of the Lebanese people and of their Palestinian refugee guests and remain mute.

17. After literally destroying all the main cities of southern Lebanon, the Israelis have been bombarding the city of Beirut by air, sea and land to the point where it has already been largely razed. Hardly a home, a hospital, an orphanage or a Government building has been spared this indiscriminate shelling, which has cost countless lives and has brought indescribable suffering to the innocent civilian population, 12,000 of whom have today, following the carnage of last Sunday when Israel dropped 180,000 rockets, bombs and shells within a 22-hour period, seized the opportunity of a short lull to take the path of exodus in order to escape the inferno of a city without water, medical supplies or any provisions at all.

18. Quite apart from our sense of anguish and outrage, however, we are duty-bound to look into the report of the Secretary-General and its addendum, which we received today [S/15345 and Add.1]. I wish to express to the Secretary-General our deep appreciation for the promptness with which he has submitted his report, issued this morning, as well as the addendum he subsequently submitted, after having had to wait for two or three days until the Israeli Gov-

ernment decided to examine the matter—as though it were a mere matter of routine—even though that Government is aware of the urgency of the question, involving as it does the lives and survival of half a million people.

19. What is most appalling is that in its reply, which is contained in the addendum to the Secretary-General's report, Israel rejects Council resolutions 516 (1982) and 517 (1982), which call for nothing more than a cease-fire and the deployment of United Nations observers.

20. The Israeli Government has based its rejection on flimsy reasons which not even a child would find credible.

21. We can compare the answers of the two other parties to the request of the Council, adopted unanimously. The Government of Lebanon, whose country is the victim of aggression, replied as follows:

“... I am writing to assure you of the Lebanese Government's readiness to co-operate fully in the implementation of resolution 517 (1982). This co-operation is made pursuant to our letters of 7 June [S/15178, para. 3] and 1 August [S/15333] and therefore without prejudice to Lebanon's well-known attitude regarding the validity of the General Armistice Agreement of 1949<sup>1</sup> with Israel.” [S/15345, para. 4.]

22. Similarly, the reply of Chairman Arafat of the Executive Committee of the PLO states the following:

“I received your letter addressed to me through the head of the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission, via our representative at the United Nations, at 10.00 a.m., Beirut time, on 5 August 1982. I would like to affirm to you that the PLO will continue to respect and remain committed to the cease-fire.

“Moreover, the future arrangements for the departure of Palestinian armed forces from Beirut will be determined in agreement with the Lebanese Government on the basis of the Jeddah declaration [see S/15329]. A Palestinian-Lebanese joint committee has been continuously engaged in meetings for several days to put into implementation the contents of this agreement.

“The Israeli aggression which took place yesterday and which led to the total isolation of the city from the outside world, obstructed the Lebanese side from contact with higher authorities, because of the indiscriminate shelling of all quarters and districts of the besieged city.” [S/15345, para. 5.]

23. As a matter of fact, the telephone lines of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, of the Presidential Palace and of various quarters in Lebanon are no longer functioning.

24. Now, the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO, in a memorandum dated today addressed to the President of the Security Council—and I have requested that it be circulated to the members of the Council—states the following:

“‘International observers are supposed to arrive, though none has arrived as yet. Their arrival is very important, especially in view of the continued Israeli military buildup. It is imperative that they come as soon as possible. We are awaiting your answer tonight.’

“As you know, the PLO has already reaffirmed its commitment to the cease-fire, as was reported by the Secretary-General [*ibid.*].

“We have also noted that observers have established the positions of the Israeli forces of invasion [*ibid.*, para. 7]. In this respect, we wish to recall paragraph 4 of resolution 517 (1982). We trust that the Security Council will take prompt action to consider the response and the action taken by the parties to the conflict.” [S/15348, annex.]

25. One of the more ominous signs we find in the Israeli Government's reply—apart from its humiliating attitude towards the Council and the whole United Nations system; apart from its defiance of the obligations devolving upon every Member State to abide by the mandatory decisions of the Council, in accordance with Articles 5 and 24 of the Charter—is contained in paragraph 4, especially if one reads between the lines:

“Following the departure of the terrorist organizations”—as they call them—“operating in Beirut beyond the Lebanese borders, the arrangements for the deployment of the Israel forces will be determined on the basis of the principle that all foreign forces will leave the sovereign territory of Lebanon.” [See S/15345/Add.1]

26. In other words, instead of talking about the arrangements for the withdrawal of the Israeli forces and what follows, they are talking about the “deployment of the Israel forces”. And we know what “deployment” means, because we know that Israel's designs are to continue its aggression right up to the northern frontiers of Lebanon and the Bekaa valley, as I said in my statement two days ago. And here is the confirmation that Israel is not simply satisfied with the withdrawal of other forces but will, in return for that withdrawal, deploy its forces.

27. We are meeting today because we are duty-bound to meet in accordance with resolution 517 (1982), which in paragraph 8 states:

“Decides to meet . . . if necessary, 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 the Charter of the United Nations.”

We are meeting here as members of the Security Council and, therefore, as an integral part of the United Nations system and the Charter of the United Nations.

28. Now, what should our attitude be when we find a recalcitrant party refusing to recognize a unanimous decision of the Council and even refusing to receive the Secretary-General to discuss the matter with him? Are we going to accept this humiliation, this insult, lying down? And why this attitude? Why are Begin and Sharon against the deployment of 20, 30 or 50 United Nations observers? They are some of the best people I know; they are people of integrity, who speak the truth and nothing but the truth. Begin and Sharon do not want those observers to be deployed because they want to carry on with their barbaric aggression and invasion of Lebanon. There is no other explanation for it. Therefore, they have torpedoed the essence of the provisions of the Council resolution.

29. Now, what should be our response? On 4 August we stated specifically that

“ . . . 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 the Charter of the United Nations” [*resolution 517 (1982), para. 8*].

That is what we decided upon two days ago. Are we going to renege on our resolution to suit the aggressive whims of Mr. Begin and General Sharon? Are they going to dictate to us? Are we going to forfeit the Charter?

30. These are extremely serious problems because they have a direct impact upon peace and security in the world. A very, very serious precedent could be set in relations among nations.

31. I wish to express my appreciation to the representative of the Soviet Union for having called upon us, at 10 o'clock yesterday evening, to meet, because of the sense of urgency that we all share. I must confess that I have certain observations to make on the draft resolution before the Council [*S/15347*]. My delegation does not believe that it goes far enough. When members of the Council were discussing earlier drafts of resolutions 516 (1982) and 517 (1982), we talked about Chapter VII of the Charter, namely, the imposition of sanctions, whereas in the present draft resolution, the Council, after condemning Israel—with which condemnation, I believe, nobody has any dispute—decides that, in order to carry out the decisions of the Security Council aimed at terminating the bloodshed in Beirut, all the States Members of the United Nations should, as a first step, refrain from supplying Israel with any weapons and from providing

it with any military aid. I wish to make clear that that would be just a small step which is not going to help alleviate the immediate plight of the city of Beirut or the catastrophe which might befall it at any moment.

32. What we should envisage is sanctions, which should be more effective and more lasting, diplomatically, politically, militarily and in all the other ways outlined in the Charter. I believe that the invading forces have sufficient arms to continue the commission of their crimes. How they get their supplies I do not know. In my statement of 4 August I mentioned that in 1973, after a mere few days of fighting, they came begging to the United States, saying 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” [*2388th meeting, para. 14*]. And yet now they are showering Beirut—a mere 10 square miles—with 180,000 rockets, shells and bombs. That process is ongoing and relentless—against 10 square miles.

33. It is for that reason that I believe that we should take more forceful action which will impel Israel to recognize that the Security Council is the highest executive organ of the community of nations and that its will cannot be flouted with impunity.

34. I believe that there must be other draft resolutions, amendments to the present one, or whatever members wish. I would assume that these would have to be forwarded to our respective Governments.

35. The draft before the Council falls short of what my delegation believes should be the response to the genocidal acts against Lebanon and Beirut. Perhaps other delegations have different views, but in any event we have to consult with our Governments, so I would suggest that we meet later today—perhaps at 11.30 a.m.—and take action in accordance with our duty as members of the Council.

36. THE PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel.

37. Mr. BLUM (Israel): One wonders why, if members of the Council wish to consult with their Governments and convene a Council meeting later today, this meeting should have been convened in the first place. Well, the answer is clear: the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics felt an irresistible impulse to have his say tonight. It is possible, though, that he suffers from insomnia, but that should be his problem, not the problem of the Council. I do not believe that he feels an irresistible impulse to make obscene statements every night. Because that is precisely what his statement was: an obscene and perverse statement—so much so that I asked myself whether it was worth responding to at all, whether I should really dignify it by responding to it.

38. I decided to do so for one simple reason: not for the purpose of detaining members of the Council at

this hour, but in order to show the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that his bullying tactics do not pay. We are used to them; we have been exposed to them over the years. He should have known better. He should have known by now that no amount of bullying and intimidation is going to achieve any objective of his. But apparently it is difficult to get rid of ingrained habits and of atavistic impulses, so that statement had to be made.

39. Who was speaking here in the Council about barbarism and atrocities and violations of international law? The representative of a country which, by general consensus—yes, by general consensus—is the foremost violator of international law in contemporary life. Mr. Ovinnikov, you represent a country which constitutes the gravest threat to international peace and security since 1945. There is no secret ballot being taken in the Council. If it were, 14 members of the Council would identify your country as the worst offender against international peace. Even Mr. Nowak, in a secret ballot, would vote with the majority, because Mr. Nowak comes from a country—from one of the many countries—which you have enslaved—

40. The PRESIDENT: I apologize to the representative of Israel. The representative of Poland has asked to speak on a point of order, and I call on him.

41. Mr. NOWAK (Poland): Mr. President, I should like to request that you ask the representative of Israel to speak on the matter before the Council and to stop insulting members of the Council. The matter is the item which is on the agenda.

42. The PRESIDENT: I note the point of order of the representative of Poland.

43. The wish of the Council is, I am sure, to allow complete freedom of speech in debates. At the same time, I am sure it is also the wish of the Council that we should have proper respect for its members. At this stage, I shall simply ask the representative of Israel to continue his statement, having noted the point made by the representative of Poland.

44. Mr. BLUM (Israel): It seems that the representative of Poland is somewhat confused. We are not in Warsaw, we are at the United Nations, and freedom of speech still exists here. We are not being muzzled here as they are in Warsaw these days. These cheap tactics of interrupting me will not interrupt the flow of my argument, Mr. Nowak; so do not bother.

45. The PRESIDENT: I request the representative of Israel to yield for a moment while I call on the representative of Poland on a point of order.

46. Mr. NOWAK (Poland): I should like once again to request you, Mr. President, to remind the representative of Israel that he is not here to speak directly

to anyone. I have no personal quarrel with the representative of Israel. He is here to speak on the item that is on the agenda. At the moment his speech is insulting. I am not trying to prevent him from speaking. He can say anything about the item on the agenda and that is what he should do. If he makes personal references, please be good enough to call the representative of Israel to order, Mr. President.

47. The PRESIDENT: I would ask those who speak in the Council to address their remarks through me as President, as is the normal practice.

48. I call on the representative of Israel.

49. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I should like to inform the representative of Poland, through you, Mr. President, that we are at the United Nations and not in Warsaw and that, consequently, freedom of speech is still exercised here, as distinct from the situation in Warsaw. I would be obliged, Mr. President, if you would inform the representative of Poland that the Council is not in the habit of muzzling speakers, especially not those who have something to say about the truth as it is perceived outside this building, as distinct from the surrealistic truth in this building.

50. Let me return to where I left off when I was first interrupted on a so-called point of order.

51. The Soviet Union constitutes the gravest threat to international peace and security since 1945. The Soviet Union has enslaved virtually all of its neighbours through the force of arms. The Soviet Union has oppressed its own people and has deprived them of their fundamental human rights. Soviet barbarism has been exported to other countries—most recently, to Afghanistan. Significantly, the representative of the Soviet Union has not responded to any of my queries in this regard. Let me ask him here—since he spoke about barbarism: What happened to the population of the valley of Panjshir, north of Kabul, in Afghanistan, the tens of thousands of people whom you massacred in the villages of that valley? What happened to all those inhabitants of Afghanistan whom you have subjected to bacteriological and chemical warfare, whom you regard as human guinea-pigs? Who are you to speak about violations of international law, violations of human rights, and barbarism? From where do you take the audacity and the temerity to accuse others of barbarism and atrocities, you the heroes of Kabul and of Warsaw and of Budapest and of Prague and of East Berlin? What were your humanitarian tanks doing in all those cities?

52. We have been treated to displays of your vulgarity before, Mr. Ovinnikov. But you have descended here tonight to new depths of vulgarity—even by your own standards. You claim to speak on behalf of a State of workers. We all know it is a sham—

53. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union wishes to speak on a point of order.

I therefore interrupt the representative of Israel to call on him.

54. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I should simply like to seek your opinion, Mr. President. Is the representative of Israel speaking on the agenda item?

55. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union has asked my opinion. I believe it is the tradition and practice of the Council to allow complete freedom of speech to members of the Council and to those whom it decides to invite to the Council table. At the same time, I remind all those who speak in the present debate of the item on our agenda, which is the situation in the Middle East. I would also appeal to members of the Council and those who are invited to the Council table to try and show full regard for the practices and norms of the Council, and to show respect and a willingness to continue the debate, as far as possible, on the agenda item.

56. Having said that, I repeat that it is the tradition and practice of the Council to allow complete freedom of speech to those who are invited to the Council table and to avoid any kind of personal recrimination across the Council table as far as possible.

57. That is my opinion. I have not been asked for a ruling on a point of order, but I ventured to remind members of the Council of those views and hope that they will support me if I draw the attention of all present here to them.

58. I call on the representative of Poland on a point of order.

59. Mr. NOWAK (Poland): I think if we take Article 31 of the Charter into account we shall see that we are definitely obliged to speak only on the question that has been brought before the Security Council. This is not incompatible with freedom of speech. Anything can be said on the question itself.

60. The PRESIDENT: I again call on the representative of Israel.

61. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I am not surprised that the representatives of the Soviet Union and Poland find it so difficult to listen to these words. In their countries it is not customary to listen to the truth.

62. As I said before, the representative of the Soviet Union claims to speak on behalf of a State of workers. We all know it is a sham, but the pretensions are still there. I will therefore, through you, Mr. President, invite him to listen to what free workers in a free society have to say about recent events in Lebanon.

63. The Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), the largest organization of free

workers in a free country in the world, published a statement yesterday, on 5 August, on the question of Lebanon. For the enlightenment of Mr. Ovinnikov—and of Mr. Nowak, if he cares to listen—I should like to read out that statement:

“For seven years the people of Lebanon have been subjected to a reign of terror at the hands of the PLO and Syria, which together occupied 60 per cent of the country. Nearly 100,000 were killed, another quarter of a million wounded, and 800,000 Christians and 500,000 Muslims made homeless.

“The country’s political structure and institutions of authority were shattered. In Lebanon the world could see what a PLO State would look like. But little attention was paid to this unfolding tragedy. By contrast, when the Israeli forces moved into Lebanon there was a global outcry against the civilian casualties.

“The AFL-CIO deeply regrets the loss of civilian lives in the present conflict. The PLO tactic of deliberately locating its forces in residential areas and storing its ammunition in schools, hospitals and other public facilities has compounded the number of civilian casualties. In effect, it is holding the civilian population of west Beirut hostage.

“The Executive Council considers the Israeli invasion of Lebanon entirely justified on security grounds. The seizure of vast caches of PLO weapons and ammunition in southern Lebanon is proof of a PLO military buildup which posed a direct threat to Israel’s security. To protect its security, Israel was justified not only in altering its stated objective of removing the immediate threat but in attacking its source, the command structure of the PLO itself.

“In the conflict between Israel, on the one hand, and the PLO and Syria, on the other, the AFL-CIO is not neutral. We support Israel. The world should demand that the PLO and Syria leave Lebanon now and allow the Lebanese to proceed with the task of reconstruction and the creation of an independent central Government. Upon the departure of those forces, the Israeli forces must also withdraw, as they have committed themselves to do.

“We call upon the United States Government to assist the Lebanese in this task in every way possible and to make humanitarian aid available to the Lebanese and the Palestinians.

“In destroying the PLO military infrastructure, Israel has not only created the possibility of a free Lebanon; it has dealt a blow to international terrorism and set back Soviet influence in the Middle East and thus advanced the interests of the Western democracies. The weakening of the PLO and of Soviet influence may set the stage for fruitful dis-



cussion with moderate Arab forces aimed at a solution of the Palestinian problem.

"The United States, through diplomatic and other means, should work towards the creation of conditions for a negotiated settlement of this issue. Towards this end, the AFL-CIO urges the United States Government to continue withholding recognition from the PLO and to refrain from any actions which would encourage the PLO to believe that it can snatch a political victory from military defeat. The PLO should be denied recognition of legitimacy, not only because it is dedicated to the destruction of Israel but because it is a terrorist organization. To reward it with recognition is to encourage terrorism as a political tactic around the world."

64. I hope Mr. Ovinnikov has listened to the views of free workers in a free country. And if he has, he will have realized why he and his country are so upset about recent developments in Lebanon. It is because their stooge, the terrorist PLO, has been dealt a severe blow. And all these attempts, culminating in late-night meetings of the Council, are designed for only one purpose—to save whatever can be saved for the PLO.

65. As I have already had occasion to tell the Council yesterday, we are grateful to the representative of the Soviet Union for having displayed so manifestly the true face of the PLO, not only as a linchpin of international terrorism but also as a blind stooge of the Soviet Union in the Middle East—of the Soviet Union, which has been the major destabilizing factor in the entire region for the past 25 years.

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

67. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): We seem to have forgotten what we were discussing. It was my understanding that this meeting was convened to deal with Israel's rejection of a unanimous decision of the Council. The question is, how does the Council intend to deal with such a situation?

68. Shelling has been resumed. More people will be killed in cold blood. The question before the Council, therefore, is—I ask again—how to deal with that issue? Where does the responsibility lie and how do the members of the Council carry out their duty of fulfilling the tasks, functions and responsibilities of the Council? That is the issue that we thought we were to discuss. Somehow, however, the discussion has been diverted—or, rather, hijacked.

69. All I can say is that the Council has forgotten that from July 1981 to May 1982 the people of Galilee did enjoy peace and the cease-fire was observed—on one side at least. Yet, according to the report of the Secretary-General, Israel is the one that on hundreds of occasions violated that cease-fire.

70. If it is their purpose to bring down upon Beirut what was brought down upon Deir Yassin, the Israelis are mistaken, because we are determined to defend our survival.

71. The reply of the representative of Israel as set forth by the Secretary-General in the addendum to his report [*see S/15345/Add.1*] makes us wonder. When we read paragraph 3 of that reply, we wonder who is sending the reply. It mentions the demand of the Lebanese Government and the explicit and urgent demands of the President of the United States that what they call the "terrorist organizations" leave Beirut and Lebanon as speedily as possible and says that the presence of observers in Beirut would signal to those "terrorist organizations" that they are under no obligation to leave Beirut and Lebanon. I do not think that Israel can speak for the President of the United States. All of us heard the President of the United States demanding that Israel put an end to its aggression in Lebanon and withdraw. I thought that in this chamber and at this table the President and Government of the United States were represented. The Lebanese Government is also represented here. They do not need anyone to speak on their behalf.

72. With regard to the free workers and free movements and free labour and so on, I would just like to put on record here some information I have received, namely, that the Labour Party of the Netherlands has severed relations with the Labour Party of Israel because of the latter's support of the aggression against the sovereignty and people of Lebanon.

73. The PRESIDENT: It was my understanding, from informal consultations before this meeting began, that the Council was in general agreement to adjourn the meeting until mid-morning, that is to say, mid-morning today, Friday, 6 August. I had intended to suggest the hour of 11 a.m. I note that the representative of Jordan suggested 11.30 a.m. I would ask him whether he prefers 11.30, or would there be agreement to meet at 11 a.m.?

74. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I would certainly go along with the consensus of my colleagues. I suggested 11.30 a.m., but if 11 a.m. is the preference of other members, I would of course go along with that.

75. The PRESIDENT: Before adjourning the present meeting, I should again like to thank the Conference Services and others who responded and have worked with us late into the night.

*The meeting rose at 2.55 a.m.*

---

NOTE

<sup>1</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 4.*

---

### كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها 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销处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

#### HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

#### COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

#### КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

#### COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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

---