



CONTENTS

- Agenda item 3:
Credentials of representatives to the eighth special session of the
General Assembly (*concluded*):
(b) Report of the Credentials Committee
- Agenda item 7:
Financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon
- Closing statement by the President
- Agenda item 2:
Minute of silent prayer or meditation
- Closure of the eighth special session

President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).

AGENDA ITEM 3

**Credentials of representatives to the eighth special session
of the General Assembly (*concluded*):
(b) Report of the Credentials Committee**

1. The PRESIDENT: Since no representative has asked to be allowed to speak on this item, I invite members to turn their attention to the draft resolution recommended by the Credentials Committee in paragraph 14 of its report [A/S-8/8].
2. In the Committee the draft resolution was adopted without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution S-8/1).

AGENDA ITEM 7

Financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE

3. Mr. BELYAEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee (*interpretation from Russian*): I have the honour to present the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 7, entitled "Financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon" contained in document A/S-8/9.
4. The Committee considered this question at the three meetings it held on 20 and 21 April. The recommendation of the Fifth Committee is contained in paragraph 11 of the report. It consists of a draft resolution which was adopted by the Committee by 90 votes to 13, with 3 abstentions.

5. The PRESIDENT: May I remind members that the General Assembly, at its 1st meeting held yesterday, approved the allocation of agenda item 7 to the Fifth Committee on the understanding that delegations would have an opportunity to express their views, on the basis of rule 66 of the rules of procedure, when the Committee's report was considered in plenary meeting.

6. After holding consultations with representatives of various delegations, I have a definite feeling that there is an understanding that the General Assembly would wish to discuss the report of the Fifth Committee. Indeed, there are already 41 names inscribed on the speakers' list for that purpose. Unless there is any objection, we shall proceed to discuss the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 7.

It was so decided.

7. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): The eighth special session of our General Assembly is a very special session indeed. It is not an administrative and financial meeting, nor is it just another political forum where we assemble to debate endlessly, to adopt resolutions that are never translated into reality. If we are meeting today, it is because there has been a unique response in the world community, which we here embody, to the appeal of a Member State in agony a response to Lebanon's peace cry, "Let my people live".

8. Paraphrasing, if I may, the words with which the representative of the United Kingdom concluded the meetings of the Security Council over which he presided last month, I here repeat as a testimony that, in our imperfect world, the Security Council has asserted its ability to discharge its responsibility for securing as best it can international peace and security.

9. In the Fifth Committee there was, as you know, a magnificent consensus on the objectives of Council resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978), on their unequivocal character, on the spirit of practicality with which they were adopted, and then on the swiftness with which the Secretariat moved to implement them.

10. The soldiers of peace are now active in my bleeding country. And, before proceeding any further in this debate, I beg to be allowed to interpret the moment of silent meditation and prayer which we shared yesterday as a solemn salute and tribute to those who have chosen to imperil their lives, far from their own homelands, for the cause of international law and order.

11. In such moments of dramatic history, budgets and figures and statistics and costs all suddenly acquire a different dimension: they become so unimportant, so

futile, when compared with the sacrifice of human lives, let alone the destruction of homes, of property, of the very means of livelihood, of villages and of cities and the sudden disruption and withering away of the fabric of communities.

12. Yet, I wish to present the financial proposal put before this Assembly in the form of a very candid equation: peace equals UNIFIL, the existence of which in turn is contingent upon your voting its budget—hence you are once more called upon to express, by your vote, an international will for peace. It is in this perspective, transcending finances and administration, that the delegation of Lebanon views the draft resolution [*see A/S-8/9, para. 11*] of which we are sponsors.

13. We also read in this draft resolution—and I invite all the Member States to read in it unequivocally—a reaffirmation of the principles adopted by the Security Council: namely, the immediate cessation of hostilities and the total withdrawal of the Israeli aggressor, to be confirmed by the United Nations Interim Force entrusted with the task of establishing an “area of peace” and helping the Government of Lebanon in restoring its sole sovereignty over all its territory, within its internationally recognized boundaries.

14. The Secretary-General has just returned from a visit to Lebanon and to Israel. He has also met with the commanders and soldiers of UNIFIL, and ascertained directly the difficulties of peace keeping, as well as the needs, present and future, involved in maintaining and developing this international undertaking. Our tribute to Mr. Kurt Waldheim will be meaningless if we do not take very seriously the conclusions that he has brought back from this visit, in which he found it necessary to engage the prestige and responsibility of both his personality and function.

15. We are grateful that he should have spoken so frankly and so honestly and with such deep concern of Lebanon’s terrible and poignant crisis, as well as of Israel’s reluctance to withdraw immediately, let alone of the sad realities of the Palestinian diaspora in revolt, and the grave consequences and implications thereof. It is a very hazardous game indeed for me to speak of causality at this stage. But it is obvious to us that one of those inevitable implications was the traumatic clash between a logic of revolution—Palestinian, of course, but also generally Arab—and the logic of the State, the Lebanese State. Yet, solidarity with the Palestinian cause was and is still maintained in the face of Israel’s constant efforts at destabilizing Lebanon, through war and during peace—the last and most patent of these efforts, which interests us here directly, being the creation by Israel of the difficulties which confront the poor unarmed villagers wanting to return to occupied southern Lebanon, which Israel wants to maintain as a barren empty land.

16. The draft resolution submitted to this Assembly should be read and adopted within the context and in the light of these realities and of the Secretary-General’s conclusions, as well as of the thoughts already expressed by the representatives of the States most concerned by peace in the Middle East, and particularly by the Ambassador of the United States of America who, having so forcefully

sponsored the text adopted as resolution 425 (1978), must feel today, I presume, particularly obligated to uphold it in all its components and whatever the consequences may be.

17. Many of our friends, particularly from the non-aligned group, had prepared various working papers which they contemplated submitting as a “political resolution” expressing their strong sentiment on the non-compliance of Israel with resolution 425 (1978) and the necessity of prompt and total implementation. Such a resolution would, of course, have given our cause tremendous support. Yet, in a spirit of expediency and consensus on the objectives of the resolution, there will be only one draft resolution proposed, the one adopted by the Fifth Committee.

18. Indeed, a standard had been set by the members of the Security Council which we feel this Assembly must maintain, for then we in the shattered Middle East shall believe that this is the beginning of the end.

19. The men who have come from Sweden, Ghana, France, Norway, Iran, Canada, Nepal, Senegal, and the many others who had come before from other countries or may still have to come to establish international *présence* in Lebanon and the Middle East—those men are the expression of a new perception by this Organization of the brotherhood within the United Nations—a brotherhood that rejects not only aggression, but all forms, old and new, dead or reborn, of colonialism and imperialistic designs.

20. We, in Lebanon, view international *présence* not only as an expression of concern for our fate or assistance in our struggle for survival, against all odds, but rather as a challenge addressed to us and to the world community—a challenge to preserve the sovereignty, the unity and the freedom of Lebanon, without which there can be no stability and hardly any order, justice, or peace in this most important part of the world.

21. An Israeli newspaper, *Davar*, said in the wake of the invasion: “It is easy to lose in Lebanon, but very difficult to win.”

22. Once, back in history, thousands of years ago, my country was described as the land beloved by the gods, where strangers were always welcome with a message of peace and fraternity. Since then, we believe, our history, ancient and modern, has proven beyond doubt that conquest is vain and doomed, whereas the brotherhood of nations, of religions and cultures, is the reality that shall always prevail and triumph.

23. Let there be, therefore, no place for despair in our hearts, and no place for the logic of despair in our minds, the logic that breeds hatred, violence, and terror. Let this august Assembly restore hope, and let peace be with us, a reality beyond doubt.

24. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): As the representative of a country which has sent a contingent to UNIFIL, I cannot but begin my statement by associating myself with the tribute just paid to the soldiers of peace who are sacrificing their lives in order that peace may soon be restored in the beautiful country of Lebanon.

25. This special session of the General Assembly on the financing of the Interim Force in Lebanon is a symptom of the worsening of the conflict in the Middle East. Indeed, the invasion and occupation by Israel of a part of Lebanese territory have added a new dimension to the conflict and complicated the outlook for peace. Furthermore, they place on the United Nations a burden of expenditure caused by the acts of a State about which the least that can be said is that it has never made the task of our Organization easy. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, over which I have the honour to preside, had on 20 March expressed to the Security Council its deep concern and disquiet about the invasion of Lebanon by Israel.¹ That invasion, which constitutes a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter, was above all directed against the Palestinian refugees in Lebanon. The pretext advanced at that time by the Israeli leaders, any more than the justifications that they put forward for carrying out their acts of aggression, did not in fact correspond to their real motives. Those are less readily admissible and very far from the alleged crusade against international terrorism. In fact, the aim of Israel's acts is the physical and moral destruction of the Palestinian people, which has become the more embarrassing and troublesome since it is more than ever resolved to defend its legitimate and inalienable rights. Israel is therefore seeking to eliminate it as a people, which explains the enormous disproportion between the operation of the Palestinian fedayeen near Tel Aviv of 11 March last and the invasion and occupation of southern Lebanon by the Israeli armed forces. The aim pursued was very clear: it was a matter not of eliminating a few straggling terrorists, but in fact of breaking the will of a whole people. Hence the massive bombardments of Palestinian camps, even when they were very far from the combat zones and occupied only by women, children and the elderly. The Israeli troops, furthermore, forced 250,000 Lebanese and Palestinians, all civilians, to leave their homes to become in their turn refugees, that is to say, persons at the mercy of international charity. They seriously damaged 82 villages and completely destroyed 6 of them. The number of victims of the invasion of Lebanon stands today at roughly 1,000 dead.

26. On 19 March 1978, the Security Council, at an emergency meeting,² called upon Israel to withdraw forthwith its forces from all Lebanese territory [*see Council resolution 425 (1978)*]. Unfortunately, that decision still has not been fully implemented. Israel has evacuated only part of the zone which it illegally occupies. This attitude can only be detrimental to the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force, whose purpose is to confirm the withdrawal of the Israeli forces. Furthermore, the occupation, if it were to be prolonged, would surely lead to the resumption of fighting. Such a situation, therefore, could scarcely be favourable for the restoration of the effective authority of the Lebanese Government in the region and would hence be contrary to the provisions of resolution 425 (1978). Israel should be called upon by the Security

Council to withdraw without delay from the whole of Lebanese territory.

27. The consequences of the Israeli aggression against Lebanon are now showing their adverse effects. First, there is the prospect of the considerable expense of maintaining peace that our Organization will have to bear. The estimate of \$54 million, submitted by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions [*see A/S-8/9*], seems to us not to be correct but to be simply the beginning of a spiraling expenditure caused by the Israeli invasion. For it is highly probable, in our view, that the United Nations Interim Force will remain in Lebanon for more than six months. In that case, the United Nations must expect additional expenses, which could be substantial. Similarly, the material destruction and the displacement of 65,000 Palestinians cannot but have financial implications for this Organization.

28. The task of assisting the Palestinian and Lebanese refugees has already been tackled by UNRWA. An initial estimate of the cost of that operation is \$2 million.

29. The question that arises at this stage is whether the United Nations intends to pay the costs of ensuring the security of Israel's northern borders. Israel should be made liable for the entire expenditure resulting from its armed intervention in southern Lebanon: Compensating the victims of that operation should also be envisaged.

30. Moreover, the limited objectives given the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon make its task difficult and dangerous, since the Force is faced with an extremely complex situation that cannot be overcome by a mere separation of the parties involved. Indeed, the United Nations troops, however useful their task may be, cannot be a substitute for a political settlement nor delay such a settlement. What is worse, the longer these troops remain, the greater the danger that they will find themselves in the middle of a war with dangerously unforeseeable consequences.

31. At its thirty-second session the General Assembly adopted resolution 32/40 B providing for the establishment within the Secretariat of the United Nations of a Special Unit on Palestinian Rights.

32. The expenditure for that unit was estimated at less than \$1 million. Everyone remembers the indignation expressed at that time by the representative of Israel, who felt that such an expenditure would bankrupt the Organization.

33. Today we are called upon to provide for covering the expenditure resulting from the aggressive policy of the Government of Israel—an expenditure provisionally estimated at \$54 million, not including the even greater damages caused to the Lebanese State and to the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples.

34. On 6 March the Secretary-General transmitted to the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People a petition from several hundred Palestinians struggling in the occupied territories. It called upon all national and international bodies to help to put an end to any attempts to prejudice the rights of the Palestinian people and the legitimacy of their representation through

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1978*, document S/12614.

² *Ibid.*, *Thirty-third Year*, 2074th meeting.

the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). The authors of the petition said in particular:

“The Palestinian people in the occupied territories reaffirms unequivocally its complete confidence in the unity of the Palestinian people, both within and outside these territories. It also affirms the unity of Palestinian representation through the PLO, the only organization authorized to speak on behalf of the Palestinian people, and denounces any attempt to establish another steering organization that would be a substitute for or equal to the PLO.

“The rights of our Palestinian people, as affirmed in various United Nations resolutions, cannot be the subject of any bartering. First among the rights of the Palestinian people is its legitimate right to decide, in complete freedom, its own future in its own country. We therefore reject any form of trusteeship system, whatever its origin may be, as well as any form of settlement that would be prejudicial to the independence of the Palestinian people and the autonomy of its will. We therefore also reject any compulsory link between the Palestinian State and any other party to the extent that this runs counter to our people’s freedom to decide its own future.”

35. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People believes that the presence of United Nations forces must not enable some people to solidify their injustices and pursue their policy of oppression and occupation. On the contrary, it should impel the United Nations, and particularly the Security Council, to seek a lasting solution to the problem of southern Lebanon. Now, that problem can be solved only in the context of an over-all settlement making it possible for the Palestinian people to exercise their inalienable rights. These rights, need we recall, have been recognized by the United Nations since 1947.

36. Our Committee has prepared recommendations³ that could not only enable the Palestinian people to exercise their rights, but also assist in finding a solution to the Middle East conflict. Those recommendations were endorsed by the General Assembly [*see resolution 32/40 A*]. The National Council of Palestine, the supreme body of the Palestinian people, has also approved them.

37. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to implement them, because of the immobility of the Security Council, which has not yet taken a position on the question.

38. The Committee believes, nevertheless, that the present situation allows for no further delay. It is therefore imperative for the Security Council to act in a more decisive way to bring about a just and lasting settlement of the Middle East question. Otherwise, a new cycle of violence and destruction could not only endanger international peace and security, but also jeopardize any chances for a peaceful settlement. In the Committee’s opinion, a positive response to these recommendations would be an **important step towards eliminating the danger of war in the Middle East, promoting a just and lasting peace and, finally,**

devoting large United Nations funds to profitable tasks, tasks more useful to the international community as a whole.

39. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): For whom the bell tolls? The bells have tolled with sadness—even if inaudible—and with regular and sickening frequency ever since our Middle East was afflicted with Zionist ambition and aggressive expansion. It is a gruesome tale which compels all of us at the United Nations to ponder with deep agony what has become of the United Nations—Charter, sovereignty, the much-abused Declaration of Human Rights, dignity and elemental decency.

40. The new victims of Israel’s reckless and bestial aggression are yet another of our oldest and most esteemed Member States, Lebanon, its people, and its guests, who are determined to terminate their dispersal if only they can do so by returning to their homeland—their only alternative being to jump into the Mediterranean. Mr. Begin latterly conceded, with notorious nostalgia, that the days he would like to remember most are the days when he led the bloodthirsty Irgun terror, in the latter part of the 1940s. He evidently, in the invasion of south Lebanon, had an irresistible penchant to upmanship of his own dark record and to give a live repeat of those earlier abominable crimes. In Deir Yassin, at the King David hotel and in many other cases the innocent victims, mainly women and children, could be counted in the hundreds. After all, weaponry three decades ago was relatively constrained in the magnitude of its power of destruction. Today he is in possession of cluster bombs, the most sophisticated fighter bombers, the heaviest calibre guns and tanks and, to complete the show, the means of naval missile bombardment.

41. No wonder the civilian victims were in the thousands, even though militarily it was a dismal failure. I do not know if this has sated Mr. Begin’s insatiable vengeful appetite or not, only the future will tell. And while talking about brutal tools of mass destruction, I remember vividly Senator McGovern campaigning for the presidency against Mr. Nixon at the height of the Viet Nam war. He was addressing the American conscience on television, when he said to the American people: “Imagine a cluster bomb being dropped on a countryside the size of a football field. It has the capability to kill or maim practically everyone present on that field.” The American conscience eventually prevailed and the tragic episode of Viet Nam came to an end.

42. I recall this story not to resuscitate unsavoury memories or to get involved in the power game of international politics; I do so because I recall a decision made by a President in whose integrity and humaneness I have considerable faith. Shortly after President Carter assumed the duties of his great office he rescinded an earlier decision to supply Israel with cluster bombs. I must confess that I was filled with appreciation and relief. Now, since those cluster bombs have been profusely deployed against our Lebanese and Palestinian civilian brethren in Lebanon—and who knows whose turn comes next in the bloody calendar?—I should be less than honest if I did not request our colleagues in the United States delegation here to convey our urgent request for an inquiry as to when deliveries of such cluster bombs have been made. We know

³ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, Supplement No. 35*, paras. 43 and 44.

that the original decision was made when Secretary of State Kissinger was at the helm in the former Administration, but we should make certain that lower echelons in the present Administration are not acting by inertia and are not oblivious to presidential orders, publicly pronounced. The blood of several thousand innocent women and children compels us and the good American people to make this request and to brush aside any cover-ups.

43. Lest there should be any misunderstanding as to ulterior motives, I should recall that I made a similar request for an inquiry back in 1965 to the then Secretary of State pertaining to unimpeachable information which my Government had received on Israel's accelerated nuclear activity at Daymona. Even though the Secretary of State was incredulous, he agreed instantly to an inquiry, which, in spite of Israeli obstructionism, substantially proved our information to be correct. The United States Ambassador to Jordan, Mr. McComber, conveyed the results of the inquiry to my Government. We were entitled to this since a mere two years earlier we had ratified the partial test-ban Treaty in both Washington and Moscow.

44. It is timely and gratifying that a four-part film on the holocaust has been shown on one of the major television networks lest the new generations should forget the bestiality of the Nazis committed 40 years ago. As I was watching those abominable scenes with deep revulsion my mind would unconsciously stray in a lonesome and spontaneous reflection. I was saying to myself overburdened with the reports that I receive and the hundreds of first-hand stories I have heard from our people under occupation over the past 11 years: "My God, this is the kind of abomination that my people have been undergoing, and still are, and which I read about in the abstract. Nazism is dead in Europe, but its spirit has been incarnated and transplanted in the Middle East." If I understood its message correctly, *Holocaust* was not simply a record of a dark page in history; nor is its purpose to avenge its criminal perpetrators, for they are all dead. The message is that this was what happened, and let our new generation beware of its scourge.

45. I therefore recommend very strongly that *Holocaust* be given the widest showing all over the world, and particularly in Israel itself. Perhaps the conscience of the officer or sergeant who is at present torturing our young boys and girls will get a new insight into, a new dimension of, the ugliness of his criminal deeds. I think many will repent and act with a little more insight and perspective. Who knows?

46. Even though it is the internationally recognized principle that an aggressor should pay the cost of his aggression, my delegation supports the draft resolution – introduced by Norway in the Fifth Committee and now recommended by that Committee – on financing UNIFIL in accordance with the letter and spirit of Security Council resolution 425 (1978), that is, to confirm the withdrawal forthwith of the Israeli forces from Lebanon. This is our top priority, in deference to and with esteem for a dear sisterly State, Lebanon, and we shall vote for it.

47. And while we are on resolution 425 (1978), may I remind Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan that Lebanon has

absolutely nothing to do with resolution 242 (1967). That was intended for the belligerents in that war, and Lebanon was not among them. If one must play poker in politics, the least one expects is that he will refrain from cheating. The number 425 is roughly double the number 242, and it takes wizardry to confuse the two numbers.

48. The Israeli plan of withdrawal presented to the Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim, is not in conformity with resolution 425 (1978), which was adopted unanimously. That resolution uses the term "forthwith", which means "immediately". It was used to give relief from the sordid experience of abuse of the word "immediate", which in the English vocabulary means exactly what it is meant to mean, namely "immediate". A time-table for prompt withdrawal is much nearer "forthwith" than a vague promise to negotiate an eventual total withdrawal in a third phase.

49. There are a quarter of a million Lebanese farmers who have been displaced and who stand to lose their seasonal crops through illegal Israeli dilly-dallying. Those crops are their only livelihood; I know the area pretty well. Shall we deprive them of their daily bread, and add them to those depending on international charity?

50. Furthermore, the Ambassador of Lebanon, an accomplished and recognized expert on the Middle East, made certain that the provision on withdrawal would state specifically and categorically withdrawal "from all Lebanese territory". He was wise in leaving no room for semantic tricks like those in the English wording of resolution 242 (1967). It would be linguistically ridiculous to talk about withdrawal from all Lebanese territory as delineated by their international boundary.

51. And yet we are told that under the Israeli plan of withdrawal Israel would retain a sizable portion of occupied south Lebanon to a depth of six miles. But the original plan of invasion was publicly declared by the Israelis to concern a six-mile belt which they exceeded to a depth of 14 miles. Are we in a game of gimmickry here? Where is the withdrawal from all Lebanese territory? Are we not being pushed back to square one in this game?

52. The question is not so much one of bargaining over a range of withdrawal, be it six or 14 miles, but one of the sovereign independence, inviolability and territorial integrity of a Member State, a victim of ruthless and blatant invasion. Under no circumstances, no matter what may be the pretences of the aggressor, should the Security Council permit conquest to reap the spoils of aggression. This is what the Charter states, and this is the solemn responsibility of this august Assembly. We are not in a bazaar, and if permissiveness is allowed to go unpunished, or at least unrectified, then the whole fabric of the international order will be rendered meaningless and inoperative.

53. May I take this opportunity to express my delegation's profoundest appreciation of the dedicated and untiring efforts of Mr. Waldheim to extinguish the conflagration that has ravaged Lebanon and by corollary the efforts of the members of the United Nations Interim Force.

54. In conclusion, may I suggest – and I would ask Members please to lend me their ears that, when the term of

the mandate of UNIFIL expires and the situation returns to normality, to commemorate their role a monument inspired by the United Nations Charter and spirit be erected to the Force, bearing the following lines from the famous English poem, Gray's "Elegy":

I ull many a gem of purest ray serene,
The dark unfathom'd waves of ocean bear,
I ull many a flower is born to blush unseen,
And waste its sweetness on the desert air.

This will comfort us, if not the thousands of dead who have in untimely fashion been deprived of their birthright to live and flower as God ordained.

55. Mr. ABDUL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*). Mr. President, before I address the members of the General Assembly at this eighth special session, I should like to congratulate you most warmly on your election to the presidency of this very important session. At this stage I should like to affirm my delegation's promise of co-operation with you. We are all aware that your political and diplomatic expertise will contribute greatly to the success of this special session.

56. On 14 March Israel carried out a violent armed aggression against Lebanon. This is nothing new for Israel in its aggressions against Lebanon or any other neighbouring Arab countries. As seems to have been its custom since it was established as a State, Israel thought that the international community would silently accept whatever it did, but this time the Security Council was quick to react, and it took a dynamic decision asserting the need to reaffirm respect for the sovereignty, the political independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon within its boundaries, which are internationally recognized, and it called upon Israel to withdraw its troops immediately from Lebanese territory.

57. What seems essential to us in the terms of that decision is that it involved the use of United Nations forces. Are we not within our rights here to ask ourselves who is responsible for imposing the burden of these additional expenses on the United Nations?

58. More than a month has gone by since the Israeli aggression against Lebanon; more than 10 years have gone by since the Israeli aggression against other neighbouring Arab countries; and more than 30 years have gone by since the violation by Israel of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. Israeli forces continue to occupy Lebanese, Egyptian, Syrian, Jordanian and Palestinian territory. What we have read concerning the outcome of the Secretary-General's recent visit to Israel namely, that State's refusal to undertake to set a final date for its total withdrawal from Lebanese territory impels me to remind the Assembly of a statement by the Egyptian Minister for Foreign Affairs in commenting on a communiqué of the Israeli Government of 16 April. The Minister for Foreign Affairs said that in the past, Israel had attempted to exclude the Gaza Strip and the West Bank from the withdrawal agreement concluded in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967), without any basis of logic or law. Israel is now trying to allege that Security Council resolution 425 (1978), in which there is a demand for Israel's immediate and total withdrawal from Lebanon, should be interpreted in a similar way.

59. I should like to seize this opportunity to affirm yet again from this podium Egypt's position concerning Israeli aggression against Lebanon. Egypt considers that aggression as a dangerous development in the situation in the Middle East and a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter. It is a development which adds a new obstacle in the path to achievement of a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East situation. Egypt considers that aggression to be all the more threatening since Israeli practices are designed to annihilate Palestinians simply because they are Palestinians; that is considered to be a systematic campaign for the annihilation of the Palestinian people. Security for all the countries of that area can be attained only through a just peace based on total Israeli withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories, settlement of the Palestinian question in all its aspects and recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. That is Egypt's declared policy; it is the policy that is effectively followed by Egypt, and it will always be its consistent policy in the future. That should be absolutely clear in everyone's mind.

60. The Israeli aggression against Lebanon was combined with the use of ultra-modern weapons of destruction against innocent civilians among the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples. It is rather strange for the former Chief of Staff of the Israeli forces to mention that there were no more than 200 civilian victims. It was as though he was apologizing for that minimal figure. The entire world is witness to the fact that hundreds of innocent civilians fell victim to indiscriminate Israeli attacks against townships in which cluster bombs were used by Israel. Those bombs are prohibited by international conscience, since such bombs either kill their victims or cripple for life those wounded by them. Israel did not hesitate to use those weapons. Is that not further proof of its lack of respect for the agreements Israel made with the United States in this respect?

61. In addition to the hundreds of innocent victims and to the massive destruction of civilian agglomerations, the Israeli invasion on Lebanon has created a new wave of refugees among the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples. UNRWA has declared that the majority of the 200,000 Palestinian refugees in Lebanon were affected by these Israeli acts and were forced to flee to the North. In addition, a great number of Lebanese had to leave their homes, which were for the most part destroyed by Israeli raids; the Israeli forces even went as far as hindering the Lebanese civilians from returning to their destroyed homes, in spite of the presence of United Nations forces in that area.

62. This special session of the General Assembly must give firm support to the Security Council resolution which calls for the total and immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Lebanese territory and it must not accept any Israeli pretext or argument for holding up or postponing that withdrawal. We feel that the General Assembly must call upon the Security Council to take all appropriate, effective measures available to it to force Israel to implement the Council resolutions; otherwise the Council will have absolutely no authority or effectiveness, since Israel is continuing its aggression and occupation and defies the relevant Security Council resolutions.

63. On behalf of Egypt, I should like here to express my deep appreciation of the role played by the Secretary-General from the beginning of the Israeli aggression against Lebanon and to pay a tribute to the effectiveness of his action in setting up the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, which is provided for in resolution 425 (1978). That is only a reflection of the interest of the entire international community represented by this international body, for that community cannot remain silent in the face of violations of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of a State Member of our Organization. I should like to say to the Secretary-General that Egypt will continue to support all his constructive efforts to contribute to the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Egypt is convinced that the United Nations is the best support for our people in fighting against aggression and occupation. The Secretary-General was quite clear when he reaffirmed several times the importance of the immediate implementation of the Security Council resolution, which calls for the complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Lebanese territory.

64. The Arab Republic of Egypt will vote in favour of appropriating the necessary funds for the implementation of Security Council resolution 425 (1978), based on the following two considerations: first, the approval by the Lebanese Government of the presence of an international force on its territory, which constitutes a legal and fundamental act, thus ensuring the legitimacy of the presence of that force; secondly, the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from Lebanese territory--which should be done immediately, as stipulated by the Security Council and should in no way be connected with the deployment of the forces or with any conditions which would violate the sovereignty of the Lebanese State.

65. While thanking you for having allowed me to speak on this occasion, I cannot help but address the following message to the Members of this Organization: the Charter was based on principles which we have all accepted: its main objective being the non-use of force in international relations; the Charter also provided our Organization with the necessary prerogatives to dissuade the aggressor. Has the time not yet come for us to adhere to these principles and to use our prerogatives?

66. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): Since this is my first statement at this special session of the Assembly, I should like to pay a tribute to the Members of this Organization which have come forward so speedily and contributed military and other personnel to assist in the implementation of Security Council resolution 425 (1978). Although UNIFIL is not yet fully deployed, those of its officers and men, under the able direction of Lieutenant General Siilasvuo and Major General Erskine, already in southern Lebanon are performing a difficult and delicate task in conditions which are still far from stable.

67. Agenda item 7 is entitled "Financing"--I repeat: "Financing"--of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. I feel that this body may have forgotten this fact, having listened to my predecessors on this podium who indulged in long and futile irrelevancies. Instead, in the time-honoured tradition of this Organization in all matters affecting the Middle East, a purely financial and technical

decision has been turned into a display of polemics and vituperation.

68. Several representatives, apparently bent on thwarting Israel's determination to implement Security Council resolution 425 (1978), have turned the Fifth Committee, whose mandate is confined to budgetary and administrative matters, into a political forum, and have thus usurped the functions of the Security Council.

69. In this regard, it should be mentioned again that no special session of the General Assembly was called two years ago, when 50,000 Lebanese were being killed, 100,000 wounded and 1 million turned into refugees by the Lebanese civil war. Indeed, at that time, when Lebanon was being torn apart by the self-same PLO that brought about the present situation, there was not one discussion on Lebanon, either in the Assembly or in the Security Council, or in any other organ of this world Organization.

70. In the light of the lies and distortions that have been perpetrated in the present debate so far, I am constrained to reiterate the facts that led to the present situation.

71. The PLO came in force to Lebanon and proceeded to use it as a base for operations against Israel after it failed to overthrow King Hussein of Jordan and his régime in September 1970: the so-called Black September--and after it was finally banished from Jordan in 1971. The Jordanian representative regaled us today with the broad scope of his literary expertise, ranging from Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls* to Gray's "Elegy"--a useful diversion, I might say, from recalling the killing of 20,000 Palestinians, according to Arafat at that time, by the Jordanian forces.

72. The Israel-Lebanon border had been quiet and peaceful for years, with the farmers on both sides living side-by-side in amity. The advent of the PLO brought misery, murder and disruption to the area, both for the Lebanese and for the Israelis. Since the end of 1973, there have been 1,548 individual acts of aggression arising out of artillery, Katyusha, mortar and terrorist attacks mounted against Israel from Lebanon by these terrorists. In these attacks, 108 Israeli citizens, mostly women and children, were killed, and 221 were wounded.

73. During these years, Israel exercised a forbearance which, alas, produced no results, and the brutal massacre of Israeli citizens on the Tel Aviv-Haifa road last month was but the most recent and bestial in the long chain of carnage and death wrought by the PLO.

74. Last month, the Government of Israel was therefore faced with the problem of exercising its duty--the inherent duty of every Government to exercise its right of self-defence in the protection of the inviolability of its territory and its people.

75. Now, it is imperative at this point to correct some of the gross distortions that have been propounded in this debate and to place Israel's operation in southern Lebanon into the correct perspective. Of 17,000 homes in southern Lebanon, some 550 were damaged. Of the latter, approximately 300 have been or are in the process of being rehabilitated and restored. Exaggerated press reports and

the speeches we have heard today have spoken of “thousands” dead. The facts are that Israel has buried fewer than 140 people in the area under its control, apart from the combatants killed on both sides.

76. Israel has provided food, medicine and other forms of relief and has reactivated schools in the area in order to assist in the return of normal life to the area, and we have done everything possible to facilitate the return of refugees to southern Lebanon.

77. Latest reports indicate that nearly half of the 60,000 refugees from the area south of the Litani River have already returned to their homes, and it should be noted that many of those returning are not refugees of the recent fighting, but include many of the 100,000 who fled earlier during the years in which the PLO inflicted a reign of terror in the region and who now, for the first time, feel it safe to return.

78. I repeat what I stated in the Security Council on 17⁴ and 19 March⁵: Israel did not enter southern Lebanon with the intention of staying, and we do not intend to stay. We seek no Lebanese territory. We honour and respect the international border with Lebanon. We do not wish to acquire one inch of Lebanese soil. Our purpose was solely to remove the terrorist forces which have brought chaos, misery and destruction to southern Lebanon. We wish to see the official central Lebanese authorities backed by adequate force, return to the area and take over control in such a manner that the terrorist forces will not be allowed to return to the area now held by Israeli and United Nations forces.

79. In this regard, the Secretary-General this week reported in his letter to the Security Council that Prime Minister Begin had assured him of “. . . the firm intention of Israel to withdraw completely from Lebanese territory”.⁶ And in his press conference in Jerusalem, the Secretary-General reported: “The Prime Minister told me that it is the Israeli intention to withdraw from the occupied territory. But a vacuum has to be avoided, as he put it to me, and therefore the role of the United Nations Force is very important in this regard.”

80. Despite delays in the deployment of UNIFIL troops, Israel has begun the process of withdrawal. At the same time, if UNIFIL is to exercise fully the responsibility entrusted to it by the Security Council, it is imperative that no vacuum whatsoever should be created in southern Lebanon liable to impair the purpose of assuring peace and security.

81. In all his contacts with the Government of Israel, the Secretary-General has emphasized his preoccupation with ensuring the effectiveness of the United Nations operation in southern Lebanon and with forestalling events which could lead to further conflict and bloodshed. Prime Minister Begin has informed the Secretary-General that Israel shares his concern and interest “in creating optimal

conditions for the efficient functioning of UNIFIL in southern Lebanon, with the purpose of establishing stability in the region . . . and in giving proper expression to Lebanese sovereignty.” Indeed, Israel has already made all necessary facilities available to the incoming United Nations troops, and has assisted in every phase of their deployment. We remain willing to assist in every way possible to speed up this process and, I repeat, to ensure the rapid implementation of Security Council resolution 425 (1978)

82. For reasons beyond its own control, and through no fault of its own, the United Nations has not yet been able to complete its part of the implementation of resolution 425 (1978) and, one month after that resolution was passed, only something over half of the 4,000 UNIFIL men envisaged at that time are in place.

83. There are some elements in the region whose avowed purpose is to prevent the establishment of peace and security in southern Lebanon. It has been apparent several times in the last few weeks that Yassir Arafat has been unable or unwilling to deliver on his tongue-in-cheek assurances to the Secretary-General.

84. Fatah leader, Salah Khalaf, otherwise known as Abu Iyad, Arafat’s second-in-command, who planned the last of the outrages that led to the present situation, told the Zurich newspaper, *Tagesanzeiger*, quoted by Reuters on 5 April 1978:

“We have fought against the Arabs and against the Israelis. We will fight against the United Nations troops, too, if they stand in our way . . . No one can prevent us from returning to our bases in southern Lebanon”

And Arafat himself told Thames television in London: “It is our right to return [to southern Lebanon].”

85. The mandate of UNIFIL is to prevent the PLO from doing precisely that. Security Council resolution 425 (1978) of 19 March 1978 established the interim force

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

It is Israel’s position that these elements form an integral whole, and that resolution 425 (1978) must be carried out in full, that is, in all its parts. It is our understanding that the Government of Lebanon concurs in this interpretation. During the Secretary-General’s visit to the region, the Lebanese Defence and Foreign Affairs Minister, Fouad Boutros expressed:

“Lebanon’s support for the Secretary-General’s efforts to implement Security Council resolution 425 (1978) in all its aspects”.

Indeed, almost every official Lebanese Government statement in recent weeks has affirmed the linkage between the various parts of resolution 425 (1978). President Sarkis has called for the implementation of

“every provision, clause and principle in the United Nations Security Council resolution . . . to achieve our complete sovereignty over all our territory”.

⁴ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year, 2071st meeting*.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 2074th meeting.

⁶ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-third Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1978*, document S/12657.

And the Minister of Defence and Foreign Affairs, Fouad Boutros has spoken frequently of

“the implementation of both parts of the United Nations Security Council resolution pertaining to the Israeli withdrawal and the restoration of the State’s sovereignty in the south”.

86. In this connexion it is of interest to note the interview given yesterday to the French newspaper *Le Figaro* by Camille Chamoun, in which he criticized resolution 425 (1978) for referring only to the withdrawal of Israeli forces from southern Lebanon and for ignoring the presence of the PLO and the dangers created by it. In this interview, Mr. Chamoun, a former President of Lebanon, praised Israel’s assistance to the Christian community in Lebanon and said that Israel’s support “in no way prevented Lebanon from recovering its sovereignty”. This statement by a former President of Lebanon seems to me to be irreconcilable with the statement of the representative of Lebanon that we have just heard. The tenor of his remarks is not reflected in the sentiments being conveyed to us from Lebanon and from the people of Lebanon. Surely Mr. Chamoun is in a better position to talk about Lebanese sovereignty than those who deliver themselves of statements in so cynical and hypocritical a manner on the issue of Lebanese territorial integrity in this Assembly.

87. As the Secretary-General has reported, following the arrangements made between the Chief-of-Staff of the Israeli Defence Forces and General Siilasvuo, the Israeli forces will have withdrawn from the bulk of the area of southern Lebanon by 30 April. Negotiations will begin in the coming days in respect of the three remaining enclaves which are narrow strips of territory ranging in depth from one to six miles along the international border. These areas include two Christian enclaves with a population of approximately 25,000 and one Shiite Moslem enclave with a population of between 7,000 and 10,000, depending on the number of refugees who have in the meantime returned.

88. In the light of the experience of those villagers at the hands of the PLO in the past, it appears that they are faced with the stark and grim issue of life or death. Now I know that, judging by the attitude of this body in the past, they can expect little consolation from the General Assembly. The citizens of Lebanon certainly can have no illusions whatsoever on this issue. Hence their grave misgivings about a United Nations presence. We are working this problem out with UNIFIL headquarters with a view to our complete withdrawal and I have no doubt that they are, on their part, in touch with the Lebanese Government on this issue.

89. But let me emphasize to this audience that we are dealing with human beings, men, women and children whose lives are at stake. They saw their neighbours being massacred in cold blood by the PLO in those villages which were not fortunate enough to be sited near Israeli territory. Do I have to recall the description given by the Lebanese Ambassador, in this hall, of those events during the civil war? Israel has a moral responsibility towards the inhabitants of the areas adjacent to Israel. Just as we were not silent in the past and protected those innocent people from murder and massacre, so we shall not renege on our moral responsibility towards them today, the incomprehensible

indifference of significant elements of the Christian world notwithstanding. I reiterate, we will negotiate this matter with UNIFIL in the coming days with the purpose of ensuring the safety of those innocent villagers after we have withdrawn.

90. Might I propose that, as many countries here rise and call, some of them like parrots, for Israel’s withdrawal, they express their opinion as to the fate of some 35,000 Lebanese villagers and not ignore it in such a cavalier manner? At least let them address themselves to this humanitarian problem, because outside this hall, the ignoring of this problem by any delegation will be interpreted as acquiescence in the horrible fate which could befall those innocent villagers.

91. Mischievous suggestions have been made in the course of this debate to the effect that Israel should pay the costs of UNIFIL; such a proposal is irresponsible and unrealistic. We will of course pay our part of the costs as assessed for all Members of this Organization, just as we have always paid our assessed share for other United Nations peace-keeping activities, whether we agreed with them or not. Such is the responsibility of every United Nations Member, and those who unilaterally absolve themselves from obligations arising from Security Council decisions and who thus stand in violation of the United Nations Charter are scarcely entitled to give the advice they offer to others.

92. Let me say in conclusion that conditions now exist in which the Government of Lebanon can restore control over southern Lebanon and in the process re-establish its sovereign rights in the area. This is no small thing, for we will have brought about a situation in which the ordinary people, of all faiths, living both in southern Lebanon and northern Israel, need know fear no more and in which they can live in harmony, with the border between them open, as it has been ever since the height of the civil war in Lebanon. This surely is a situation which men of reason and goodwill can only look upon with favour. Thus, we may return to being, as we were for 20 years until the advent of the terrorists, peaceful neighbours along a common border, farming side by side and living in harmony.

93. My delegation supports the draft resolution on the financing of UNIFIL. However we cannot, I regret to say, vote for it because in the operative paragraph Israel is as usual singled out while the two main elements of Security Council resolution 425 (1978) – namely, the establishment of peace and security in the area of southern Lebanon and the re-establishment of Lebanese sovereignty in the area – are not mentioned. That is serious and ominous having regard to the true and ill-concealed intentions concerning Lebanese independence of those who have tried to bring pressure to bear in this respect behind the scenes in the past few days

94. Accordingly, for that reason and that reason alone – my delegation will abstain from voting.

95. Mr. President, with reference to your plea that we remain in the hall until the conclusion of the debate tonight, I would say this: if this debate concludes on time, we shall be present to register our vote. If not, I greatly regret to say that my delegation will not be present, for at

sundown today we together with our people throughout the world will be commemorating Passover, the struggle of our people more than 3,000 years ago to live in freedom in our own land. Then, as now, we refused to live in slavery and we revolted against the type of oppression and totalitarian régime which is, alas, represented by all too many in this unhappy world of ours today. Our struggle then gave rise to those values and principles enshrined in the Ten Commandments and in the Book of Books, which inspired much of civilization in subsequent history.

96. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The question of the financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon an item on our agenda is by no means a merely technical financial question; rather, it is a profoundly political one.

97. This is not the first time that a session of the General Assembly has been obliged to deal with Israel's aggressive policy. This special session has been convened in connexion with the extension to Lebanon of the continuing aggression by Israel against the Arab States.

98. That the invasion by Israeli troops of southern Lebanon was an act of aggression is well known to everyone. The invasion was prepared long in advance. It was planned in detail and committed at the precise time the aggressor deemed to be the right one. Armed gangs of local reactionary forces helped the aggressor. A certain policy pursued by some Western Powers promoted an expansion of the aggression.

99. The murder of women and children, the destruction of populated areas, the expulsion of thousands of persons from their homes: all this was cold-bloodedly calculated by the aggressor. The aggressor did not even shrink from the use of such criminal weapons as the one which became notorious during the Viet Nam war: the cluster bomb. The world has become the witness of a further clear-cut act of violation of international law by Israel.

100. Israel's violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon, for the purpose of occupying the southern part of the country and routing the Palestine Liberation Organization, is so clear-cut that even Israel's allies cannot bring themselves to defend this act of aggression although they try to avoid condemning it outright.

101. In the light of the numerous resolutions relating to Israel's aggression, at this special session the General Assembly should say a firm "No" to this new act of aggression

102. The resolution adopted by the Security Council calls upon Israel to withdraw forthwith its forces from the territory of Lebanon, and provides for the stationing of a United Nations interim force in southern Lebanon. Unfortunately, no specific time-table has been established for the withdrawal of the aggressor's forces. The resolution does contain a specific reference to the tasks of the United Nations force which goes beyond the framework of confirming Israel's withdrawal of its troops and entails a danger of intervention in Lebanon's internal affairs. Events have confirmed that the socialist States, the Union of

Soviet Socialist Republics and Czechoslovakia, were right in expressing reservations in the Security Council. To this very day no decisive steps have been taken to withdraw Israeli troops from Lebanese territory; and, as we have just come to see, no time-table for final withdrawal has been established. Thus the occupation is continuing. This has been confirmed by the latest report of the Secretary-General.

103. A complicated situation would arise for the United Nations Force--which was by no means established to protect the aggressor if it were not to concentrate on the implementation of its major task; that is, confirming the withdrawal of all Israeli troops.

104. The Palestine Liberation Organization has been recognized by the United Nations as the sole authentic representative of the Arab people of Palestine, and its presence in Lebanon is based upon a legal agreement with the Government of Lebanon. Those facts should not be overlooked.

105. Since the United Nations Interim Force was dispatched in connexion with an act of aggression committed by one Member of the United Nations against another Member State, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic considers that absolutely all the expenditures connected with this should be borne by the aggressor. Peace-loving States have neither international legal nor moral obligations of any kind to finance actions which have been or may be rendered necessary as a result of the barbarous act of aggression by Israel. Member States of the United Nations cannot be expected to undertake to pay off Israel's debts. That is exclusively the business of Israel. Furthermore, the aggressor State, Israel, should be held to account for the damage it has caused and for the payment of appropriate compensation. The regular budget of the United Nations should not be burdened in any way by the costs for the United Nations Interim Force in southern Lebanon. The German Democratic Republic does not intend to take part in the financing of this Force.

106. In conclusion, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic would like to reaffirm its view that only a categorical condemnation of the Israeli aggression and the consistent implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions on the basis of the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967, the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including its right to self-determination and the establishment of its own State, together with assurance of the independent existence and security of all States in the Middle East can lead to a settlement of the problem and to lasting peace in the area. Such a settlement can be achieved only by means of collective efforts within the framework of the Geneva Conference, with the participation of all interested parties, including the Palestine Liberation Organization.

107. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The situation resulting from the act of naked aggression by Israel against Lebanon, a sovereign State Member of the United Nations, gives rise to the most serious concern. A month has gone by since the Security Council adopted a decision calling on

Israel to cease immediately its military action against Lebanese territorial integrity, withdraw forthwith its forces from all Lebanese territory and respect strictly the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon. However, it continues to act provocatively and to sabotage the implementation of this decision of the Security Council, is persisting stubbornly in its aggression against Lebanon and is attempting to entrench itself in occupied Lebanese territory.

108. The barbarous invasion of Lebanon by Israel is one more link in the chain of Israeli crimes against neighbouring Arab States. There is no room for doubt that this invasion was most carefully prepared beforehand and pursued the longstanding designs of Israel to occupy the southern part of Lebanon and complicate what is in any case the extremely complicated internal situation of that country in order to undermine efforts to bring about a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem and to strike a blow at the national liberation struggle of the Arab peoples.

Mr. Albornoz (Ecuador), Vice-President, took the Chair.

109. In the course of this aggression Israeli troops subjected the peaceful Lebanese towns and villages as well as Palestinian refugee camps to cruel fire. The Israeli militarists in effect carried out a scorched earth policy on the territory of Lebanon. As has become clear from the investigation by the International Committee of the Red Cross, as a result of the Israeli aggression 80 per cent of the towns and villages in the south of Lebanon were destroyed. According to information published in the Western press the number of victims among the peaceful inhabitants of southern Lebanon amounted to several thousand.

110. Nearly 300,000 Lebanese and Palestinians were forced to leave their homes, thus constituting a tremendous army of refugees, which served to complicate still further the difficulties already being experienced by Lebanon and the colossal damage done by the Israeli aggression to the economy of Lebanon. According to preliminary data, almost the entire harvest of citrus fruits and tobacco, with a total value of \$30 million, will be lost since it was left ungathered as a result of the war begun by Israel in the south. The total volume of damage resulting from the destruction of towns and villages in southern Lebanon has so far not been fully calculated.

111. The intensively advertised withdrawal of Israeli troops into certain parts of Lebanese territory should not be allowed to mislead anyone.

112. The promises of Israel to carry out the partial withdrawal of its troops by 30 April concern basically areas which Israel occupied even after the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 425 (1978), which calls upon Israel to cease military action immediately. These promises cannot be viewed as compliance by Israel with the clear-cut decision of the Security Council calling for an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from the entire territory of Lebanon. It is clear that Israel intends to continue to maintain its hold on strategically important areas of southern Lebanon. It is stubbornly refusing to state a time-table for the total withdrawal of its troops from Lebanon and is putting forward various

inadmissible terms and demands in connexion with the nature of the activities and the strength of the United Nations Force in southern Lebanon. By continuing its illegal occupation of Lebanese territory, the Israeli aggressor is attempting to dictate its own terms to the victim of the aggression, Lebanon, and the United Nations.

113. All this amply demonstrates that the actions of Israel with regard to partial withdrawal of its troops are nothing but a propaganda manoeuvre designed to weaken international pressure on Israel, to play for time and to prevent the adoption by the United Nations of effective measures to call a halt to Israeli aggression.

114. It is clear that the United Nations cannot reconcile itself to such a provocative attitude on the part of Israel.

115. Events in Lebanon have revealed conclusively once again the true purport of the policy of Israel, which is striving not towards peace in the Middle East but rather towards a rearrangement of the map of that area and expansion by means of seizure of Arab lands. All manoeuvres with regard to separate Egyptian-Israeli talks have been and remain only a screen for the continuance of aggressive action against the Arab countries which are neighbours of Israel. In essence, those talks are being used to entrench the Israeli occupation of those ancient Arab lands and to deprive the Arab people of Palestine of its lawful national rights.

116. There cannot be any doubt that responsibility for the continuing aggression of Israel is borne also by those who have connived at the Israeli expansionist plans and have been hindering the adoption of effective measures to call a halt to aggression.

117. Events in the area of the Middle East have convincingly confirmed the justification for the repeated warnings issued by the Soviet Union that failure to bring about a settlement of the Middle East conflict, the occupation by Israel of Arab territories and the trampling underfoot of the lawful national rights of the Arab people of Palestine have created an explosive situation and lead to new military confrontations and clashes. And this contains within itself a most serious threat to international peace and security.

118. The Soviet Union is in favour of a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East, with the participation of all interested parties, including of course the Palestine Liberation Organization. It is the conviction of the Soviet Union that lasting peace in the Middle East can be established only on the basis of the implementation of the following conditions of principle: the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967; the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian Arab people, including its right to self-determination and to create its own State; the ensuring of the right to an independent existence and the security of all States which are direct parties to the conflict; and the cessation of the state of war between the Arab States concerned and Israel.

119. The shortest route to the resolution of the Middle East problem is that of negotiations within the framework of machinery which already exists—namely, the Geneva

Peace Conference on the Middle East. Recent events have once again demonstrated that the course of one-sided concessions to Israel and separate talks with it leads only to the undermining of a genuine settlement in the Middle East and complication of the situation in that area. It is clear that there is no even minimally acceptable alternative to the Geneva Conference. For the Geneva machinery for the attainment of a genuinely comprehensive and genuinely just Middle East settlement to be activated it is necessary to put an end to any tendencies to conclude separate deals with Israel, since such tendencies endanger the interests of the Arab peoples.

120. The overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations are also in favour of a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East and the convening for that purpose of the Geneva Peace Conference, and this was reflected in the relevant decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

121. With regard to United Nations troops in Lebanon, the Soviet delegation believes it is necessary to stress that, as has already been pointed out by the representative of the USSR in the Security Council, in the establishment of the United Nations Force for southern Lebanon certain important principles of the United Nations Charter relating to this kind of action by the United Nations were not observed. In particular we pointed out that the United Nations Force should not be endowed with functions that are not proper to it, concerning the transfer of effective power in this area to the Government of Lebanon. The sending of United Nations troops to Lebanese territory should in no way infringe upon the sovereign rights of that State. Unfortunately, these and a number of other considerations put forward by the Soviet Union were not duly taken into account. However, bearing in mind the request made by the Government of Lebanon, the Soviet Union did not object to the adoption of the resolution and abstained in the voting on it. The Soviet delegation also confirms its position of principle according to which all expenses involved in eradicating the consequences of the armed aggression of Israel against Lebanon should be borne by the aggressor. On the basis of this position, the Soviet Union does not intend to take part in meeting the expenditures connected with the creation and functioning of the United Nations Force in Lebanon.

122. The Soviet delegation believes that the General Assembly should categorically condemn Israel's aggression against Lebanon and call on it to comply without reservation with the decision of the Security Council on the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from the whole territory of Lebanon. We cannot reconcile ourselves to the idea that by means of various tricks Israel may be allowed to entrench itself in its occupation of southern Lebanon. The criminal actions of the Israeli aggressors should be halted.

123. Mr. KUBBA (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The General Assembly is holding at present a special session which should be added to the series of sessions held to examine the aggressions of the Zionist entity against the Arab people. Once more, the Zionists are pursuing their aggression against Lebanon under enormous pretexts which are repeated each time they commit an aggression; the

argument that tops the list being that of defending the security of Israel. Everyone is familiar with the expansionist designs of the Zionist entity, their covetousness of the Arab homeland is deeply rooted in the Zionist dream which aims at usurping the lands and expanding by force. That is what happened in 1948, 1956, 1967 and recently in Lebanon. Everyone is aware of the aspirations of the Zionist entity in obtaining southern Lebanon and the Litani river from its source, that fact is as old as the Zionist movement itself. We can quote various sources in support of this. According to the book *The Frontiers of a Nation*, the claim submitted by the Zionist organization to the Peace Conference of 1919

“... demanded a line starting on the Mediterranean just south of the port of Sidon and then running north-east up the slopes of the Lebanon, to include the greater part of the Litani and the whole of the Jordan catchment area up to its northernmost source, near Rashaya. From there, the frontier was to run along the crest of the Hermon, then, turning east, to run along the northern watershed of the Yarmuk tributaries towards the Hejaz Railway at a distance of some 20 kilometres south of Damascus...”⁷

124. In his book *Trial and Error*, Chaim Weizmann, plainly expressing his intentions towards Lebanon, wrote:

“We travelled fairly extensively, crossing the Syrian border into Lebanon and stopping off at some of the outpost settlements. Every hill and every rock stood out like a challenge to me at this time, telling me at every turn of the road how much planning and energy and money would have to be poured into this country before it could be ready to absorb large numbers of people.”⁸

125. The recent occupation of southern Lebanon is merely a measure carried out by the Zionist leaders in accordance with a plan established by the Zionist movement since its inception. Iraq has already stated its attitude towards Security Council resolution 425 (1978).⁹ We stated then that that resolution had created new conditions and complexities in the region and that it did not deal with the problem for which the Security Council meeting had been called – in other words, a flagrant act of Zionist aggression against an independent State Member of the Organization, in which armed forces took possession of its territory, in addition to committing the crime of genocide against the Palestinian people.

126. On the basis of those fundamental principles our delegation stated that it was not in favour of the draft resolution sponsored by the United States. Similarly, our delegation will not take part in the vote on the draft resolution concerning the financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon.

127. Logic and justice demand that the aggressor alone is responsible for his aggression, and this international Organization must not allow the aggressor to reap the fruits of

⁷ H. F. I. Rischwasser-Ra'anana *The Frontiers of a Nation*, (London, Batchworth Press, 1955), p. 107. Quoted in English by the speaker.

⁸ Chaim Weizmann, *Trial and Error* (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1949), p. 251. Quoted in English by the speaker.

⁹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year*, 2074th meeting.

his aggression. What are we to do while the enemy is occupying territories of four Arab States and violating all the rights of the Palestinian people? Is it not the duty of the Organization to see to it that the severest sanctions provided for in the Charter are imposed? The Zionist aggressor should be made responsible for all the expenditure relating to the international force as well as for the compensation of all the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples for their losses.

128. The fact that the United States continues to supply arms to the Zionist entity and to support it at the very time that entity continues its acts of aggression against Arab countries occupying their territories in violation of international law is nothing more than acting in collusion with that entity against the Arab people. The United States is not, therefore, carrying out its responsibility as a permanent member of the Security Council to ensure international peace and security but, on the contrary, the United States is indeed encouraging the aggressor and creating favourable conditions for its protection at the international level.

129. Finally, my country's delegation wishes to reaffirm that it will follow its clear policy of solidarity in support of the Palestinian revolution and in support of the brother country of Lebanon in defence of its territorial integrity and sovereignty and will firmly resist any imperialist-Zionist plan for the Arab territories.

130. The justness of the Palestinian cause will prevail. The racist nature of the Zionist entity and its latent fascism is sure proof of its inevitable downfall—as has been shown by history many a time.

131. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland): This special session is yet another testimony of the continued absence of a stable and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East. Only last November I deemed it necessary to state from this very rostrum¹⁰ that the abnormality of the situation in and around the Middle East had hardly been so evident as it was then. I said that we had all the reasons to believe that, unless a solution was found, it could only further intensify—and, indeed, it did.

132. At midnight of 14-15 March 1978 Israel launched a massive invasion of Lebanon by land, sea and air. Another blatant aggression against an Arab State became a fact.

133. On 19 March, by its resolution 425 (1978), the Security Council decided to establish immediately, under its authority, the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL),

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

A month has passed since the adoption of that resolution.

134. Owing to Israel's non-compliance with the Security Council's call immediately to cease its military action

against Lebanese territorial integrity and to withdraw forthwith its forces from all Lebanese territory, none of the purposes of the Force has so far been accomplished. What is more, in view of the persistent occupation of Lebanese territory by Israel, UNIFIL's task of confirming the withdrawal of Israeli forces has in fact become irrelevant.

135. A number of reasons account for the present situation. First among them is the Council's failure to condemn resolutely and unequivocally the latest aggression against Lebanon. Besides, the attack on Lebanon has been one more link in the chain of Israeli aggressive acts against the Arabs. In contravention of the relevant Security Council resolutions, Israel has never ceased its policy of constant violations of the sovereignty of neighbouring Arab States.

136. Public statements by Israeli officials just prior to the invasion of Lebanon called for a merciless struggle against the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and the physical annihilation of its fighters. Hence the Israeli action cannot but be regarded also as a carefully premeditated and planned act aimed at the total destruction of the Palestine resistance movement and as an attempt at undermining the struggle for the implementation of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

137. Israel has thereby elevated terror and intimidation to the level of State policy. The pretext of strengthening its own security has been used again to justify the attacks on its neighbours, practise outright terrorism, create Jewish settlements and to pursue a policy of faits accomplis on the occupied Arab territories. Israel has thus claimed to be a judge in its own case by arbitrarily trying to administer its own justice. Members of the United Nations cannot tolerate an approach like that.

138. We are in full solidarity and agreement with the communiqué issued on 17 March by the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries¹¹ which unanimously condemned the new Israeli aggression, pointing out that the invasion had complicated and retarded progress towards the solution of the Middle East problem and would have severe repercussions on all efforts to achieve a just and lasting settlement in the Middle East. For, as in many previous international crises where peace and tranquillity were at stake, it is not by way of accomplished facts that one may go about and pursue one's own one-sided objectives. However, Israel has for long been bent on pursuing such arbitrary goals. It is therefore understandable that Members of the United Nations are reluctant to provide their troops to promote such policies.

139. That is why the magnitude of the problem we are considering today is first and foremost of a political nature, and should also be viewed as such when approached from its financial angle. Until recently Israel had been attempting to impress a notion upon the international community that territorial gains should be the premium for aggression. The invasion of southern Lebanon and its political and military repercussions have distinctly brought one more Israeli claim

¹⁰ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, Plenary Meetings*, 78th meeting.

¹¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1978*, document S/12609.

to the fore, namely, that the membership of this Organization should also cover the material costs for the consequences of its successive acts of aggression and illegal occupation of foreign territories. Members of the United Nations are not prepared to accept that either. All the costs of the invasion against Lebanon have to be borne by its perpetrator. It is for those reasons that Poland, as we have already stated in the Fifth Committee, is not prepared to participate in the financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon.

140. The presence of Israeli troops in Lebanon, together with a United Nations Force, contradicts the very notion of peace-keeping, for the United Nations Force is not an expeditionary corps: its task is not to end hostilities—including the aggressor's presence there—or to create a special *cordon sanitaire* in the interest of Israel, but is first and foremost to confirm the withdrawal of Israeli forces. It is not the task of United Nations troops to pull the chestnuts out of the fire which Israel sets in different parts of the area. As long as the occupation continues, there is in fact no room for the functioning of a peace-keeping Force in Lebanon.

141. Neither short-term nor long-term remedies for the situation we are discussing today lie in the proliferation of peace-keeping operations in the Middle East. The crux of the matter is finding without further delay a comprehensive settlement in the region, incorporating all parties concerned and all questions. This is precisely what the two co-Chairmen of the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East stressed in their Joint Statement of 1 October 1977 and what the world community has awaited for the last several years. Those expectations stand valid today as never before. With fortified political and moral strength they expose the growing timeliness of the three inseparable elements of a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East, which can only be worked out at the Geneva Conference: namely, withdrawal by Israel from all territories occupied since 1967; realization of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, which include the right to self-determination and to independent statehood: safeguarding the right to independent existence and security of all States in the region, including the State of Israel, and granting effective international guarantees for their frontiers.

142. It is on these consistent and inexpedient bases that Poland will continue its contribution to a peaceful and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East.

143. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): During the discussions held in the Fifth Committee, the Albanian delegation put forward its views and the attitude of its Government concerning the problem which is the subject of consideration for the eighth special session of the General Assembly.¹²

144. At a time when the General Assembly has been called to discuss this very problem and to take a decision on the draft resolution contained in the report submitted by the Fifth Committee [A/S-8/9, para. 11], my delegation would

like to reiterate its position, as follows: the Socialist People's Republic of Albania has always maintained an unchanging position of principle concerning the establishment of various so-called United Nations Forces and their financing; it has always been opposed to the establishing and financing of such Forces and has repeatedly and unequivocally declared that it would not agree to pay for their upkeep.

145. It should be stressed that the so-called United Nations Forces have never served the cause of real peace and stability in the world. Quite the contrary, those Forces have always been used by the imperialist Powers—by the two super-Powers in particular, the Soviet Union and the United States of America—as a means to interfere in the internal affairs of other sovereign countries and to support their own hegemonistic and aggressive policies in various regions of the world.

146. Subsequent to the barbarous act of aggression carried out by the Israeli Zionists against Lebanon recently, a new United Nations Force was set up. When the Israeli Zionist aggressors were giving free rein to their invasion of southern Lebanon, ravaging that country and massacring its population, the Security Council adopted a resolution, prepared and submitted by the American imperialists, announcing that an interim United Nations Force would be sent to Lebanon. In view of the events that have taken place—in particular, the adoption of resolution 425 (1978), which not only does not condemn the Israeli Zionist aggression but even makes no distinction between the aggressor and the victim of aggression—it can only be noted that UNIFIL has been established for the purpose of being used against the just struggle of Arab peoples, and in particular against the struggle of the Palestinian people, as has been the case already with other United Nations Forces in the Middle East.

147. To realize the effects of the establishment of UNIFIL and of the role it is going to play, we feel it important to review the dangerous experiment we have already carried out with the other United Nations Forces in the Middle East. The events of recent years and the hazardous situation still prevailing in the Middle East prove overwhelmingly that the United Nations Forces established in that region after many manoeuvres and machinations by the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists have in no way contributed to the establishment of peace and tranquility in the Middle East and have prevented any progress towards a settlement of the problems of that region. Those Forces have in no way served to prevent Israeli Zionist aggression against the Arab peoples, and still less to discourage Israel's annexionist and expansionist policy on Arab territories. The latest Israeli Zionist aggression against Lebanon is evidence of this. On the other hand, it is the enemies of the Arab peoples—the two imperialist super-Powers and the Israeli Zionists—that have taken advantage of the presence of United Nations Forces in the Middle East to intensify their aggressive acts aimed at stifling the just struggle of Arab peoples and to eliminate the Palestinian question. The two imperialist super-Powers—the United States of America and the Soviet Union—have taken advantage of the presence of the United Nations Forces in the Middle East to give further scope to their rivalries and to their machinations in order to maintain there the

¹² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighth Special Session, Fifth Committee*, 2nd meeting, paras. 10-12; and *ibid.*, *Sessional Fascicle*, corrigendum.

situation of “no war, no peace”, to establish their hegemony and to stake out zones of influence.

148. In the light of these facts, we feel that there is no ground for our harbouring any illusions or hoping that the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon is going to play a role different from that of the other United Nations Forces sent to the Middle East previously.

149. My delegation roundly condemns aggression of the Israeli Zionists against Lebanon and their policy of annexation and expansion vis-à-vis the Arab countries. It is precisely this policy which is at the root of the armed aggression in Lebanese territory.

150. The Albanian delegation vigorously condemns the aggressive, hegemonistic policy, and the plots and intrigues of the two imperialist super-Powers, which are to the detriment of the national rights and just struggle of the Arab peoples and designed to prevent them from realizing their aspirations to liberate the occupied territories and to prevent the restoration of the national rights of the Palestinian people to its homeland.

151. We wish to reiterate the feeling of solidarity and support of the Albanian people and Government for the just cause for which the Palestinian and other Arab peoples are struggling.

152. For the reasons we have just set forth, my delegation is opposed to the establishment of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and reaffirms that the Socialist People's Republic of Albania will not participate in financing that Force. The Albanian delegation will vote against the draft resolution contained in the report of the Fifth Committee when the vote takes place.

153. Mr. PUNTSAGNOROV (Mongolia) (*interpretation from Russian*): My delegation would like to point out that the item being considered at this special session on the financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon has a clearly marked political character, because what we are considering is an act of aggression committed against a State Member of the United Nations and the consequences of that act. As we know, the General Assembly and the Security Council have repeatedly considered items connected with acts of aggression by Israel against Arab States and have adopted a large number of resolutions designed to bring about a settlement of the Middle East conflict.

154. However, Israel not only has disregarded the relevant decisions of the United Nations, but also is defying the international community by committing further acts of aggression. At present, the world is once again the witness of a sharp exacerbation of the situation in the Middle East as a result of the act of armed aggression committed by Israel against Lebanon. Israeli aggression has brought suffering and woe to many thousands of peaceful inhabitants of Lebanon and Palestinians who had found refuge in that country. It is quite obvious that this new act of Israeli aggression has a specific purpose in view, namely, that of weakening the national liberation struggle of the Arabs and, above all, of striking a blow at the Palestine resistance movement embodied by the Palestine Liberation Organization.

155. The occupation by Israel of the territory of southern Lebanon once more demonstrates that Israel in essence not only is striving towards entrenching the results of its aggression against the Arab States, but also is aiming at the further expansion of territory. Israel is clearly aiming at erecting new obstacles to a political settlement of the Middle East conflict.

156. Recent events have shown that manoeuvres surrounding so-called separate deals with Israel have led only to encouraging Israel in its acts of aggression against neighbouring Arab countries and against the Arab people of Palestine.

157. The Government and people of the Mongolian People's Republic categorically condemn the aggression of Israel against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Lebanon and call for the immediate and total withdrawal of all Israeli troops from Lebanese territory. The Mongolian People's Republic has consistently supported the struggle of the Arab peoples for the elimination of the consequences of Israeli aggression. We believe that for there to be a peaceful and just settlement of the Middle East problem what is necessary is the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, the implementation of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to self-determination and the creation of its own State, the ensuring of the right to an independent existence and the security of all States of the Middle East area. For the purpose of successfully resolving the Middle East problem, an important role should be played by the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all parties, including the Palestine Liberation Organization.

158. The delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic is of the view that responsibility for the current dangerous situation in the Middle East lies entirely with Israel, which undertook an act of direct armed aggression against Lebanon. Israel should also bear material responsibility for the damage done to the cause of peace in the Middle East and to Lebanon.

159. On the basis of this, my delegation believes that the expenditures connected with the consequences of Israeli aggression against Lebanon should be paid for by the aggressor State. That is why the Mongolian People's Republic will take no part in the financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon.

160. Mr. MARTYNENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR deems it necessary to state that the further complications in the Middle East which have entailed the establishment of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon have arisen as a result of yet a further act of aggression by Israel against a neighbouring country. This once again demonstrates most convincingly that the Middle East remains a most dangerous flashpoint and that the failure to settle the conflict in that area, the continuing occupation by Israel of Arab territories, its flaunting of the lawful national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, and the Israeli policy of expansion and aggression have created a serious threat to international peace and security. Today Israel is occupying considerable portions of the territories

of all those Arab States with which it has a common border.

161. As a result of the most recent Israeli invasion, more than 1,000 square kilometres of Lebanese territory have been occupied. This act of aggression, previously planned and carefully prepared with the use of the most cruel forms of weaponry, has led to the death of thousands of peaceful inhabitants of Lebanon, and of Palestinian refugees and to the barbarous destruction by the aggressors of 80 per cent of the towns and villages in the southern part of the country.

162. Hundreds of thousands of Lebanese and Palestinians, many of them for the second and third time, have been driven out of their homes and forced to become refugees. Tremendous damage has been done by this new act of aggression by Israel to the economy of the country. There can be no doubt also that this further act of aggression is a continuation of the expansionist and annexationist policy of the rulers of Israel and is designed to complicate the situation in the Middle East and aimed at the occupation of part of Lebanon in order to strike a blow against the national liberation struggle of the Arab peoples, in order to undermine efforts to bring about a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem.

163. Israel is still persisting in its aggression against Lebanon and is arrogantly sabotaging the implementation of the relevant decision of the Security Council. But a month has gone by now since the Security Council called upon Israel to withdraw forthwith its troops from all the territory of Lebanon and to respect the territorial integrity and sovereignty of that country. But all that we hear in reply are assurances. Instead of an unreserved and immediate compliance with the decision of the Security Council, Israel is attempting to play for time and to entrench itself in the south of Lebanon and to take cover behind a propaganda smoke-screen about a partial withdrawal of troops which affects only an insignificant portion of the territory seized.

164. All these manoeuvres on the part of Israel, like the widely advertised separate talks, in essence are designed, under the cover of the so-called partial measures and separate deals to bring about the permanent occupation of these Arab territories and to prevent the restoration of the lawful national rights of the Arab people of Palestine and to continue further the policy of aggression against Arab States and territorial expansion at the cost of their territories.

165. This policy has nothing whatsoever in common with the purpose of establishing peace in the Middle East. This is a policy of aggression and expansion and all those who have hindered the adoption of effective measures to call a halt to it, along with Israel, bear responsibility for the possible serious consequences of such a policy for international peace and security.

166. The Ukrainian SSR believes that the path to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East lies not through "guarantees of security", which Israel has been attempting to obtain for itself by means of seizing the territory of others and by violating the vital interests of the Arab

peoples, but through the earliest possible comprehensive and radical settlement of the whole Middle East problem, with the participation of all parties, including Arab States and Israel, as well as the Palestine Liberation Organization, as the sole lawful representative of the Arab people of Palestine.

167. Peace in the Middle East is possible only if the following interlinked components of a comprehensive settlement are put into effect: the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all territories occupied since 1967; the exercise by the Palestinian Arab people of their inalienable rights, including of course their right to self-determination and the creation of their own State; the guaranteeing to all States directly involved in the conflict of their right to an independent existence and security; and the halting of the state of war between the Arab States concerned and Israel. We also have a reliable instrument for a Middle East settlement. Everyone knows very well that that instrument is the Geneva Conference.

168. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR would like to stress also that the sending of United Nations troops to Lebanon, on the request of the Government of that country, in no way whatever should be allowed to infringe the sovereign rights of the Government of the country that has been the victim of aggression. The task of these troops is to observe the cease-fire, to separate the sides and to ensure the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon. The Ukrainian SSR cannot agree to the assignment of anti-Charter functions to United Nations forces and to their use for intervention in the internal affairs of Lebanon. All questions affecting the formation and functioning of the United Nations Force in Lebanon should be solved in strict compliance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

169. We believe that Israel should bear the full responsibility for the act of aggression it has committed, and this includes financial responsibility for all United Nations expenditures occasioned by this act of aggression.

170. In accordance with that position, the Ukrainian SSR will take no part in the financing of the United Nations operation in Lebanon.

171. Mr. ABE (Japan): The Japanese Government deplores the recent recurrence of actions of violence between Arab and Israeli sides, which culminated in the military action by Israel in southern Lebanon last March. We are gravely concerned that such a situation, if left as it is, would crush our hopes and efforts for achieving a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

172. Therefore, my delegation welcomed the adoption by the Security Council of the two resolutions, 425 (1978) and 426 (1978), aimed at the immediate establishment of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL).

173. For the Interim Force to discharge its mission well and, indeed, for the Security Council resolutions to be implemented fully, one of the key elements is the withdrawal of the Israeli forces. Paragraph 2 of resolution 425 (1978) clearly states that the Council calls upon Israel to withdraw forthwith its forces from all Lebanese terri-

tory. There is no prior condition attached to it, such as an establishment of UNIFIL in their place. My delegation strongly urges the Government of Israel to fulfil its responsibilities under that resolution.

174. Although the Security Council has made a right decision on launching the peace-keeping operation of the United Nations in southern Lebanon—surely it has the full competence to do so—it is obvious that peace-keeping operations of the United Nations cannot be successfully achieved without a sound and assured financial backing. It is for this reason that the General Assembly is to be convened, as a sequel to the Security Council meetings, to deal with the financial aspect of the matter, the importance of which is not less than that of the other. The eighth special session of the General Assembly was thus convened yesterday for the purpose of exercising its authority under the Charter to provide special funds for the current operations. I should now like to make a few comments on this important matter.

175. First, the task which UNIFIL is entrusted with is the one closely related to the whole issue of the Middle East which bears global implications for international affairs. The issue concerns the maintenance of international peace and security, which is the principal purpose for which our Organization has been created. In view of the particular nature of the action of the Security Council, we are of the opinion that the costs of the Force should be borne by all the Members in accordance with Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter. My delegation, which has consistently supported the principle of collective financial responsibility of the Member States, endorses the proposal made by the Secretary-General in this regard.

176. Secondly, with regard to the scale of assessment, my delegation is of the view that the permanent members of the Security Council, which are assigned special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, should bear the costs of the operations in a proportion commensurate with their special responsibility. We are particularly concerned over the possible failure by some of them to discharge their obligation as Members of this Organization. Our concern, which is based on what we have seen in similar operations of the past, is regrettably deepened by what we heard during the Security Council debates last March which led to the adoption of resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978). My delegation hopes that these Member States will fully realize—or reconsider, if their position has already been taken—that their obligation derives from the precise and clear provision of the Charter, and that they will not fail to honour their obligation not only as Members of this Organization but particularly as permanent members of the Security Council.

177. Thirdly, it should be recalled that UNIFIL, as the name itself shows, has been established as an interim measure to cope with the critical situation in the area and, therefore, it is obviously of a short-term nature. The Security Council decided, in paragraph 2 of its resolution 426 (1978), that

“the Force shall be established in accordance with the above-mentioned report for an initial period of six months, and that it shall continue in operation thereafter, if required, provided the Security Council so decides”.

In my delegation's view, however, the Security Council should have adopted a more carefully-thought-out wording reflecting the short-term and interim nature of the Force. It should have taken a stand to the effect that before the end of the initial period of six months it would review the situation to determine whether the operation should be continued.

178. Fourthly, as stated earlier, in the light of the particular prerogative attributed to the General Assembly in financial matters, we cannot but feel that the time lag of about one month after the action by the Security Council until the convening of the special session yesterday was quite unusual. This special session should have been convened much earlier to allow interested Members of the General Assembly to ascertain the manageability and feasibility of the proposed peace-keeping operations in their financial aspect. It is suggested, therefore, that the Secretary-General, before he prepares his report on the implementation of the resolution of the Security Council for launching peace-keeping operations in the future, should consult in practical terms not only with the parties directly involved in a conflict, the members of the Security Council and potential contributors either in troops or in kind, but also with potential bearers of large contributions. Since financial support for peace-keeping operations must be secured at any cost, my delegation believes that sufficient attention should be paid in a practical manner to the views of Members which will be asked to bear very heavy burdens.

179. Japan recognizes the vital importance of peace-keeping operations as part of the manifold political functions of the United Nations, considers it likely that ever-increasing activities await us in this field in the future and feels the need to strengthen the preparedness of this Organization in this matter. It is in this context that my delegation has made the aforementioned suggestion for consideration by the Security Council, the Secretary-General and all Members of this Organization.

180. We should not let the Interim Force be an element which delays the solution of the problem. My delegation sincerely hopes that the efforts by all the parties concerned and the Secretary-General will make possible an early and successful termination of the mission assigned to UNIFIL. Japan, together with other Member States, will not be averse to offering its full co-operation to this end.

181. Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): Before I present the point of view of my delegation on the documents before us, I feel constrained to express the deep concern of the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria at the dangerous developments in the Middle East, and particularly in Lebanon.

182. We have recently witnessed another massive act of aggression by the land, air and naval forces of Israel, this time against the territorial sovereignty of Lebanon. Vast material damage has been caused, while the loss of thousands of innocent civilians completes the sinister picture of those events. Thousands of Lebanese and Palestinians have been made homeless and have swelled the ranks of the already greatly increased number of refugees. The new Israeli attack is part of a long chain of acts of

aggression carried out over a long period by Israel against the Arab States. It should be recalled that since 1968 the Security Council has been seized 13 times of the question of the aggression of Israel against Lebanon. As can be seen from the communications from the Chief of Staff of UNTSO, during recent months alone the cases of infiltration of Israeli troops into the territory of Lebanon and Israeli violations of the air space and territorial waters of Lebanon have numbered several dozen.

183. The latest act of aggression by Israel occurred at a time when the United Nations was endeavouring to establish favourable conditions for an over-all settlement of the Middle East conflict and the establishment of a just and lasting peace in that region based on the complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967, recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and strict observance of the relevant United Nations resolutions. Israel responded to those efforts by occupying a fifth Arab territory, by a massive, premeditated and planned attack aimed at crushing the Palestine resistance movement and exterminating the Palestinian people. And this took place at a time when the Israeli Government was trying to convince public opinion that it too was in favour of a peaceful settlement of the conflict in the region.

184. There is no doubt whatsoever that it would be difficult for Israel to continue its policy of expansion and aggression without the tacit assent of imperialist circles and without the extensive military and financial assistance provided by interested circles which see in Israel a faithful guardian of their interests in that region. The tragic events in Lebanon have shown clearly and irrefutably that Israel has taken advantage of the separate negotiations with Egypt to give its policy of aggression and expansion a more acceptable appearance. The new acts of aggression have shown once again that Israel's final objective is to impose by force a settlement of the conflict which would entail the annexation of the occupied Arab lands and meet the strategic interests of world imperialism in that region. Israel's refusal to bow to the decision of the Security Council and its obstructionist manoeuvres with regard to the withdrawal of troops provide additional proof of this. My Government has taken a clear position with regard to recent events in southern Lebanon. As can be seen from the statement issued by the Bulgarian telegraphic agency on 17 March 1978, "The People's Republic of Bulgaria strongly condemns the armed invasion of Lebanon by Israel and insists on the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanese territory." My Government joins those who consider that full responsibility for the dangerous consequences of this new exacerbation of the situation in the Middle East lies with the Israeli Government, and that this includes financial responsibility for payment of the United Nations forces. We believe that it would be just and in keeping with the basic principles of international law to charge the aggressor and those who support it with the burden of financing the United Nations operations.

185. The Bulgarian Government has repeatedly stressed the fact that the only way to reach an over-all settlement of the Middle East conflict is to reconvene the Geneva Conference with the participation of all the interested parties, including the PLO. It is high time that Israeli

leaders realized what the whole world knows—the simple fact that the Palestinian people cannot be annihilated, that its right to self-determination and to establish its own independent State in conformity with United Nations resolutions is the crux of the Middle East problem. Only in those conditions and in that spirit can the right of all the peoples and countries of that region, including Israel, to live in peace and security be guaranteed.

186. Concerning the United Nations Force in Lebanon, the position of principle of my delegation is that its establishment there can only be a temporary measure that must take into account the interests of all the countries and peoples of the region. We regret that in formulating the Force's mandate in the Security Council, the sponsors of resolution 425 (1978) did not take as their basis a strict observance of the Charter. Now we have serious misgivings that with such a mandate these Forces will be able to serve the interests of those who wish to freeze the existing explosive situation. In these circumstances, Bulgaria cannot take part in the financing of the Force.

187. My delegation has already made a number of comments in the Fifth Committee concerning expenditures foreseen for the operations in Lebanon. It would be hard to avoid the impression that those who drew up the cost estimates were influenced in large measure by the tacit presumption that the stationing of the forces would be prolonged for an almost unlimited time, if not permanently.

188. My delegation regrets that because of these considerations it is not in a position to support the draft resolution submitted in document A/S-8/9 and, consequently, will vote against it.

189. Mr. PETRIĆ (Yugoslavia): The General Assembly is meeting in special session to consider questions directly linked to the most recent aggression committed by Israel and the occupation of the territory of Lebanon, a small and peaceful non-aligned country which has become the latest neighbour of Israel whose territory is in the hands of Israeli occupation forces.

190. My country condemns most strongly this newest Israeli aggression, which constitutes a flagrant violation of the basic norms of international law and an infringement of the sovereignty and independence of non-aligned Lebanon. In continuing to pursue its policy of aggression, expansion and occupation, Israel is directly responsible for bloodshed and the killing of innocent people in Lebanon and the destruction of their property. It is clear, however, that the brutal attack against Lebanon was aimed at threatening the very existence of the Palestinian people living in Lebanon and at eliminating the Palestine Liberation Organization as one of the key factors in the solving of the Middle East crisis.

191. Peace cannot be achieved by means of aggression against neighbours and the occupation of their territories. Nor can it be achieved by denying the inalienable rights of a people—the Palestinian people, in this tragic case. How can we trust the recent statements of the Israeli Government that it is in favour of a peaceful solution of the Middle East crisis when it has consistently demonstrated its lack of

readiness to search for a solution based on respect for the right of every country and people in the region to live in peace? It is high time for Israel to realize that a just and lasting peace in the Middle East can be achieved only through the withdrawal of Israel from all the territories occupied since 1967 and recognition and realization of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to its own State. Only the fulfilment of these conditions can guarantee the security of Israel and open up new prospects for its relations with neighbours and other countries.

192. The debate in the Security Council in connexion with the occupation of the territory of Lebanon by Israeli forces has shown that no one is prepared to accept any explanation or pretext for aggression against the sovereignty and independence of a State Member of the United Nations or any other country. At the same time the international community as a whole was categorical in its demand that Israel should withdraw immediately from occupied Lebanese territory. This demand was also embodied in paragraph 2 of Security Council resolution 425 (1978) of 19 March 1978, which reads:

“Calls upon Israel immediately to cease its military action against Lebanese territorial integrity and withdraw forthwith its forces from all Lebanese territory”.

193. More than one month has already elapsed since the adoption of that resolution by the Security Council, and Israeli forces are still in Lebanese territory. The United Nations peace-keeping forces, whose involvement constitutes a further burden for the States Members of our Organization, are not able to fulfil their obligations as Israel is constantly inventing new pretexts to justify its occupation of Lebanese territory.

194. My delegation has examined with due attention the reports of the Secretary-General [A/S-8/3] and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions [A/S-8/4]. We are under the impression that the Secretary-General's estimates regarding the financial resources necessary for the current six-month period are based on realistic elements. Therefore my delegation is prepared to accept them, taking also into account the comments and views of the Advisory Committee. When peace and security in the world are at stake, nothing is too costly, and the international community must provide the necessary resources for safeguarding peace. For that reason my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution on the financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. In deciding to do so, we also had in mind resolution 425 (1978), whose financial implications encompass the implementation of Article 17, paragraph 2, Charter of the United Nations.

195. However, I wish to emphasize that in the opinion of my delegation the aggressor itself—in this case, Israel—should bear all the expenses incurred by the international Organization as a result of the aggression. This applies both to the financing of peace-keeping forces and to compensation for the damage inflicted through the massive destruction of whole towns and villages, of innocent populations, their homes and other property, as well as to expenditure in connexion with the organization and holding of this special session.

196. The international community cannot tolerate indefinitely a situation in which aggressive acts are committed with impunity and in which the financial implications are borne by all the States Members of the United Nations. If such a practice were to continue, precedents would become a rule and aggression would become a means of satisfying expansionist appetites and policies of force. In the interests of peace and security the international community must find other solutions.

197. Consequently, maximum efforts should be exerted in order to ensure the immediate implementation of resolution 425 (1978) and the unconditional withdrawal of the troops of the Israeli aggressor from the territory of Lebanon.

198. Tan Sri ZAITON (Malaysia): It is indeed a matter of serious concern to my delegation that the eighth special session of the General Assembly should meet against the backdrop of Israel's continued intransigence in failing to comply with Security Council resolution 425 (1978). That resolution has clearly put into proper perspective the irresponsible action of the Government of Israel in launching the invasion of Lebanon. It is our submission that that invasion, based on calculated and premeditated designs, not only constitutes aggression of the most blatant kind against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon but also represents the deliberate policy of the Government of Israel to expand its control into other parts of the Middle East. This would have very negative consequences and would threaten not only to escalate violence and war in the region but also to hamper efforts at reaching a just and lasting solution of the problem in the Middle East, that would also take into account the rights of the Palestinian people to return to their homelands and to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

199. My Government deplores in the strongest terms that blatant aggression. We call upon the Government of Israel immediately to comply with resolution 425 (1978) and withdraw all its forces from Lebanon, to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and promote conditions that would lead to the resumption of efforts to find a peaceful settlement of the whole Middle East problem.

200. Security Council resolution 425 (1978) has indeed laid down the necessary provisions for ensuring the withdrawal of Israeli forces and the return to the Government of Lebanon of effective authority over its own territory. Inasmuch as the resolution was intended to serve that very purpose, despite its several shortcomings my delegation supports it and welcomes the stationing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. We fully subscribe to the view that the peace-keeping role of the United Nations can effectively prevent the escalation of wider conflicts and ease tension in the area. It is in support of that effort by the United Nations and thereby recognizing our financial obligations arising from such peace-keeping operations that my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in the Fifth Committee. However, my delegation would like to put on record that that does not represent an intention to condone Israeli aggression and its blatant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

201. We hope that with the adoption of the draft resolution at this special session Israel will immediately respond by promptly withdrawing all its forces from Lebanon so as to ensure the peaceful return of the effective authority of the Government of Lebanon in the area and at the same time undertake not to repeat such aggression and expansionist actions in the future.

202. Mr. DATCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): The position of the Romanian delegation on the question of financing the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon was expressed this morning in the Fifth Committee.¹³

203. With the Assembly's permission, we should now like briefly to put forward Romania's position regarding the circumstances in which the problem to which we have referred arose and also the steps that should be taken to prevent and eliminate the danger of the possible recurrence of such a situation.

204. Romania, like many other countries, considers that the events that recently occurred in the southern part of Lebanon show once again how dangerous is the situation in the Middle East and how necessary it is to avoid any action that might aggravate that situation. It is quite obvious that the military action undertaken by Israel in the southern part of Lebanon has further complicated the state of affairs in that area. Our country considers that, in the situation which has arisen, it is necessary for Israel to withdraw its troops immediately and completely from southern Lebanon as an initial step towards withdrawal from all occupied territories. Generally speaking, we feel that the negotiations should continue in order to bring about a political solution to the conflict in the Middle East; that adequate means should be found to ensure that all parties concerned participate in those negotiations, in a framework acceptable to one and all and, of course, through the resumption of the Geneva Conference.

205. My delegation's position regarding the fundamental principles underlying a solution to the problem in the Middle East is something that has frequently been expressed in this hall and in the Security Council. Romania is definitely in favour of Israel's withdrawing from the territories it occupies as a result of the 1967 war; it is in favour of respecting the national rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to establish their own independent State; and it favours ensuring the right to existence, peace and security of all peoples and nations in that area.

206. Fully aware as we are of the need for all States to step up their efforts to bring about a solution of the conflict in the Middle East, Romania attaches extremely high priority to that problem. We regard it as one of the most urgent tasks of international politics. The most recent confirmation of this constant concern can be found in the joint statement which President Ceausescu and President Carter issued a few days ago in Washington and also in the statements recently made by our President during his meetings in the United States.

207. Thus in the joint statement by the United States and Romania both Presidents have expressed their determination to encourage efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement, a just, lasting and global solution to that problem, based on the withdrawal by Israel from all Arab territories occupied since the 1967 war; respect for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people; and on ensuring the independence, territorial integrity and security of all States in that area. To that end they have spoken out in favour of negotiations among all parties concerned in finding a solution to the situation in the Middle East, with the appropriate participation of the Palestinian people.

208. President Ceausescu further stressed that it was necessary to undertake new steps in order to determine how negotiations that had been cut off should be resumed and at the same time to create an adequate international setting that would make it possible for Syria, Jordan and the Palestinian people through the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), their legitimate representative, to participate in the negotiations together with the two co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference, namely, the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

209. We should like to reiterate how much we value the sincere efforts that have been made so tirelessly by the Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim, and his colleagues in order to set up within so short a period of time the Interim Force in Lebanon as a temporary means of putting an end to the hostilities and thus of contributing to the re-establishment of peace.

210. At the same time, we should like to voice the hope that the new Force which has just been created will definitely be interim in nature, and that more intense efforts will be made to bring about a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. The United Nations Force should in no way be a substitute for political action designed to find a solution to the existing conflict and to prevent the recurrence of any such conflict in the future.

The President returned to the Chair.

211. In conclusion, I would voice the hope of the Romanian delegation that the discussions as well as the decisions at the present special session of the General Assembly will make an effective contribution to the efforts being made to bring about peace in the Middle East. This special session must, we believe, confirm and reinforce the major role which should be played by the United Nations, its organs and its Secretary-General in seeking ways and means for a just and lasting settlement of the situation in the Middle East.

212. Mr. LAI Ya-li (China) (*translation from Chinese*): This special session of the General Assembly is devoted mainly to the consideration of the financing of UNIFIL. The Chinese representative already stated our position at the meetings of the Security Council.¹⁴ Here, we wish to recapitulate the principled position of the Chinese Government.

¹³ *Ibid.*, Fifth Committee, 3rd meeting, para. 33; and *ibid.*, Sessional Fascicle, corrigendum.

¹⁴ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year* 2074th and 2075th meetings.

213. The Chinese Government has consistently held that the essence of the Middle East question lies in the fierce rivalry between the super-Powers in this region and the Israeli Zionists' aggression against the Arab and Palestinian peoples with the support and abetment of the super-Powers. On the 15th of last March, with greater rampancy, Israel flagrantly dispatched large numbers of aircraft, war vessels and armoured vehicles to invade the southern part of Lebanon, raid the camps of the Palestinian armed forces, ravage villages, massacre civilian inhabitants, and thus committed a fresh unpardonable crime. The just public opinion of Arab countries and the rest of the world has severely condemned Israel's aggressive acts and strongly demanded that Israel withdraw all its armed forces from Lebanese territory immediately and unconditionally. On 19 March the Security Council adopted a resolution calling for the cessation of Israeli aggression and the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli forces. More than a month has elapsed; yet Israel has thus far refused to withdraw all its forces but instead has put forward a plan for a so-called "partial and phased withdrawal", in an attempt to hang on perpetually in the southern part of Lebanon and to use the large tracts of occupied land as bases for continued expansion. This is absolutely intolerable. Should Israel cling to its plan of delayed withdrawal in obdurate pursuance of its policies of aggression, it will certainly arouse even greater indignation on the part of the Arab and Palestinian peoples and the people of the rest of the world against the Israeli Zionists.

214. The Chinese delegation wishes to reiterate that the Chinese Government and people strongly condemn the Israeli Zionists for their aggressive atrocities against Lebanon and other Arab countries. We maintain that Israel must withdraw all its forces from Lebanese territory and the territories of other Arab countries immediately and unconditionally. We will, as always, give resolute support to the Palestinian, Lebanese and other Arab peoples in their just struggle to resist aggression, recover the lost territories and regain national rights.

215. With regard to the dispatch of a United Nations Force, the Chinese Government has always held a different position in principle. We cannot agree to listing the costs of UNIFIL as expenses of the United Nations. Therefore, we will not participate in the vote on the draft resolution contained in the report of the Fifth Committee, nor shall we assume any obligations thereunder.

216. The PRESIDENT: There are still 27 names inscribed on my list of speakers, and, as I informed Members, it is my intention to exhaust that list this evening in order to be able to terminate today the eighth special session of the General Assembly as scheduled. But in view of the interest expressed to me by a number of delegations in having the General Assembly vote on this important draft resolution while there are a great number of representatives present in the Hall, it has been suggested that we suspend for the time being the discussion on the report of the Fifth Committee and proceed immediately to explanations of vote by those who have indicated their desire to make such explanations before the vote. After the vote, any delegations that had planned to speak on the report would of course have an opportunity to do so. But first I would call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, and

then on the representatives of four countries that wish to explain their votes before the vote. May I take it that the Assembly agrees to this suggested procedure?

It was so decided.

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

218. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): If I pin on my decoration of knighthood, it is only to affirm in this Assembly that we Palestinians are Palestinians first, Christians, Moslems and Jews second.

219. This Assembly was told that the PLO is a group of terrorists that will commit genocide and murder 25,000 Christians in southern Lebanon. I was dubbed a knight of the Order of the Holy Sepulchre, of which I am very proud, in 1966, two years after I joined ranks with the PLO. His Beatitude the Patriarch of Jerusalem, when he granted me this knighthood, granted it because of my defence of the Christian faith. I am proud of that and I would like to have it on record again that we Palestinians are Palestinians first, Christians, Moslems and Jews second. Therefore, the allegations that were brought to this General Assembly are all false.

220. We were told that the Christians might be slaughtered in Lebanon. Let me recall what his Holiness the Pope in Rome declared when he expressed concern that the sacred sanctuaries in Jerusalem might one day become museums for lack of Christian worshippers. Those Christian worshippers were being pushed out by the Israeli-Zionist forces of occupation. During the barbarous attack on Lebanon, His Holiness the Pope sent out the following message, which was signed by Cardinal Villot and sent to the Apostolic Nuncio in Beirut, His Excellency Monsignor Alfredo Bruniera on 19 March 1978. His Holiness said:

"The Holy Father is deeply grieved because of the huge number of victims caused by the indiscriminate Israeli bombing even on the unarmed population in refugee camps and Lebanese towns. Your Excellency is charged to express in the name of His Holiness deepest sympathy to the authorities and the families of Lebanese and Palestinian victims assuring them of his fervent prayers and of his consoling apostolic blessing."

Yet we are told that the Palestinians will kill the Christians in southern Lebanon. By whom? By someone whose *Knesset*, the Israeli Parliament, in 1977 passed Law No. 1313 which is called "The Penal Code Amendment Law; enticement to change of religion". This law reads as follows:

"The giving of bonuses as enticement to change of religion: he who gives or promises to give money, the equivalent of money or another benefit in order to entice a person to change his religion or in order to entice a person to bring about the change of another's religion, his sentence will be five years' imprisonment or a fine of 50,000 Israeli lira".

The second paragraph of the law reads:

"He who receives or agrees to receive money, the equivalent of money or another benefit in exchange for a

promise to change his religion or to bring about the change of another's religion, the sentence due to him is three years' imprisonment or a fine of 30,000 Israeli lira."

221. That law was passed in a country that some people refer to as the only democracy in the Middle East. And we are told about the PLO trying to massacre the Christians. The entire world knows the fate of Monsignor Capucci and Reverend Elia Khouri who were expelled from their own homes and prevented from practising their rites and leading their congregations. Yet we are made to sit here and hear what the Zionist representative has to say. Who is he trying to fool?

222. Once again the General Assembly meets to consider the derivative of a derivative, because at the heart of the issue is the question of Palestine and the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. These are the two prerequisites for any peace in the Middle East, any peace that may lead to peace in the world.

223. The General Assembly is considering the financing of UNIFIL. In accordance with Security Council resolution 425 (1978) the purpose of UNIFIL is to confirm the complete and immediate withdrawal of the Zionist forces of invasion. This is the thirty-second day after the adoption of that resolution and have those forces really withdrawn? What are we talking about? What are we trying to finance?

224. We pay a great tribute to the efforts of Secretary-General Waldheim to bring about peace in the area. In his press statement on 17 April in Vienna, he said that he considered that the number of contingents at the time was sufficient for the full implementation of resolution 425 (1978). Then why wait? Secretary-General Waldheim even said yesterday in a press conference "The Security Council does not accept that argumentation or condition"—about the deployment of UNIFIL and the third-phase withdrawal by Israel. "The Security Council members refer to the fact that the resolution is clear: it requests the withdrawal of Israeli forces forthwith." To me the word "forthwith" means here and now, and not after 32 days.

225. It is beyond us to comprehend why Israel should make its withdrawal contingent upon the full manning of UNIFIL. But naturally, as Sharon declared in 1974—and Sharon is a minister in the present cabinet of Israel—a buffer zone is to be created between Israel and its neighbours. That is the Israel that comes to us here and says that it wants to live in peace and wants to negotiate; that is the Israel that wants to create buffer zones by force, to keep itself isolated from its neighbours. Again, the full manning of UNIFIL is just another pretext in order to satisfy the Zionist aims for expansion and annexation.

226. I shall not go into detail. Previous speakers have referred to the Zionist aims of annexation of Lebanon. However, on the other hand, it was very clear from the statements made by the Government of Israel that the aim of the campaign or the military operations against Lebanon was to annihilate the Palestine people, and annihilation is genocide. We have all watched the film *Holocaust* about the dreadful, abominable Nazi atrocities. But again, what do the Zionists do? They discriminate among the victims. The Nazis did not only slaughter 6 million Jews. There were 52

million victims of Nazi atrocities in Europe and elsewhere. Why discriminate among the victims? Or are the non-Jews just "the others" and to hell with them? Who cares? That is the racist mentality of the Zionists: their dead should be respected and the dead of the others, the relatives, the mothers, the children of the others should not be taken into consideration. But again this is another manifestation of that racist Zionist ideology with which we are dealing.

227. To annihilate a people is a crime, and yet the representative of that group which calls for annihilation is seated among the respectable representatives of the world.

228. With regard to the position of the PLO towards the UNIFIL, I would just quote what Secretary-General Waldheim has said; he is, after all, the final authority on this. Yesterday he stated:

"In my talks with Mr. Arafat he assured me again that he has given all instructions for co-operation with the United Nations peace-keeping forces, instructions not to hamper their activity and to help in the implementation of resolution 425 (1978), to ensure the full withdrawal of Israeli forces, in line with that resolution."

In response to a question, Secretary-General Waldheim said that there were no conflicts between UNIFIL and PLO forces. He added:

"The PLO is co-operating in a satisfactory way with the United Nations peace-keeping forces. A typical example is the situation in Tyre. Tyre was never occupied by Israeli forces; yet the headquarters of the French battalion is in the city of Tyre—and that has been made possible through arrangements with the PLO"—

because our interpretation of resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) is that UNIFIL will operate only in the zone that was occupied by Israel.

229. Thus, there is an assurance by the Secretary-General to this Assembly that the leadership of the Palestinian people will co-operate.

230. It has been said here that the PLO came to Lebanon in 1971. That is a distortion of history. The PLO is the Palestinian people, and the Palestinian people were forced out of their homes and found refuge and shelter in Lebanon and were welcome by their brothers there. That happened in 1948. The cause of all the trouble is that Israel has adamantly refused since 1948 to permit any of those Palestinians to return to their homes, despite resolutions adopted year after year calling for that.

231. What do we get? We get a resolution in this General Assembly, but there is no implementation of that resolution. So it is Israel that is obstructing the road to peace; it is Israel that is preventing the Palestinians from returning to their homes—and it is the right of the Palestinians to return to their homes in whatever way and by whatever method they deem proper.

232. Since October 1977—and I am referring to the date when a joint statement was issued by the co-Chairmen of the Peace Conference on the Middle East, the Union of

Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States—many mines have been planted and many torpedoes have been laid to hamper the efforts to convene the Peace Conference on the Middle East. Among those mines was the Begin interpretation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967)—that is, that the resolution did not apply to the Palestinian territories of the West Bank and Jordan. He regarded those territories as Judaea and Samaria, as liberated territories, and consequently he said that resolution 242 (1967) did not apply. When he failed to get that interpretation accepted, he created a new argument: invade Lebanon.

233. But we want to make it clear to this Assembly that withdrawal from Lebanon should in no way be regarded as an alternative to complete withdrawal from the Palestinian territories occupied by the Zionists, especially those territories occupied as a result of the Zionist aggression in 1967.

234. The aim should be immediate and “immediate” should mean within a maximum of a week or two—withdrawal by the Zionist forces of occupation from Lebanon, so that we may once again place our efforts in the direction of a peace conference on the Middle East, in accordance with United Nations resolutions, and especially General Assembly resolutions.

235. From 1969 to 1974 the Zionists committed 789 acts of terrorism against the territory of Lebanon. There were 561 innocent civilians killed and 649 wounded. On top of that, a civilian aircraft was downed by the Zionists. Yet we are told that Israel had to defend its borders. What borders?

236. In conclusion, I should like to refer to the role of the United States of America in the Zionist invasion. It is the United States of America that is encouraging the Zionists in Israel to commit these acts of aggression. Cluster bombs are used as an instrument for genocide: yet the United States of America is supplying Israel with cluster bombs. It is supplying Israel with F-15s and other lethal weapons. And for what reason? Primarily to annihilate the Palestinian people. The United States can pick up the tab for UNIFIL. How much is it? \$100 million? That represents the cost of perhaps two or three F-15s—which we shall down if Israel maintains its aggressive policy.

237. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting.

238. Mr. ZAIMI (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution recommended to the Assembly by the Fifth Committee. Nevertheless, I wish to explain my country's position on some aspects of the question before the General Assembly for consideration.

239. First, we support the thesis that the role of UNIFIL is not to cover, perpetuate or protect the Israeli aggression against Lebanese territory. The role of that Force could not be to encourage Israeli aggression against the Palestinian people or the physical annihilation of the Palestinian people and its revolution. We cannot subscribe to that under any pretext whatsoever. The Israeli withdrawal must be unconditional. Indeed, we believe that Security Council

resolution 425 (1978) is sufficiently clear in that regard, and the immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces must be the first task to be accomplished by UNIFIL. Once the Israeli withdrawal has taken place, UNIFIL must withdraw in order to allow for the restoration of Lebanese authority over all of Lebanese territory.

240. This is therefore a mission limited in time and in its objective. Consequently, a new and troublesome element must not be introduced into the region, and we do not wish to have to resort to prolonging the presence of UNIFIL on Lebanese territory.

241. Furthermore, we would have preferred the draft resolution to be more explicit by requiring Israel to withdraw its forces of aggression at the earliest possible time and in keeping with a very specific schedule.

242. In any event, that is the meaning given by my delegation to the last provision of this draft resolution.

243. Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote before the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/S-8/9. The draft resolution calls upon Israel to assume its responsibilities and to fulfil the provisions of Security Council resolution 425 (1978), which calls for Israel's immediate and total withdrawal from all Lebanese territory. Nevertheless, we see that the Israeli occupation forces continue to occupy part of Lebanese territory and to prevent, through force and aggression, the inhabitants who were expelled from returning to their homes and recovering their property.

244. Despite Israel's obstinacy and its refusal to comply with the pertinent resolutions of the Security Council, despite its defiance of the international community, we find that the United Nations, in keeping with its responsibilities, is trying to maintain peace and security in the world and to ensure the implementation of resolution 425 (1978). At a time when the United Nations is facing great financial difficulties, Israel has engaged in a barbaric attack against the peaceful population of southern Lebanon in order to realize its expansionist colonialist designs, thus imposing, unnecessarily, on States Members of the United Nations the burden of heavy expenses arising from Israel's perfidious aggression against Lebanon and the Arab people of Palestine.

245. The series of continued Israeli acts of aggression and all their consequences have resulted in a cost of over \$700 million to the States Members of the United Nations and we are now meeting again to pay the price of Israeli aggression by defraying the expenses of the maintenance of the emergency forces in Lebanon although the whole world holds Israel alone responsible for the deteriorating situation in the Middle East region, and therefore, Israel alone should defray the expenses of those forces.

246. My country, which is convinced of the need to apply the principles of the United Nations Charter and of the impartiality of the case of the Arab nations, which deplores the Israeli acts of aggression and Israel's continued attempts to perpetuate occupation and aggression, will join the other Members in shouldering its responsibilities vis-à-vis

the United Nations, therefore, shall vote in favour of the draft resolution.

247. Mr. SOUTHICHAK (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, in the vote taken in the Fifth Committee this morning, opposed the adoption of the draft resolution contained in the Fifth Committee's report now before the General Assembly [*A/S-8/9, para. 11*]. We shall oppose it again in the General Assembly and, in so doing, we wish to emphasize our position that the perpetrator of the aggression, Israel, must alone assume the political and financial responsibilities stemming from its barbaric aggression against Lebanon. The financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon must be borne by the aggressor State, and my country has no intention of sharing with it the cost of its aggression.

248. Mr. KHAN (Bangladesh): Bangladesh will vote in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the Fifth Committee. While the immediate focus of this eighth special session is of a financial nature, Bangladesh believes that the jurisdiction of the Assembly cannot in all logic be restricted to or divorced from the underlying political realities that surround this case.

249. The motivating factor governing the establishment of UNIFIL is spelled out in paragraph 3 of the unanimously adopted Security Council resolution 425 (1978). The Fifth Committee itself took cognizance of these vital political pre-conditions under the terms of the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution it is recommending.

250. The Government of Bangladesh has unequivocally condemned the brutal invasion of southern Lebanon and considers it to be an act of wanton aggression in flagrant violation of the most fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter. These acts have not only resulted in the dismemberment of foreign territory by conquest, in the indiscriminate killing of innocent civilians through an organized military operation tantamount to genocide but have also burdened the United Nations itself with an expensive salvage operation, the cost of which should rightfully be claimed from the aggressor.

251. Bangladesh will nevertheless vote in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the Fifth Committee, in conformity with our confirmed commitment towards strengthening the collective authority of the United Nations in the preservation and maintenance of peace, particularly by enhancing its peace-making and peace-keeping role. We do so, however, in the belief that these measures must be contingent upon the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli occupying forces in southern Lebanon. We cannot but condemn the continued extension of the occupying presence of Israel in Lebanon even after the adoption of resolution 425 (1978) on 19 March 1978, in spite of assurances by Israel that it would withdraw its forces. We reject outright its blatant justification for remaining in Lebanon to prevent a so-called vacuum in the exercise of effective authority.

252. It is in the context of those explanations that Bangladesh will vote in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the Fifth Committee.

253. Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary): Before we take a note, I should like to state very briefly the position of the Hungarian delegation.

254. The General Assembly is compelled to deal once again with the situation in the Middle East because of the aggression committed by Israel against Lebanon. The violation of the territorial integrity of a sovereign Member State of our Organization constitutes gross disregard of the United Nations Charter and a grave violation of the independence of Lebanon. At the same time, that aggression creates a threat to peace and international security in general.

255. The crisis in the Middle East has been and continues to be a heavy burden on international relations. The occupation by Israel of Arab territories and the denial of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people persist to this day, in defiance of the resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly. What is more, by establishing a growing number of settlements and extending the application of Israeli laws to occupied territories, Israel gives further evidence of its striving towards final annexation of Arab territories.

256. Therefore, what is at issue as regards the financing of UNIFIL is not a financial question but rather a political one. The fundamental question of great political importance is this: should all of us, who are making every effort to seek a just and peaceful solution, discharge financial responsibilities for a crisis created by an aggressor when the aggressor itself rejects the assumption of any obligation?

257. Together with other delegations we are unable to support any resolution which does not differentiate between the aggressor, its victims and those who are requested to pay for the aggression. We are of the opinion that the aggressor alone—that is, the State of Israel—is responsible for the costs arising in connexion with UNIFIL and that all costs must be borne by Israel itself. Consequently Hungary will not share any financial responsibility.

258. In conclusion, I wish to reiterate the position of my Government, a position which has remained basically unchanged since the beginning of the conflict and has been expressed in this forum on a number of occasions. This time I should like only to emphasize my Government's support for the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of Lebanon, and also our solidarity with and support for the people of Palestine in the struggle for the exercise of its inalienable national rights, including the right to establish an independent State of its own.

259. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): The Algerian delegation believes that the substance of the problem is clearly political and that the financial and technical questions which were considered in the Fifth Committee constitute only one of the implications of the fundamental question, which is the premeditated aggression committed by the Zionist armed forces against Lebanon.

260. My delegation believes that this fundamental aspect has not been sufficiently emphasized in the draft resolution which is before the General Assembly for consideration in

document A/S-8/9. My delegation has also decided not to participate when this draft resolution is put to the vote.

261 Mr. ROA KOURI (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Comrade President, since this is the first time I have come to this rostrum as Permanent Representative of the Republic of Cuba, allow me to convey to you my warmest congratulations on your election to the presidency of the eighth special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

262. In a political context, we have analysed the adoption of the draft resolution to put into effect the Security Council decision concerning the financing of the military force requested by the Government of Lebanon. It is absolutely clear to everybody that we should not confuse the aggressor and those who encourage and arm it with the victim of aggression.

263. We do not oppose the adoption of that draft resolution in so far as it stems from the provisions of Security Council resolution 425 (1978), but we affirm categorically that the expenses must be borne by the aggressors and by those who have sponsored them more or less boldly, or in fact have encouraged aggression through spokesmen who showed no surprise when faced by a violation of the territorial integrity of a Member State of the United Nations and the sufferings of its innocent population, repeatedly attacked by an aggressor which has so far escaped punishment and cynically announces that it dropped anti-personnel bombs by mistake on children, women and elderly.

264. So far as the operation itself is concerned, we must state that we understand the mandate of the Security Council to be aimed at controlling the unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from the territory Israel occupied by aggression; that the aggressor cannot be placed on an equal footing with the victim of aggression either in the plan or in its execution; and that its implementation must necessarily be inspired and guided by the relevant resolutions of this Assembly concerning the situation in the Middle East and the question of Palestine, which we consider to be the only valid legal interpretation of the will of the international community in this respect.

265. Our interpretation of the mandate could be no different. Furthermore, the mandate should include a precise and brief schedule, a time period—one week or two weeks, as my comrade the representative of the PLO has stated—for the withdrawal of the invading forces, and indicate at the same time the manner in which the withdrawal should be effected. This is essential if we wish to avoid a repetition of tragic similar operations sponsored by the United Nations in other regions where, counter to the international will expressed in resolutions adopted by our Organization, the forces sent to guarantee the peace and security of the victim State have become instruments of the aggressors and their accomplices.

266. In this connexion I wish to make it clear that my delegation does not rest its best hopes for the restoration of Lebanon's sovereignty over all of its territory—and even less for the solving of the thorny problem brought about by Israeli expansionism—on the sending of interim contingents

from the United Nations. However, we do not object to adopting a budget for the forces requested by Lebanon, a non-aligned country whose people enjoys our unswerving solidarity and whose aggressors deserve the firmest and most categorical condemnation and rejection by the international community.

267. The General Assembly must maintain strict and continuous vigilance over the development of the present situation and the fulfilling by the military forces dispatched by the United Nations of the express mandate entrusted to them by the Security Council. It must keep watch also on the actions of the inveterate aggressor against Arab peoples and on the actions of those who encourage it in its plans for domination in the area in the service of spurious commercial and political interests that are only too well known.

268. In the present circumstances, together with the victim Arab States, we must defend the true rights of man: the rights of peoples to independence, to sovereignty and to self-determination; the right of countries to live in peace within respected boundaries and without foreign interference in their internal affairs; the right of a people to decide its own destiny in a State that can no longer accept, and in fact never did, domination of any kind nor paternalistic or condescending attitudes on the part of those who have practised a double standard and adopt offensive international attitudes.

269. For these reasons my delegation will vote against the draft resolution in document A/S-8/9.

270. Mr. PAPOULIAS (Greece): The Greek delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/S-8/9, which we support in its totality. In doing so, we are guided not only by our feelings of solidarity with Lebanon, with which Greece is linked by traditional ties of friendship, but also by the principles which have consistently inspired my country's policy on the problem of the Middle East in its various aspects.

271. We therefore stand for the immediate and complete implementation of Security Council resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) and fully share the feelings expressed by the representative of Lebanon when he spoke of his country's terrible and poignant crisis.

272. On the basis of the fundamental principles of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory through the use of military force, we join in the call for the immediate and complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory, and respect for the independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon, as well as restoration of the sole sovereignty of the Government of Lebanon over all its territory within its internationally recognized boundaries. We also urge that all concerned should co-operate fully with the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon in order to ensure implementation of the Security Council resolutions in all their parts, including the speedy return of all the refugees to their homes.

273. As regards the solution of the over-all problem of the Middle East, may I once more stress that our position remains as it has repeatedly been stated, most recently

during the debate at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly.¹⁵

274. Mr. PHAM DUONG (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*). My delegation wishes briefly to explain its vote before the vote on the draft resolution in document A/S-8/9.

275. At the meeting of the Security Council on 18 March 1978¹⁶ my delegation joined with a number of other representatives who spoke to condemn the aggression committed by Israel against the sovereignty of Lebanon. We also appealed to the Council to take the most appropriate and effective steps to compel Israel immediately to withdraw its troops from Lebanon, to put an end to its attacks against that country and to respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Arab countries. We believe that that is also the most profound aspiration of almost all the Members of this Organization.

276. Like some members of the Security Council and a great number of other peace-loving and justice-loving countries, we have a number of reservations regarding Security Council resolution 425 (1978). The Security Council should have vigorously condemned the aggression perpetrated by Israel against Lebanon. It should have denounced and condemned the odious crimes which Israeli troops have perpetrated against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples. It should have demanded the total, unconditional and immediate withdrawal of all Israeli troops from the territory of Lebanon. If Israel stubbornly persists in not withdrawing troops from Lebanese territory, the Council should strictly apply punitive measures pursuant to the pertinent Articles of the Charter.

277. It is nevertheless regrettable that, because of imperialist intrigues, the Council was unable to adopt a resolution that reflected the appeals that were made by the overwhelming majority of Member States.

278. Under resolution 425 (1978) and the draft resolution in document A/S-8/9 the Member States would have to meet the conditions that have been imposed by the aggressor and pay the expenses according to the provisions of Article 17 of the Charter.

279. I think that I can say without fear of exaggeration that that provision will constitute an extremely dangerous precedent and will represent a breach in international law which might well encourage Israel and the imperialists to embark with impunity on other military adventures against the Palestinian and Arab peoples.

280. That being so, I declare that my Government will in no way be bound by the financial provisions in that draft resolution and that only the aggressors should pay the expenses resulting from their crimes. Consequently my delegation will vote against the draft resolution.

281. My delegation considers that in order to achieve a just and lasting solution of the problem of the Middle East,

and in order to ensure peace and security in that part of the world, Israel should unconditionally and immediately withdraw all its armed forces from Lebanon and from the other Arab territories and recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to create its own State in Palestine.

282. Mr. BA-ISSA (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): This morning in the Fifth Committee we explained our position on the draft resolution which is before us.¹⁷ We cannot speak about the actual financing of UNIFIL unless we take into account its political element. This is not a problem which arose in the void. This problem came upon us as the result of the recent Zionist aggression against Lebanese territory. The major Israeli military invasion in the southern part of Lebanon, is part and parcel of Zionist expansionist and racist policy. That was clearly demonstrated in the statement issued by the Cabinet of Democratic Yemen on 16 March 1978, which stressed the fact that that invasion was aimed at occupying the territory of south Lebanon and annihilating the Palestinian people.

283. We are not saying anything new when we emphasize the aggressive nature of the Zionist entity and its expansionist designs. For 30 years now the United Nations has been deploring that very fact. It is really paradoxical and a true irony of fate that we see this entity which was created by the United Nations in very special circumstances defying all the relevant resolutions of the international body, arrogantly violating the United Nations Charter and the principles therein. Such defiance would never have seen the light of day without the support given by the imperialist Powers to that entity which has been implanted in the heart of the Arab nation to safeguard the interests of the imperialist Powers, to sunder the Arab world and to pillage its resources.

284. While mourning the victims of the Zionist aggression, we should not overlook the great arsenal of ultra-modern destructive arms provided by those States that stand behind the Zionist entity and support it to consolidate its expansionist and terrorist policy which represents a threat to international peace and security.

285. The Zionist entity could only have arisen on the basis of violence and terrorism, the expulsion of the Palestinian people, the occupation of Arab territories and the exploitation of their resources. From that point of departure and within that framework, the nature and aims of the recent aggression for the occupation of southern Lebanon and the annihilation of the Palestinian people are evident.

286. For some time now our country has participated in the financing of the United Nations Emergency Force and the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force. Our participation and contribution should not be construed as meaning that we agree with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) or 338 (1973). We have clearly stated this on many occasions at various meetings held under United Nations auspices. However, since last year, we have been stating that we are determined to cease contributing to the

¹⁵ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, Plenary Meetings*, 14th meeting, paras. 141 and 142.

¹⁶ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year, 2072nd meeting*.

¹⁷ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighth Special Session, Fifth Committee*, 3rd meeting, paras. 43-45; and *ibid.*, *Sessional Fascicle*, corrigendum.

financing of those international forces because they have taken on a permanent nature, thus legalizing, as it were, Israeli occupation and the violation by the Zionist entity of United Nations resolutions.

287. The stubborn attitude of the Zionists and their defiance of the international community have surpassed their acts of deploying their military forces, implanting settler colonies in occupied Arab territories and strengthening the policy of annexation and expansionism: that means that if we are financing United Nations forces, we are, as it were, accomplices in the carrying out of that policy.

288. The draft resolution before us does not affect the essence and content of that problem; it does not provide the necessary solution to it. We cannot treat the aggressor and its victim on an equal footing. We cannot fill in gaps that will be used by the aggressor subsequently in order indefinitely to postpone its evacuation from the territories and consolidate its occupation. Our country does not intend to take part in the vote on the draft resolution.

289. The situation, as we have explained it, implies that our Organization should take proper steps to restrain the aggressor and to impose sanctions on the aggressor to restore justice. That can be brought about only if the sovereignty and independence of States are respected and if the resolutions of the United Nations are implemented, in particular those relating to the restoration of the rights of the Palestinian people and the implementation of General Assembly resolutions in that connexion, including the right of the people of Palestine to self-determination and to create its own independent State under the leadership of its legitimate representative, the PLO.

290. We believe that it is logical and necessary to consider as a top priority matter the immediate Israeli withdrawal from Lebanese territory and every sincere effort should be bent to that end. If we limit ourselves in search of a comprehensive solution to the problem that exists in the Middle East or only to the deployment of international interim forces, that would only serve to further the annexationist plans of the Zionist policy; it would be a pretext to preserve that policy. All that constitutes the violation of the sovereignty of an independent State Member of this international Organization. It also constitutes a serious threat to peace throughout the world, and we cannot imagine any justification for such a situation.

291. Mr. AL-HADDAD (Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on the draft resolution which has been submitted to this august Assembly. First of all, we should recall that Zionist aggression persists against Lebanon and the Palestinian people and that the perfidious Zionist rule over Lebanese territory, over civilian villages and the Palestinian camps continues to this moment.

292. Any action relating to the financing of the international forces should stem from the legal precept that condemns aggression and holds that the aggressor should bear the consequences of his aggression; otherwise our community will commit an error, if not a crime against humanity, should it assume the responsibility on behalf of the aggressor, thereby encouraging the aggressor to pursue his aggression and usurp the rights of others.

293. The financing of UNIFIL must not be linked to the withdrawal of Zionist forces from southern Lebanon, because that would entail the consolidation of the occupation of territories of others by force; it would be contrary to Security Council resolution 425 (1978), which calls upon Israel to withdraw forthwith and to do so unconditionally.

294. The presence of international forces in Lebanon depends on the will of the Lebanese Government; this point should be taken into consideration. That is why the General Assembly demands the support of the aforementioned Security Council resolution. Acting in accordance with that resolution will bring about the withdrawal of the Zionist forces within a time-limit of no more than a few weeks in order to preserve the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon as an independent member of the international community.

295. The Yemen Arab Republic deplors the perfidious Zionist attack on Lebanese territory and on the camps of the Palestinian refugees in southern Lebanon. Our delegation particularly deplors the use by the enemy of cluster bombs on civilian areas occupied by Lebanese and Palestinian people, and we call upon the United Nations to act in keeping with its responsibilities as provided for in the Charter to put a decisive and prompt end to the Zionist aggression against the Arab nation, to bring about the withdrawal of the aggressive forces from Lebanon and from all occupied Arab territories, and to allow the Palestinian people to exercise its right to self-determination and to the creation of its own independent State, in accordance with the United Nations resolutions on this question.

296. Despite our reservations concerning the draft resolution in document A/S-8/9, particularly operative paragraph 2(d) and the second part of operative paragraph 5, we shall vote in favour of it, in the belief that it will contribute towards the immediate withdrawal of the aggressive Zionist forces from southern Lebanon.

297. The question of the financing of UNIFIL is merely one of the negative results of the United Nations role in the field of peace keeping and of its inability to put an end to Zionist aggression against the Arab nations; this aggression, which has been going on for 30 years, constitutes a flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter and international conventions: its continuance is considered as an acceptance of the aggressive policies, terrorist and racist practices of the Zionist authorities against the sovereignty and independence of the Arab States near occupied Palestine. My delegation believes that this strange situation merely violates the fundamental principles of civilization and international law and will eventually lead us back to the law of the jungle.

298. The stability and security of the Arab region are subject to the withdrawal of the Zionist forces from the Arab territories they had occupied by force, and the recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people to return to their homeland, Palestine. The United Nations should not be satisfied with merely patching up by the use of emergency forces which cause a heavy financial burden that only increases with the expansion of Zionist aggression, thus contributing to the consolidation of occupation and usurpation.

299. It is therefore imperative to seek a just and lasting solution by way of ending the Zionist aggression against the Arab nation so that it can devote itself to building its national economy and participate in the international efforts exerted for the achievement of prosperity, equity and development in the world.

300. Mrs. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation will not participate in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/S-8/9 not because we are against the establishment of UNIFIL, which should help to bring about the withdrawal of Israel and the restoration of peace to Lebanon, in accordance with Security Council resolution 425 (1978). We should like, in this connexion, to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General for the tireless efforts he has been making to discharge the responsibilities entrusted to him in that part of the world.

301. We shall not participate in the voting because we are convinced that a vast plot has been hatched against the Palestinian people by the forces of Zionism and international imperialism. Israel has committed aggression against Lebanon, a small defenceless country, and has taken thousands of civilian victims, both Palestinian and Lebanese, and our Assembly, which has now been called into special session, is not even condemning the Israeli aggression against Lebanon but now intends to vote on a draft resolution which falls short of Security Council resolution 425 (1978).

302. As we said this morning,¹⁸ the People's Republic of Benin will not participate in this plot against the Palestinian people. My delegation believes, as do many others that spoke before us, that the expenses for financing UNIFIL should be borne entirely by the aggressor. Therefore, we will assume no financial responsibility deriving from that resolution.

303. Mr. OYONO (United Republic of Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution which has been submitted to our Assembly. Before anything else, Mr. President, may I say how pleased we are at seeing you presiding over the eighth special session of the General Assembly devoted to the financing of UNIFIL. Your election to the presidency of this session certainly augurs well for the success of our work.

304. In my delegation's view, this session, beyond its financial and technical nature, inherent in the very title of the agenda item, should not blind us to the importance of its political aspects, a result of the particularly unstable and explosive situation in the Middle East which has persisted for over three decades, a situation of which the recent Israeli aggression against Lebanon is one of the most revealing manifestations.

305. This session, which is taking place shortly after the Security Council meetings on this flagrant act of aggression, reflects, we need hardly recall, the serious and constant concern of the international community over the unforeseeable threats to international peace and security which continue to arise in the Middle East.

306. Israel deliberately invaded Lebanon, an independent State Member of the United Nations and of the great family of non-aligned nations, in flagrant violation of the rules of international law and of the purposes and principles of the Charter of our Organization: in particular, Article 2, which provides that:

“All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.”

307. In adopting resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) of 19 March 1978, the Security Council not only reaffirmed the need to respect that cardinal principle of our Organization—in this case, for the benefit of Lebanon—and therefore to call for the withdrawal of the Israeli forces, a withdrawal which should lead to the general withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories occupied since 1967; it also decided to establish an interim United Nations Force for the purpose of confirming that withdrawal and restoring international peace and security that are so seriously threatened in that region.

308. First and foremost, we wish to congratulate Secretary-General Waldheim for the speed, seriousness and devotion with which he implemented those resolutions in establishing UNIFIL. We express our appreciation also to the Member States that have contributed contingents to the force, namely, Canada, France, Ghana, Iran, Nepal, Norway, Senegal and Sweden.

309. Cameroon, for its part condemns that act of aggression and, concerned that a just and lasting peace shall be brought about in the Middle East, repeats its support of Security Council resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) which I have already mentioned, because those resolutions are important landmarks in the process of restoring peace and security in Lebanon, as testified to by the positive statements made in that regard by various interested parties.

310. With respect to the financing of UNIFIL, my delegation has noted with interest the Secretary-General's report in document A/S-8/3, the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, in document A/S-8/4, and the recommendation of the Fifth Committee to the Assembly.

311. My delegation appreciates the reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee from \$58.7 million to \$54 million of the cost estimates for UNIFIL operations over a six-month period from 19 March to 18 September, for 4,000 men. Cameroon furthermore subscribes to the apportionment of expenses as defined in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution before us, because that apportionment takes into account the specific responsibilities of the permanent members of the Security Council concerning peace keeping and the maintenance of international peace and security and also because it takes into account the various economic situations of States.

312. Nevertheless, Cameroon wishes formally to recall that this is basically an interim arrangement which can in

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, para. 50; and *ibid.*, *Sessional Fascicle*, corrigendum.

no way change the urgent need to reach an over-all settlement of the Middle East problem, at the centre of which we find the Palestinian question.

313. In that connexion, UNIFIL must play essentially a stabilizing role to enable Lebanon to regain its territorial integrity and to consolidate its sovereignty and political independence, and furthermore to promote speedy progress in all initiatives under way which are aimed at restoring a just and lasting peace, and establishing brotherly co-existence and fruitful co-operation among all the peoples of that region in the higher interest of peace, security and international co-operation.

314. Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka): I am speaking at this late hour to support the draft resolution recommended by the Fifth Committee and to explain our vote. That draft resolution was adopted by a vote and included the support of my delegation. But we hardly need to remind ourselves that this draft resolution is no more than a necessary sequel to Security Council resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978). The urgency and human considerations in south Lebanon which were brought before the Council obliged us to accept those resolutions without comment. As members know, we were urged to refrain from making time-consuming statements. We were told that the Security Council and the United Nations must act immediately to save Lebanon and its people from the agony they were undergoing as a result of Israel's invasion and renewed disregard of the principles and the Charter of the United Nations. We must therefore say now what we were precluded from saying and what the Security Council resolution omitted to say.

315. We condemn unreservedly Israel's invasion of south Lebanon. We demand that Israel withdraw its troops from the territory of Lebanon and allow the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon to carry out the mandate given it by the Security Council. If we were lukewarm about that resolution at that time, it was because we had certain fears. And what we feared has come to pass, namely, that although over a month has passed since the adoption of that resolution, Israel remains entrenched in the greater part of the territory of Lebanon which it invaded and occupied. If we are lukewarm about the draft resolution now before us, it is because we genuinely fear that this enabling resolution of the General Assembly might only perpetuate Israel's new aggression against the territory of Lebanon and the Palestine people, who have so courageously defended themselves in the face of such odds.

316. Israel must know that this is no more than a Pyrrhic victory because Israel has not gained the security which it claims is its primary objective. Nor by any means has it liquidated the Palestinian people, their cause or their indomitable will. This draft resolution of the Fifth Committee is no more than a clinical approach to the financial requirements of resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978). We would have wanted to see even at this late stage a categorical condemnation of Israel's new aggression and a demand for its withdrawal from the territory of Lebanon. That, we are told, is not feasible in this draft resolution, and if it is to be adopted by this Assembly so that UNIFIL can carry out its task, we must support the draft resolution. We therefore support it, only for that reason.

317. The almost apologetic call to Israel to fulfil its responsibilities under Security Council resolution 425 (1978) does not reflect our views. We fear—and Israel's past record justifies that fear—that this draft resolution will help perpetuate Israel's occupation and further designs on the territory of Lebanon and its hope of liquidating the Palestinian people and their cause. But Israel must by now know that what it has not realized in the last 30 years is far beyond its grasp today. A much wider and better informed international community within and beyond the membership of this Organization recognizes the futility of Israel's goals.

318. I should like to use this occasion to extend to the Government and people of Lebanon our concern and sympathy in this time of travail. To the Palestinian people and the PLO, who have so valiantly fought their cause against overwhelming odds, my Government and my delegation gives an assurance of our steadfast support.

319. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation would have liked to participate in the general debate on this item, but because of the limited time at our disposal and in view of the draft resolution which is before the Assembly, we have decided to give a brief explanation of our position concerning the vote on the draft resolution proposed by the Fifth Committee with regard to the financing of UNIFIL.

320 My delegation explained its position in the Fifth Committee this morning,¹⁹ but I wish to explain that position further, and that is why I am speaking now. I would ask the Assembly to take note officially of our position.

321 My country's position on international forces in general is well known. Repeatedly in the past we have not participated in votes on this subject and in the present case too we have decided not to participate in the vote which will take place in a few moments; indeed, we did not participate in the vote which took place this morning in the Fifth Committee.

322. To sum up, we are among those who take stringent precautions concerning circumstances and the requirements for the establishment of international forces in general. We believe, in particular, that this is a very thorny and critical problem and that the United Nations, including the General Assembly, must take this problem into consideration and study it thoroughly.

323. We would like to refer to another question: This decision, like previous decisions, can create an international precedent by making the withdrawal of aggressors who violate the national soil and territories of other parties, and refuse to withdraw their armed forces, conditional upon the creation of international forces to take their place. I think that that is a very serious legal precedent, and an even more serious political precedent, on which the United Nations should reflect deeply. It should take this into consideration in particular with regard to the future, as well as with regard to the continuing Zionist Israeli aggression against our Arab nation and our region.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, paras. 11-13; and *ibid.*, *Sessional Fascicle*, corrigendum.

324. I wish to say that it is very dangerous for an aggressor to occupy territories and induce the international community to assume the responsibilities for that aggression—political, economic and financial responsibilities—when logically and under the principles of international law it is obvious that the aggressor must assume the responsibility for the results of his aggression, whether these responsibilities are political, economic or financial.

325. For all those reasons, and for others already explained in the Fifth Committee, we cannot participate in the vote on the draft resolution now before the Assembly.

326 Mr. KANE (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): The report which the Secretary-General has submitted to the General Assembly [A/S-8/3], in accordance with the provisions of Assembly resolution 32/214, is without any doubt a cause for additional concern by our Organization.

327. The burden imposed on the United Nations by the Zionist State's invasion of Lebanese territory and the political and other repercussions of that invasion on the Middle East and the world cannot but cause legitimate concern to the international community. Thus, once again our Organization and the international community are confronted by a fait accompli by the Zionist State in Tel Aviv. But those who have followed and continue to follow the situation in the Middle East and those who are familiar with the Tel Aviv Zionists find nothing at all surprising in Israel's invasion of southern Lebanon and the unprecedented genocide perpetrated by the Israeli army.

328. Indeed, for more than a generation now, invasion and occupation of Arab territories and extermination of the Palestinian people have been—as they continue to be—basic objectives of Israeli policy.

329. Thus, the tragedy that befell the people of Lebanon on 14 March last is part of the faithful execution of the Zionist plan, whose purpose is periodically to distract the international community's attention from the essential questions of the Middle East. Why have the Israeli leaders such an attitude and why has the Zionist State chosen to extract such a heavy price from—this time—the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples? Because for almost a year now, Israel has found itself totally isolated from the rest of the international community. During the discussions at the Security Council series of meetings that began on 17 March—discussions during which the few friends that Israel still has showed their disagreement with the Tel Aviv Zionists by proposing the adoption of the draft resolution that became Council resolution 425 (1978)—that isolation became obvious to everyone. For the Israelis, the scope of their aggression must always be in proportion to the degree of isolation of the Zionist State.

330. In fact, despite the good intentions generously attributed to the team now in power in Israel, the racist and colonialist nature of Zionism cannot but find it hard to put up with a solution safeguarding the interests of all the parties to the Middle East conflict. That is why, despite the optimistic statements made from time to time by Israeli leaders, the nature of the Middle East problem has not changed in its essence.

331. How can it be otherwise when the very existence of the Palestinian people, who represent the most essential element in the Middle East conflict, is ignored by the Zionists? It is because the Zionists wish by all means to divorce the problems of the Middle East from their true context by discounting the Palestinian people that they planned and executed the invasion of southern Lebanon, for the sole purpose of exterminating those Palestinians who chose to pursue the struggle for liberation with the support of Arab peoples and the international community.

332. But Israel was wrong once again in thinking that it could end Palestinian resistance by invading Lebanon and indiscriminately massacring women, children and the elderly with its aircraft and armoured vehicles. The genocide committed by the Zionist State in Lebanon against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples, far from serving the objective of the Zionists, has only further isolated Israel at the international level. Proof of this total isolation are the unambiguous condemnations of Israeli policy by the only Power which still supports the Zionist State; another proof of this isolation is resolution 425 (1978), which the Security Council adopted unanimously and which was actually sponsored by the friends of the Zionist State.

333. That resolution calls for full respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. Furthermore, that resolution calls upon Israel, the aggressor country, to cease forthwith its military action against the territorial integrity of Lebanon and to withdraw without delay its forces from all Lebanese territory. To those who know the comfortable situation of the Zionist leaders in North America and the impact of the policy of Israeli leaders in this part of the world, resolution 425 (1978) no doubt represents a warning and the failure of Israeli policy.

334. Despite the fabulous sums spent by Zionist lobbies in order to orchestrate a noisy publicity favourable to international Zionism, the world will from now on understand that Israeli Zionism is but the immoral use of religion for purposes of occupation and colonialist and racist exploitation. Whatever the resources the Zionists put to use, they will never be able to dull the fighting spirit of the Palestinian people and of the Arab peoples, their capacity to resist. The Palestinian people has for its part once more demonstrated that during the recent Israeli aggression against Lebanon. Despite the immense resources used by the Zionist State, the Palestinian people continued struggling to the end, preferring thus to defend its dignity by force of arms.

335. The aggression against Lebanon, by imposing innumerable sacrifices on the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples, requires our Organization to take additional measures to preserve peace and security in the Middle East and, thereby to avert a world-wide conflict, which could only be catastrophic for all mankind. We know that Israeli tactics entail the maintenance of a security belt around the Zionist State. Israel, which cannot by itself act as the policeman of the entire Arab world, is seeking, through repeated acts of aggression such as that against Lebanon, to force the United Nations to bear the cost of the establishment of a security belt that is of benefit to the Zionist State alone.

336. The deployment of United Nations troops between the frontiers of the Zionist State and Arab States does in fact impede the movements of Palestinian forces and thus constitutes an indispensable wall of protection for the survival of Israel. Unless the Zionist State agrees to make concessions with a view to a settlement of the problem of the Middle East, the United Nations should no longer assist Israel, an aggressor country, to enjoy with impunity the fruits of its aggression. UNIFIL indeed constitutes a further link graciously offered by the United Nations in the chain to protect the Zionist State. When my country in the past voted in favour of resolutions establishing United Nations forces in the Middle East, it was not so that those forces would serve as permanent frontiers but rather so that their presence would promote a speedy settlement in the Middle East based on justice and law.

337. Despite the establishment of UNEF and UNDOF, it does not appear that a start has been made in the settlement of the situation in the Middle East in a manner that would meet the aspirations and concerns of all the parties to the conflict. Far from responding to the wishes of the international community, and despite the goodwill of the Arab peoples, Israel still persists in its arrogance, not only creating settlements in Arab territories but also perpetrating new acts of aggression. The Israeli aggression of 14 March against Lebanon is an eloquent example of the behaviour of the Zionist State.

338. Once again the United Nations has decided to establish an interim force, this time in Lebanon to watch over peace and security in that part of the Middle East. My country is voting in favour of the draft resolution concerning this force because the Security Council has demanded the withdrawal of the Zionist troops from Lebanon and the replacement of those troops by United Nations forces and because the Security Council wishes to assist the Lebanese Government to restore its authority in the region affected by the Zionist aggression. My country hopes that before the mandate of the force expires the situation which existed prior to the Zionist aggression will have been restored and that the Lebanese people will have regained effective control over its territory. Should these conditions not be met, a catastrophic future can be predicted not only for the Middle East but also for mankind as a whole if Israel should commit a new act of aggression against the Arab peoples.

339. Before concluding, I should like to pay a well-deserved tribute to the countries which have sent contingents to southern Lebanon. I am convinced that the courage and determination of the United Nations forces in Lebanon will ensure a speedy solution with respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon as well as the legitimate right of the Palestinian people to continue its struggle for the liberation of its homeland, which was usurped by Zionism.

340. I should also like to pay a well-deserved tribute to our Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, for his tireless efforts to find a solution based on law in the conflict in the Middle East.

341. The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the voting.

342. Before proceeding to the vote, I wish to inform the Assembly that the Government of Haiti has advised us that it has dispatched the necessary funds that will ensure that the provisions of Article 19 of the Charter no longer apply to it.

343. I now invite representatives to turn their attention to the draft resolution recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 11 of its report [A/S-8/9]. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

The draft resolution was adopted by 99 votes to 14 (resolution S-8/2).²⁰

344. Mr. DOLGUCHITS (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Together with all countries of the socialist community the Byelorussian SSR has always been in favour of the total liquidation of the consequences of Israeli aggression and the establishment of a just and lasting peace for all countries and peoples of the Middle East, and against imperialist interference in the internal affairs of Arab countries. If until now the situation in the Middle East has remained extremely serious and fraught with numerous dangers, the entire responsibility for that lies with the ruling circles of Israel and their protectors.

345. We have long known that those who like international adventures and oppose international détente have an urgent need for this kind of smouldering hotbed of new conflicts and wars in order to pursue their policy of aggression and expansion. The tragic events which took

²⁰ Subsequently the delegations of Colombia, Mexico and Sierra Leone informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

place a month ago in the Middle East were a further striking proof of this. On the hackneyed pretext of looking after its own security the Israeli military has perpetrated a new act of naked aggression, this time against another sovereign Arab State Member of the United Nations, and has occupied the southern part of Lebanon.

346. Why did Israel decide to undertake such a major military operation against a neighbouring independent country? Why did it overlook the inevitable broad wave of protest which would ensue? Why did it not consider the possibility of being faced with extremely serious consequences? First and foremost this was because this new adventure was undertaken with the knowledge of those who protect Israel. Israel would have been unable to carry out the large-scale invasion of a sovereign Arab country if it had not taken into account the situation which has been engendered by the policy of capitulation and separate Egyptian-Israeli talks.

347. The impudent provocation by the Israeli military has quite obviously given the lie to the totally false statement made by the leaders of Israel regarding their desire to bring about a peaceful settlement of the explosive situation in the Middle East and has unmasked the expansionist plans they have long been hatching to redraw the political map of that part of the world to their own advantage.

348. As a result of this further act of aggression, the Arab people of Palestine, which has been expelled from its native land, has once again been subjected to unprecedented violence by the Israeli military and its imperialist protectors. That violence has not only been extended to those who are defending with weapons in hand their own legitimate national rights but has been levelled first and foremost against defenceless old people, women and children. This is how the practice of genocide, sanctioned by legislation just beforehand, has been carried out. As the Assembly knows, before the beginning of the armed raid on Lebanon the Israeli Knesset adopted a resolution calling for a merciless struggle against the Palestine Liberation Organization and the physical annihilation of its leaders.

349. A month has passed since the Security Council took its decision that the Israeli troops be withdrawn immediately from all Lebanese territory. However, Israel continues to ignore that resolution and to indulge in multifarious attempts to obstruct the movements of the United Nations armed forces and prevent them from carrying out their mission. By deliberately protracting the withdrawal of its army, the incorrigible aggressor has openly thrown down the gauntlet to the entire international community and is trying by all available means to continue its occupation and impose its own political conditions on the Arabs.

350. The Byelorussian SSR, together with all countries of the socialist community and other States which are genuinely concerned to bring about a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, has consistently and resolutely supported an immediate, comprehensive and radical political settlement of the conflict in that region which takes account of all aspects of the problem. We are profoundly convinced that such a solution of the problem can only be achieved on the basis of the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories which were occupied in 1967; the guar-

antee of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including its right to self-determination and to create its own State; the guarantee of the right to independent existence and security for all States which are directly concerned in the conflict; and the ending of the state of war between the Arab countries concerned and Israel.

351. Such an approach to the settlement of the protracted conflict in the Middle East has received the full approval and support of an absolute majority of the Member States of the United Nations and this has been shown by the specific fundamental decisions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly.

352. The present discussion provides further proof that the time has long been ripe for the ending of the unprincipled political manoeuvres, which are a danger to the interests of Arabs in the Middle East, and for rechanneling the settlement of this problem to the Geneva Peace Conference. This approach would be in accordance with the interests of the peoples of that area and would constitute a major contribution to improving the international climate.

353. As regards the sending of United Nations forces to Lebanese territory on a decision of the Security Council in accordance with the request of the Government of Lebanon, my delegation believes that their presence should in no way infringe the sovereign rights of the Government of Lebanon and that full account should be taken of the responsibility of Israel, as the aggressor, for the acts it has committed. It is therefore essential that all the expenses consequent upon this new Israeli aggression against Lebanon, including the cost of maintaining the United Nations troop operations in southern Lebanon, should be borne by the aggressor—in this particular case Israel.

354. In view of our firm adherence to this position, my delegation would not wish to participate in the expenses involved in sending United Nations troops to Lebanon. We therefore voted against the resolution on this subject.

355. At the same time, we wish to emphasize that if part II of the operative part of that resolution had been put to a separate vote, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR would have voted in favour of it.

356. It is the duty of the United Nations to condemn this new instance of Israeli aggression as an act of international banditry. It is essential that effective steps be taken to restrain the incorrigible aggressor which has grossly violated the norms of international law and the principles of the United Nations Charter. An end must be put immediately to these aggressive actions and Israeli occupying forces must withdraw unconditionally from southern Lebanon and all other Arab territories.

Mr. N'Dong (Gabon), Vice-President, took the Chair.

357. Mr. AL-HUSSAMY (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At this late stage of our work at this special session, the Syrian delegation will not deliver a statement in the usual conventional manner but will merely assert specific points.

358. What we wish to stress is that this session is not being held merely to discuss financing, it is not being held in a political vacuum. The General Assembly is meeting today in special session because Israel has waged a new act of aggression and has occupied a new Arab territory and has expelled new Arab inhabitants from their homes and villages. The over-all context of this aggression lies in the problem of the Middle East and in the question of the deprivation of the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights.

359. What we want to stress is that Israel has already occupied Arab territories in Syria, Egypt and in the West Bank. To date it has not withdrawn from them although about 11 years have passed and dozens of resolutions have been adopted by the General Assembly. And now it has happened again. Israeli troops have not yet withdrawn from Lebanon, although over a month has passed since the adoption of Security Council resolution 425 (1978), which calls upon Israel to withdraw forthwith.

360. We do not accept any argument by Israel making the withdrawal of its troops from Lebanon contingent on the deployment of international troops, because there is nothing in resolution 425 (1978) which links the withdrawal to such a condition.

361. We appreciate the great efforts exerted by the Secretary-General in terms of implementing resolution 425 (1978); but, so far, we do not believe that Israel is seriously considering withdrawing its troops and we only find renewed procrastination, in the statements made by the responsible Israelis to the Secretary-General during his recent visit to the area.

362. The \$50 million which the United Nations is paying to defray the cost of the Interim Force covers only six months. This amount will be borne by every individual in the five continents of the world; for years, the world has been and still is bearing the burden of paying over \$1 billion every year to finance UNEF and UNDOF—expenses that are all due to acts of aggression also committed by Israel.

363. What we wish to stress is that the resolution that was just adopted produces a political vacuum, for it does not distinguish between the aggressor and the victim of aggression. We also notice that it includes Israel in the category of developing countries, contrary to fact. But, we wish to remind all representatives that Israel committed all its acts of aggression against Arab territories in Egypt, the West Bank, the Golan and Lebanon. It has all been made possible as a result of the extensive United States military and financial aid which greatly encouraged Israel to persist in its aggressive and expansionist policy in defiance of the Charter and of United Nations resolutions.

364. My delegation voted against the decision of financing UNIFIL. That was not a vote against the noble and humanitarian task undertaken by the United Nations forces to preserve peace in Lebanon. It was a vote that agrees with the stand previously taken by my delegation in terms of the financing of international forces in the area that should be borne by Israel, the aggressor.

365. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): Israel launched its aggression on Lebanon on 14 March. Originally the plan of invasion was to occupy a security belt, as it was called, along the borders.

366. The Security Council met on 18 March, and on 19 March adopted its resolution 425 (1978). The language of that resolution is clear and unequivocal in its demand for the immediate withdrawal, forthwith, of Israeli forces from all Lebanese territory.

367. It is clear that resolution 425 (1978) does not make the withdrawal of Israeli forces contingent upon the deployment of United Nations troops. The mandate of the United Nations troops is the confirmation of the Israeli withdrawal from all Lebanese territory and the restoration of Lebanon's authority thereupon.

368. The indispensability of debate on the situation in southern Lebanon arises from Israel's foot-dragging on withdrawal. The withdrawal that was completed on 14 April from a limited area of the occupied territory was a manoeuvre to whitewash the occupation and deceive world public opinion. It was merely cosmetic.

369. The invasion of Lebanon by Israel was designed to exterminate the Palestinians. After their homeland was stolen they were consigned to refugee camps not far from their homes, to live in conditions unworthy of human dignity. They were treated as subhumans, but they are being asked by the world and by the United Nations to behave as superhumans in forgetting their ancestral land and overcoming their misery.

370. Israel's aggression has proved beyond any shadow of a doubt that without the participation of the Palestinians through their legitimate representatives, the PLO, in any settlement there will be no peace. It has also proved that without the realization of the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine to self-determination and statehood there will be no peace.

371. The Secretary-General, to whom all of us are indebted for his indefatigable efforts for the implementation of resolution 425 (1978), wrote in his letter to the President of the Security Council,²¹ that the Prime Minister of Israel had assured him of the firm intention of Israel to withdraw completely from Lebanese territory. But Israel failed to submit a time-table for the withdrawal of its forces. It promised that it would withdraw in the near future. That means that Israel wants to exact a price for its invasion of Lebanon. It wants to obtain a reward for its aggression. This is intolerable. It is in violation of resolution 425 (1978) as well as of the United Nations Charter.

372. The Israeli statements about withdrawal from Lebanese territory give rise to apprehension and suspicion. In view of the experience of the last 11 years, no one in this world is willing to entertain the luxury of giving Israel the benefit of the doubt. The Arabs, as well as Member States, are justifiably distrustful of Israel's statements on southern Lebanon. Its leaders talk about withdrawal, but there is as yet no serious withdrawal.

²¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1978*, document S/12657.

373. Security Council resolution 425 (1978) speaks unambiguously about the withdrawal “forthwith” of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory. It is indisputably clear that the withdrawal of Israeli forces is not contingent upon the full deployment of United Nations forces. It is also crystal clear that the United Nations troops’ mandate is the confirmation of the withdrawal of Israeli forces from southern Lebanon. That is the understanding of the world as well as of the United Nations.

374. The Secretary-General informed us that Prime Minister Begin had confirmed Israel’s acceptance of resolution 425 (1978). To us as Arabs, and to other Member States, such words cannot be taken at their face value.

375. Israel will drag its feet indefinitely and will manufacture excuses to remain in southern Lebanon. Even if it budges it will not do so without stringent conditions that are hard to meet. *Newsweek* confirmed that on 3 April 1978 when it reported that

“... it was not clear when the Israelis would complete their withdrawal from Lebanon, as required by last week’s United Nations resolution, but it appeared that for some time they would continue to occupy the six-mile-deep security belt they seized in their first thrust across the border.”

376. The world and the United Nations should expect unlimited manoeuvres and tricks from Israel on the issue of withdrawal, notwithstanding the clarity of resolution 425 (1978) and the assurances of Prime Minister Begin.

377. Israel, judging from the speeches of its representatives and from the statements of its leaders, has nothing but disdain for the United Nations. Therefore it is very difficult to imagine Israel’s acceptance of co-operating with the United Nations forces in southern Lebanon. It is also hard to believe that Premier Begin, fanatic and terrorist that he is, will make a sudden about-face turn in favour of co-operation with United Nations troops.

378. So far there has not been full implementation of resolution 425 (1978) by Israel. Sugar-coated statements designed to deceive world public opinion do not cut much ice with those whose fingers were burnt by past experience. In our opinion, there is no justification for Israel’s refusal to withdraw.

379. Punitive measures in the event of vacillation—as is the case now—must be applied. Velvet-glove treatment given to Israel means encouragement of its course of destructiveness and rampage in southern Lebanon. Israel gives the impression that its picnic of destruction in southern Lebanon, if not condoned, is at least not vigorously opposed by certain Western headquarters. The objection in those headquarters is not to the principle of invading Lebanon but to the intensity of the invasion and its proportions.

380. Withdrawal from southern Lebanon is not a matter for bargaining; it should be as swift as the invasion was carried out. If Member States violate the Charter so swiftly and with impunity and then are allowed to dictate the terms for their withdrawal, what is left of the United Nations Charter? Would that not be a come-down to the

law of the jungle in which brawn rather than brains prevail?

381. General Dayan, Foreign Minister of Israel, recently complained in a letter sent to the Secretary-General on 14 April of terrorism by the PLO. The issue of terrorism has become a worn-out argument. The man who is at the helm in Israel is the most notorious terrorist of this century—so much so that he was included in the list of those wanted by the British Government.

382. The representative of Israel spoke earlier about terrorism. Obviously, Israel barks up the wrong tree. For Begin to talk about Palestinian terrorism is *chutzpah*. That is the same terminology terrorist Begin used to describe the Foreign Minister of Egypt when the latter called for Israeli withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem. *Chutzpah* means excessive effrontery, temerity. “Effrontery” in English idiom means “crust”; in Arabic it means *wakaha*. It is an unquestionable *chutzpah* or *wakaha* to listen to the representative of Israel speaking about terrorism. The massively destructive invasion of Lebanon with the most sophisticated American weapons is the highest form of terrorism.

383. The death and maiming of thousands of innocent civilians in Lebanon was not a pleasant visit to the Ringling Brothers Circus in Madison Square Garden but was an unforgivable and unpardonable act of terrorism—the thing that the representative of Israel so sanctimoniously and innocently complains about. That is *chutzpah*; that is excessive *wakaha*; that is clumsy temerity. So much for terrorism. We mean business here. We want the United Nations to take responsibility for implementing its resolution. Those who want to handle Israel’s impudence and defiance of the United Nations with kid gloves must bear the responsibility for future events.

384. We must remember that in 1967 Levi Eshkol, the then Prime Minister, said at that time that Israel did not want an inch of Arab land. That statement turned out to mean that Israel would not withdraw one inch from Arab land.

385. Defence Minister Weizman said recently that Israel’s forces did not intend to stay in Lebanon a minute longer than necessary. But did Mr. Eshkol not say the same in 1967? Who can take Mr. Weizman’s statement seriously?

386. In an interview with the *Jerusalem Post* on 31 March 1978, General Gur, the then Chief of Staff, said:

“Israel had been prompted to move from the original line, 10 kilometres deep in Lebanon, to the banks of the Litani because of America’s premature and hasty action in the United Nations demanding a Security Council resolution and the deployment of a United Nations force in the area . . .

“Because the United States had acted before that process had started, the Government of Israel and the [Israeli Defence Force] IDF formulated a second stage, which took the army to the banks of the Litani—a move which ensured that any United Nations Force entering the region would be deployed at positions most advantageous to Israel.”

387. That shows how Israel reacted to Security Council resolution 425 (1978). It also shows how it treats its benefactor, without whose assistance it cannot survive. In those circumstances, the Security Council cannot shun its responsibility. It is well defined in resolution 425 (1978). The withdrawal of Israel's troops from Lebanon is a *sine qua non* for the prevalence of tranquillity. Israel's tactic is to filibuster, find excuses to prolong its occupation of southern Lebanon.

388. First and foremost the Security Council must now demand anew instant Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon.

389. Secondly, in the event of procrastination and delay, the Council must invoke Chapter VII of the Charter whereby mandatory sanctions are applied. No one expects Israel, whose record of disrespect of United Nations resolutions even flutters the doves, to withdraw its forces if such a demand is not combined with the application of punitive and drastic measures. As is its habit, Israel banks on the support of some Member States to save it from the application of sanctions; but there is a limit to patience, after which that patience becomes a sinful behaviour. The world has already reached that limit.

390. Mr. MEDANI (Sudan): More than 40 days have elapsed since the Security Council demanded an immediate Israeli withdrawal from the southern part of Lebanon. Yet there is no sign of a genuine response on Israel's part. On the contrary, Israel continues its illegal occupation of the territory of a State Member of the United Nations and is arrogantly trying to dictate its own terms for withdrawal and thereby imposing its will on the international community by claiming that the United Nations troops are not adequate to give security to Israel. Such a state of affairs constitutes a serious precedent in the United Nations and should be strongly challenged by the international community.

391. The Israeli invasion has already caused extremely considerable damage to property and inflicted considerable loss of life among the innocent Lebanese and Palestinian peoples, with absolutely no regard for civilized and human norms of life.

392. As *The New York Times* asserted,

“... no one knows how many Lebanese and Palestinian civilians died when Israeli forces devastated much of south Lebanon, but the estimates range up to several thousands. Thousands more fled to avoid the same fate.”

393. It is now becoming more and more obvious that Israel has elevated terror to the level of State policy and State terrorism. Its recent cruel invasion by air, land and sea, using American-made cluster bombs, was not only dictated by its age-old design of occupying southern Lebanon, but, more importantly, was aimed at destroying the Palestinian resistance and completely annihilating the Palestinian people. This last was made evident by the fact that though Israel failed to defeat the heroic Palestinian fighters, its troops destroyed peaceful villages and murdered thousands of men, women and children.

394. Again, as *The New York Times* affirmed in its editorial of last week,

“The results hardly represent an Israeli victory, nor is it likely that Israel is any more secure now against”—what the newspaper called—“Palestinian terror.”

395. The false and malicious arguments of security advocated by Israel in an attempt to justify its gross violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter and international law have now been rejected by the whole international community, which has affirmed that security can never be achieved by expansionism and the occupation of land.

396. Now, even in Israel itself, an important section of the population has already maintained that peace is more important than a “greater Israel”.

397. The territorial integrity of Lebanon is of paramount and fundamental importance. This Assembly and the Security Council should see to it that Israel immediately—and I repeat: immediately—withdraws all its invading troops in accordance with Security Council resolution 425 (1978) before the Begin Government finds a new biblical name for that land.

398. We also appeal to the General Assembly at this special session to call on the Security Council to shoulder its responsibility in implementing that resolution in order to avoid an extremely dangerous situation in what is already an area of tension.

399. Furthermore, as the whole world is now aware, to avoid conflict in that important part of the world, a comprehensive settlement should include the recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the establishment of their own State, under the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinians.

400. The Israeli representative stated today that this Assembly should not be discussing the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, but should have confined itself to the agenda item, which is the financing of the United Nations troops in Lebanon—as if concealed behind those phrases was the idea that it is the duty of the United Nations to finance successive Israeli aggressions and invasions against every Arab land.

401. The objective of the United Nations, as enshrined in the Charter, is the maintenance of peace and, essentially, the prevention of the acquisition of territory by force. No Israeli arrogance or misleading statements can divert the attention of the international community from this established fact.

402. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (*interpretation from French*): As you know, my country associated itself with the decision taken by the Security Council on 19 March to set up UNIFIL. We did so, above all, in response to the desire of the Government of that country. Undoubtedly, France was thus underlining the importance which it attaches to peace-keeping operations, which are one of the Council's most effective means of action. But, at the same

time, we also wish to emphasize the particular interest which we have in Lebanon, in its independence, its sovereignty and its territorial integrity. France also wished to assure the sorely tried people of Lebanon that they were not alone and that they would not lose the sympathy of the French people. As President Giscard d'Estaing emphasized in his message of 22 March addressed to President Sarkis, the presence of a blue-helmeted French contingent is proof of our concern for and interest in the fate of the Lebanese people.

403. The dispatch of a United Nations Force to southern Lebanon is, in the opinion of the French Government, a significant step to promote the restoration of peace and security to that area, and therefore a means of facilitating the pursuit of peace negotiations among all parties concerned in order to bring about an over-all, just and lasting settlement to the Middle East conflict.

404. In making a contingent available to the Force, our sole purpose was to contribute directly to the implementation of Security Council resolution 425 (1978), that is to the immediate and complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from the entire Lebanese territory and the restoration of the effective authority of the Lebanese Government in that area. To that end, the Force will have to act in conformity with the mandate which was defined by the Secretary-General in his report and approved by the Security Council in resolution 426 (1978). It is important that its sphere of operations be clearly defined as being to the south of the Litani. In this connexion, I wish to recall that our contingent, like all other components of UNIFIL, in accordance with the normal practice concerning international peace-keeping forces, is under the exclusive orders of the Commander-in-chief of the Force, who is, as you know, in turn under United Nations command, which is vested in the Secretary-General under the authority of the Security Council. Its mission is therefore clearly defined; it should not be subject to any interpretations or any doubt.

405. The particularly delicate nature of the mission assigned to the Interim Force is quite obvious. In order to carry out this mission the Force will certainly require the constant confidence and support of the Security Council, as emphasized in the Secretary-General's report of 19 March. But it should also have sufficient manpower and matériel to ensure the performance of its mission. It is in order to meet that need that the General Assembly meets today, pursuant to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 32/214 and as a result of the Security Council's decision in resolution 426 (1978), to arrange for the Force's financing according to Article 17 of the Charter, which stipulates, I might recall, that the expenses of the Organization shall be borne by the Members.

406. The total sum proposed for maintenance of the Force has been given serious study. It could be reduced to a total figure of \$54 million for the period 18 March to 18 September, thanks to voluntary contributions made by a number of Member States, including my own.

407. With respect to the apportionment among the various categories of Member States of the financial burden to be defrayed by the United Nations, we were guided in this by precedents already established in financing the Sinai and

Golan forces. The same system of apportionment was adopted in the draft resolution on which we have just voted.

408. Having constituted and set in motion a new peace-keeping force in the Middle East, the international community has embarked upon a particularly important effort for the future of Lebanon. It will be up to the Security Council and the Secretary-General to do everything possible to ensure the success of the mission which has thus been given to the Force, because any failure would have the most serious consequences, not only regarding stability in that area and efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement, but also for the credibility of the United Nations with respect to peace-keeping operations.

409. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): It was not essential to wait for the holding of this special session of the General Assembly to realize the President's qualifications, wisdom and dedication, nor to recall the high esteem in which Algeria holds his country. I should therefore like to express my satisfaction as well as that of my delegation at having him preside over this eighth special session at a time when the international community is once again faced with a new act of aggression on the part of Israel.

410. The Zionist aggressor has attacked Lebanon and the Palestinian people, mobilizing the most powerful means provided through considerable external assistance. Such audacity, based on impunity and arrogance, has found admirers who have not even had the decency to keep silent about their satisfaction, despite so many new victims and further destruction which add to the account of the criminal policy of Israel.

411. Nevertheless, that attitude of defiance of international law and scorn for decisions of our Organization is a serious threat to the international order. It creates situations which in every respect resemble those which in the past brought about world-wide conflicts. It is indeed surprising that some States have tolerated and even endorsed the acquisition by force by Arab territories. But it is even more immoral that ill-disguised support is lent to the terrorism committed by Israel in a new attack against Lebanon, whose will for peace need not be proven. Lebanon, a brother country, has again been attacked by the Zionists because the Lebanese people and their leaders have always worked for the Arab cause, because they have always been side by side with the Palestinian people, to which they lend unswerving support in the defence of their national rights. Algeria wishes to repeat to Lebanon its fraternal solidarity, which will always exist since Algeria and Lebanon share the same hopes, ideals and concerns, faced with the threats of the expansionism of Israel, which geographical chance and the complicity of some States have established by force in the region at the gates of a peaceful Lebanon.

412. It would be a mistake to think that the problem before us today at this special session should be limited to the financial implications relating to the sending of an emergency force of the United Nations to southern Lebanon. It also involves the deliberate violation of the sovereignty of a State Member of our Organization. It

relates to the use by a Member of the United Nations of its armed forces for a terrorist action; it is a serious breach of the principles of international law; and, above all, it is Israeli expansionism which step by step intends to occupy the territories of neighbouring Arab States, alleging that that is a measure called for by its security needs.

413. The Security Council acted promptly to end the aggression against a State Member of the United Nations. In fact, in its resolution 425 (1978) it called upon Israel immediately to cease its military action against Lebanese territorial integrity and withdraw forthwith its forces from all Lebanese territory.

414. But at this very moment the Lebanese and Palestinian people continue to be exposed to the aggressiveness of Israel, since the Zionists continue to occupy southern Lebanon and attempt to remain on a permanent basis. That behaviour on the part of Israel reminds us of the time-honoured methods which had been used so many times by colonial Powers to occupy the territory of others.

415. It is not a new situation; it has always been brought about by the periodic aggressions of Israel in the region, acts of aggression which should be placed in the context of a policy of expansionism which we have constantly denounced. Israeli intervention in southern Lebanon should be condemned not only because it is committed against a sovereign country, but also because of its attempt to destroy the national identity of the Palestinian people, which has rights to assert and which refuses to resign itself to a fate that it does not accept. Israel, which was established by force in the Middle East, in the midst of peoples which had but recently acceded to independence, wishes to enjoy the fruits of its aggression. The United Nations must constrain the Zionist aggressor to withdraw unconditionally from southern Lebanon, because its presence there is one of the most serious dangers threatening international peace. There will be neither peace nor stability in the Middle East without the strict implementation of all relevant resolutions of the United Nations, and mainly those concerning the withdrawal of Israel from all occupied Arab territories and the recognition of the national rights of the Palestinian people. For the Palestinians, this is not only a liberation struggle against foreign domination to recover homeland taken away from them, but a struggle for their survival as a people. It is utopian to believe that Israeli terrorism, which has not hesitated to use cluster bombs, will break the determination of the Palestinians. On the contrary, their resolve will only be strengthened. For the military power of Israel may delay the realization of the objectives of the Palestinian people, but it will never succeed in wearing down its resistance.

416. The United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon was set up for six months, and it must not be renewed beyond that period; otherwise it would represent a supplementary action to aggression. Furthermore, UNIFIL should not be an instrument entrusted with police operations on behalf of the Zionist aggressor.

417. Some Members of the United Nations bear a heavy responsibility in the situation which has prevailed in the Middle East since 1947 because, at that time, wishing to ease their conscience, they did an inexcusable injustice to

the Palestinian people which, since then, has been living in exile and, as if that were not sufficient, has been subjected to a true policy of extermination by the Zionist-racist entity. To this day, because of the complacency of those same States, the United Nations has been unable to redress that injustice, despite the many resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

418. Since 1948, the cost of the various United Nations peace-keeping operations in the Middle East made necessary by repeated acts of aggression by Israel against the neighbouring Arab States has been more than \$700 million. We must note that these operations have not led to a lasting peace on the basis of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

419. Thus, it is high time that the United Nations and, above all, the principal Powers that protect the Zionist entity, became aware that peace-keeping forces cannot bring about peace so long as they serve the designs and insatiable ambitions of Israel, concealed under the false guise of security reasons.

420. It is in fact a paradox to see these forces stationed in the Arab territories occupied as a result of repeated acts of aggression, when they should be serving the purpose of preventing aggression, putting an end to occupation and guaranteeing the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including its right of return, its right to self-determination and its right to the establishment of an independent State on its national territory—rights which, moreover, have been recognized by the international community and reaffirmed by the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity and the non-aligned countries.

421. Mrs. HYDER (Pakistan): It is indeed appropriate for the General Assembly to have this opportunity to express its views on a matter of outstanding importance—namely, the Israeli aggression against Lebanon in total disregard and open defiance of the principles of the United Nations Charter. My delegation would like to take this opportunity to commend the members of the Security Council for the swiftness with which they acted and adopted resolution 425 (1978), calling for strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within the internationally recognized boundaries, and for the immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Lebanese territory.

422. The speed and efficiency with which the Secretary-General and his staff were able to set up UNIFIL and to move into the area with advance contingents, in a matter of days, deserve the Assembly's warm commendation. Our appreciation must also be placed on record for the manner in which a number of countries, especially Canada, France, Iran, Nepal, Norway and Sweden, responded to the Secretary-General's call by sending their contingents to Lebanon in a relatively short time. I should like to take this opportunity to express my delegation's whole-hearted support for the Secretary-General's continuing efforts to add further units to the contingents that are already available, in order to reach the projected strength of the Force at the earliest possible date.

423. The full dimensions of the tragedy that befell Lebanon last month have now become known to all of us.

Not only have scores of thousands of civilians, including women and children, been turned into refugees in their own country, but whole towns and villages have been destroyed, not to mention refugee camps of Palestinians who were already seeking refuge from previous acts of Israeli aggression. Thousands of civilians have been killed or maimed for life. A large part of southern Lebanon has been laid waste in a fashion reminiscent of the cruelest instances of massive bombardments of past wars. The territory occupied in southern Lebanon is, in fact, much greater than what was under Israeli occupation when the Security Council adopted resolution 425 (1978), calling for an immediate cease-fire and Israeli withdrawal. Inevitably, in accordance with a pattern with which we have become all too familiar, Israeli forces are using every device and contrivance to delay withdrawal and to resist the implementation of the Security Council's decision.

424. The affinities and sympathies which the people of my country have for the people of Lebanon and of the Middle East exacerbate the deep pain and anguish we feel at the brutal manner in which Israel has violated the territorial integrity of Lebanon and indiscriminately killed, maimed and uprooted its people. Territorial integrity and political independence of all States is one of the key principles on which the structure of the United Nations was erected. Israel has once again violated this principle in a most blatant manner and in total disregard for world opinion. The international community cannot and must not condone such violations in any circumstances. Otherwise it would create still another dangerous precedent which would be a source of encouragement to all would-be aggressors.

425. Article 51 of the Charter is certainly not to be used as a pretext by any State to do as it likes with the territorial integrity of its neighbours. Any perverse interpretation of these principles would pose the most serious threat to the very foundations of this Organization and the peace and security of the whole world.

426. Security Council resolution 425 (1978) called upon Israel "immediately to cease its military action against Lebanese territorial integrity and withdraw forthwith its forces from all Lebanese territory". It is already more than a month since that decision was taken, but Israeli forces have not withdrawn from Lebanese territory. The call for Israeli withdrawal was unconditional, and imposition of any condition would be a clear violation of that resolution. It is therefore, we feel, the duty of all of us to use the means at our disposal to put an end to this aggression. We are encouraged by the extent to which this feeling is now shared among Member States from all parts of the globe.

The President resumed the Chair.

427. The overriding objective of the Assembly must be to play its part in achieving a just and lasting settlement of the central issues that have been the cause of so much conflict and suffering in the Middle East. As long as Israel continues to violate the basic principles of the Charter and to defy the decisions of the United Nations, as long as Israel persists in denying to the people of Palestine their legitimate and inalienable rights to exist as a nation, a just and lasting peace in the area will continue to elude us. Israel's security

cannot be ensured by its occupation of its neighbours' territories; nor can Israel's attempts to annihilate the rights and the very identity of the Palestinian people—who number in the millions—contribute to a just peace. Israel today enjoys considerable military advantages because of the limitless resources available to it. However, the force of arms cannot be assumed to give Israel an upper hand over its neighbours for ever. Security does not lie in the use or threat of force. The security of Israel and all its neighbours lies in the achievement of a comprehensive settlement based on United Nations resolutions and the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

428. The great opportunity for a just peace in the Middle East is there for all to see. So far the leadership of Israel has done nothing to seize it. Instead it has done everything possible to poison the atmosphere and to undermine and obstruct the initiative taken by its largest neighbour, Egypt. The aggression against Lebanon and the continuing occupation of its territory are indeed one such attempt.

429. The situation calls for concerted action on the part of the international community. It calls for a renewed expression of its will to see that justice is done in the Middle East and a permanent and just peace is established. It calls for the elimination of the basic causes of the conflict, for the immediate vacation of all occupied territories and, above all, for the restoration to the disinherited people of Palestine of their legitimate right to live as a sovereign nation with their own territory.

430. Pakistan has consistently supported the efforts of the Security Council and the General Assembly to bring about a just peace in the Middle East. In that spirit, we wish once again to express our support for the resolution on the financing of UNIFIL, just adopted by the General Assembly. We voted in favour of that resolution.

431. Mr YOUNG (United States of America): One month has now passed since the Security Council adopted resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) with the objective of restoring peace and security to Lebanon at a critical moment in its history. An extraordinary amount of activity has occurred since then, with a large number of actors taking part, all of it directed to establishing conditions that will enable the Lebanese Government to restore stability and peace to the area. As we meet in this special session to develop sound financial arrangements for UNIFIL, it is worth while to take stock briefly of where we are and what we have done in the past month.

432. More than 2,500 United Nations troops from six countries are on the ground in southern Lebanon, with many more to come in the weeks ahead. We are pleased that the Secretary-General expects that the full 4,000 foreseen on 19 March will be deployed by the end of April. Those United Nations contingents already in place, under smooth and effective command arrangements, are carrying out the responsibilities assigned to them under the mandate prepared by the Secretary-General and approved by the Security Council. The speed and efficiency with which UNIFIL has been set up is the result of close co-operation between those determined to see this important peace-keeping operation succeed. We note that both the Lebanese and the Israeli Government have co-operated most closely

with UNIFIL. The Secretary-General and his able staff in New York have continued the tradition of high dedication and effectiveness that has marked their conduct in previous peace-keeping operations. The Governments that have contributed contingents to UNIFIL have often made sacrifices and suffered inconveniences in order to send troops and equipment in the shortest possible time. Other countries, including my own, have contributed airlift and other services in order that this operation may succeed. Perhaps most important is that all concerned in the Middle East have accepted Security Council resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) and have committed themselves to cooperate fully with UNIFIL.

433 As members of this Assembly are aware, there are several important elements in resolution 425 (1978), which was introduced by my Government. The United States is deeply committed to the full implementation of all elements of the resolution. In paragraph 1 of resolution 425 (1978) the Security Council "calls for strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries". There is no doubt that the Lebanese Government, with the assistance of UNIFIL, is determined to reassert its effective authority in the south. We must all do what we can to lend support in this process.

434. In paragraph 2 of resolution 425 (1978) the Council "calls upon Israel immediately to cease its military action against Lebanese territorial integrity and withdraw forthwith its forces from all Lebanese territory". This is an unambiguous statement, and my Government is gratified that Prime Minister Begin has stated that Israel accepts resolution 425 (1978) in all its parts and will comply with it. Israel has withdrawn some of its armed forces from Lebanon and indicated to the Secretary-General that by 30 April it will have withdrawn from approximately 65 per cent of the territory that it occupied. My Government expects that Israel will, in conformity with Prime Minister Begin's commitment, rapidly complete the full withdrawal of its forces from all Lebanese territory.

435. Paragraph 3 of the resolution, which takes the decision to establish UNIFIL, states that one of the three purposes of the force is "restoring international peace and security". It is of course essential to the achievement of this purpose that there be no repetition of the circumstances that initiated the most recent cycle of violence in the Middle East. Here too there is reason to hope that efforts to bring peace to the Middle East are nearer to success than they were a month ago.

436. The United Nations has in a remarkably short time restored peace—a fragile and precarious peace, to be sure, but nevertheless peace—in an extraordinarily difficult and unstable situation. Certainly problems remain to be worked out. However, they are being faced in a spirit of goodwill by all concerned and are far from insurmountable. At this special session the General Assembly has carried out its responsibilities in an equally constructive spirit and acted without delay to provide for the financing of UNIFIL in an equitable and businesslike manner.

437. We are also extremely gratified that you, Mr. President, and the General Assembly staff have maintained your

high level of efficiency and provided us with the leadership and diplomatic skill to end this potentially difficult session in the two days allotted.

438. Mr. FUTSCHER PEREIRA (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): Portugal was one of the sponsors of the resolution which has just been adopted by the General Assembly, and there is therefore no need to mention here the technical and financial reasons which prompted us to support it.

439. This special session was convened in order to ensure the financing of UNIFIL and its objective was to determine the sums required to maintain this peace-keeping force and the criteria to be observed in apportioning the expenses equitably among all Member States. We can therefore be pleased at the positive results which have been achieved.

440. Despite these results, the importance of which need not be underlined, it is essential that we bear in mind that the approval of a formula for the financing of a peace-keeping operation only represents the creation of a means—undoubtedly a necessary one, but one which is unfortunately inadequate by itself—to resolve the problem which, in the final analysis, led to the convening of the present session.

441. This problem—the true fundamental problem—is that of ensuring, as soon as possible, the complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from the territory of Lebanon which they invaded and occupied, the re-establishment of peace and security in the area and, finally, the restoration of the authority and complete sovereignty of Lebanon over its entire national territory.

442. In this context I should like here, on behalf of my Government, to express sentiments of solidarity with Lebanon—a country to which we have always been linked by particularly friendly relations—and with its people by voicing the heartfelt wish that in the near future it may once again live in peace and be free, like all the other peoples of the Middle East, within secure, recognized and respected frontiers.

443. Undoubtedly UNIFIL will not be able to bring this about. At best they will be able to make it possible to avoid the continuance of hostile acts and a war-like situation. But peace should not be confused with the absence of war; peace presupposes a constructive effort on the part of all the political forces engaged in this conflict to establish an open and frank dialogue capable of leading to a global solution of the problem.

444. At the present moment the hope that this dialogue will continue and be reinforced is based essentially on the withdrawal of the Israeli troops from Lebanese territory and the restoration of Lebanese sovereignty. This will be only one step towards the re-establishment of the hopeful atmosphere established recently by the courageous initiative of Egypt in an effort to defuse the situation. But it is essential that Israel take this step without delay because we cannot ask the community of nations to continue to make sacrifices to maintain peace-keeping forces in Lebanon, on the Golan Heights and in Sinai except in so far as the prospects of peace, however fragile, can thereby be improved and not constantly frustrated.

445. Mr. HRCKA (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): My Government has been observing with great concern the developments in the Middle East which, as a result of the aggressive policies of Israel, is a constant source of international tension.

446. In March of this year Israel committed another act of aggression, this time against a small State Member of the United Nations, the sovereign State of Lebanon. Armed regular contingents of the Israeli army invaded Lebanese territory along the Israel-Lebanon border and struck a barbaric blow against Lebanese towns and villages causing numerous casualties among the civilian population.

447. We witnessed a far-reaching, well-thought-out and carefully prepared act of aggression which was the best possible illustration of the age-old policy of expansionism of the Israeli Government. We have seen that the conflict in the Middle East is continuing. We have seen a further attempt to remove the consequences of numerous acts of aggression by fresh aggression. Furthermore, we have today seen the aggressor dictating conditions to the United Nations. We have seen this quite clearly from the statement made by the representative of Israel.

448. By its invasion of the territory of Lebanon Israel has shown once again that its words about peace in the Middle East and coexistence with its Arab neighbours are simply empty rhetoric. Its purpose is to use violence to break down Arab resistance to the policy of Israeli aggression and attempt to crush the liberation movement as represented by the PLO, which constitutes a key factor in the continuing struggle of the Arab people of Palestine to regain their right to self-determination and to create their own State which has been wrested from them.

449. Israel is trying, from a position of force, to dictate its own conditions to the Arab countries and thus to destroy any hope of a just settlement of the crisis in that part of the world.

450. This most recent example of violence has provided the Arab people with abundant proof that separate negotiations with Israel are unrealistic and even harmful.

451. In other words, there has been complete confirmation of the position of those Governments of Arab countries which warned us against the policy of separate talks, which is used by the Israeli Government to pursue that same purpose of destroying the unity of the Arab countries and in this way to block talks on a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East between themselves and the national liberation movement of the Arab people of Palestine.

452. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has resolutely condemned this further act of aggression by Israel against an Arab country. Naturally it was our hope that the present session of the General Assembly would condemn the actions of Israel as aggressive. At the same time, we would emphasize once again that the responsibility for all the consequences which may ensue from this most recent act of aggression will be borne by the Government of Israel. As regards the specific item which is before the eighth special session of the General Assembly, it goes without saying that

we wish once again to stress the complete responsibility of Israel for the aggressive acts it has committed, and for the financial measures which result from the decisions taken by the Security Council in accordance with the United Nations Charter. For reasons of principle, we cannot support a position with regard to UNIFIL which would transfer the duty of paying for the unfortunate results of its policy from the Government of Israel to the Members of the United Nations.

453. We believe that the best way of exerting pressure on the aggressor is to make it bear the expenses involved in its aggression. My delegation therefore voted against the resolution.

454. In conclusion, I should like to take this opportunity to emphasize once again that Czechoslovakia will, of course, continue to give comprehensive assistance to the victims of Israeli aggression, as in the past.

455. Mr. SUWONDO (Indonesia): The decision which the General Assembly has taken at this special session will have wide-ranging implications for the ability of our Organization to deal with the serious threat to international peace and security which has resulted from the Israeli invasion of southern Lebanon. That invasion has constituted a grave danger to peace and security, in view of the sensitive and explosive atmosphere prevailing in the region as a result of the continued occupation by Israel of Arab territories.

456. We are happy that the Security Council managed to adopt resolution 425 (1978) without much delay. May I take this opportunity of expressing the Indonesian delegation's deep appreciation of the role the Secretary-General has played in defusing the serious situation created by the Israeli invasion. Our appreciation also goes to those Member States which have contributed contingents to the United Nations peace-keeping Force.

457. The United Nations peace-keeping operations have been the most highly publicized and in many respects the most constructive and successful of its endeavours to preserve world peace. Indonesia has long been associated with the peace-keeping operations conducted by the United Nations. Indeed, we regard such operations as efforts to fulfil one of the basic objectives of the United Nations embodied in the Charter – that is, to save mankind from the scourge of war. Indonesia's keen interest in this aspect of United Nations affairs has been demonstrated by its contribution of contingents to various United Nations peace-keeping forces on a number of occasions in the Middle East and Africa. At present Indonesia has more than 500 troops participating in the UNEF contingent stationed in the Middle East.

458. In conclusion, my delegation thinks the time has come for the United Nations to consider the entire question of peace-keeping operations and their funding so that precise guidelines can be formulated for all United Nations peace-keeping activities rather than considering them on an *ad hoc* basis, and also in view of the fact that it seems quite likely that in the near future the United Nations will again be called upon to supply peace-keeping forces.

459. We hope that the unconditional and immediate withdrawal of the Israeli forces will take place in accordance

with Security Council resolution 425 (1978). The unity and territorial integrity of Lebanon must be restored and respected.

460. Mr. FIGUEROA (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Argentina wishes to express its satisfaction with regard to the draft resolution the General Assembly has just adopted.

461. We co-sponsored the draft in the conviction that, in view of the regrettable circumstances which have inflicted new suffering for the population of the region, the least my country could do was to extend its co-operation. The Republic of Argentina is pleased to have among its inhabitants people who have come from all the nations of the Middle East, and in particular from Lebanon, a country with which we are linked by bonds of brotherhood. All bloodshed, all disturbances of the peace are felt by us as though they affected us directly, and they increase our desire for a long-awaited calm. That is why we praise the Security Council and the Secretary-General for their prompt action.

462. However, we realize that the item being discussed at this special session of the General Assembly concerns but one of the aspects of the problem, which has existed in the region for decades. As long as the parties to the conflict go to the negotiating table lacking the necessary political will to attain a just and lasting peace, as provided for in the relevant United Nations resolutions, every solution will be temporary and uncertainty will continue to reign in those nations.

463. Our Organization and its Members are reaching the limit of what can be expected of them financially and what is politically feasible. The burden we must bear after every new confrontation and every new step in the conflict is beyond all reason, yet in the meantime we see intransigence continuing to prevail over good sense.

464. For these reasons we feel that the word "interim" applied to the new force in southern Lebanon is fully justified. We firmly believe that six months is sufficient time to remove the causes which brought about its establishment. Consequently we strongly urge compliance without delay with the provisions of Security Council resolution 425 (1978).

465. For years my country has been contributing men from its armed forces to United Nations observer missions in the area. At the same time we have been active members of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations. We therefore have direct practical and political experience of the difficulties and efforts involved in setting up every new United Nations force. Despite our familiarity with these facts we continue to believe that our Organization owes it to itself and the principles for which it stands to undertake greater efforts towards better application of the provisions of the Charter in this field. In this context I wish to state our concurrence in the views expressed by the delegation of Japan yesterday morning in the Fifth Committee²² and

today in the Assembly. We share many of their opinions, and we hope they will be taken into account by the relevant United Nations bodies.

466. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): If only for one brief meeting it is proper that we should have spent some time debating the real issue with which the Assembly is confronted at this special session. The question before us is, quite evidently, not merely a financial matter, even though that aspect is in itself, as we have seen, complex, expensive and important. The real issue is the fate of a dispossessed people who from time immemorial have worked hard, peaceably and with warm attachment to the land where they were born and in which they have toiled.

467. For many years now, more years than any would wish to remember, they, the people on the spot, have from time to time been subjected to ruthless violence and indiscriminate bombing resulting in death and destruction on an enormous scale and the sorry spectacle of countless refugees living in destitution among the rubble.

468. Similarly, this Assembly, from time to time, as in this instance, has been a helpless witness to these unwelcome and unhappy episodes and has been called in to try to restore some semblance of uneasy peace only after much physical damage has been done.

469. The serious political repercussions on the prospects of peace both at the regional and the universal level are incalculable. Certainly these episodes and the intransigent attitudes demonstrated have consistently stifled all efforts at co-operation and initiatives for political rapprochement.

470. Surely it is about time that we—that is, all of us—acted on our conviction that prevention is better than cure. It is high time that we—that is, every single Member of this Organization—lived up to our responsibilities in accordance with the Charter.

471. The international consensus on the broad parameters of a peaceful solution is well known in words but remains very elusive in implementation.

472. In a joint communiqué after a recent visit to your country, Mr. President, my Prime Minister condemned energetically the latest aggression of Israel against Lebanon since it constituted a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that independent and non-aligned country and was aimed particularly at weakening the Palestine Liberation Organization, which represents an essential factor for the settlement of the crisis in the Middle East.

473. I can only repeat that Malta supports a just and lasting solution of the crisis in the Middle East on the basis of Israel's unconditional and complete withdrawal from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967 and recognition of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to a State of their own, as well as the right of all the countries of the region to independence and security. For as long as we overlook any one of these factors a balanced solution is inconceivable.

474. Let me remind the Assembly that a prescription for peace has been drawn up and has won the endorsement of

²² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighth Special Session, Fifth Committee, 1st meeting, paras. 29-34; and ibid., Sessional Fascicle, corrigendum.*

the international community. Only some few months ago the endorsement was reconfirmed in a mood of expectant hope which has now been shattered. Despite that setback we must resolutely pick up the threads again. Let us all stop politically condoning and materially abetting massive retaliation. Let us keep alive the glimmer of hope.

475. We have to demand peace that does justice to an oppressed people still seeking to achieve dignity in nationhood. We must forget violence and inflexibility and seek instead reconciliation and negotiation. Let us act urgently and in concert. As a small step in that direction, my delegation supported the draft resolution contained in the Fifth Committee's report. I join the representative of Lebanon in expressing the hope that the unanimity achieved in the Security Council heralds a new era: the end of conflict, the foundations of peace and the momentum of steady progress.

476. To those who have made a contribution to peace keeping and to our Secretary-General for his untiring efforts, we all owe a debt of sincere gratitude.

477. Mrs. UNAYDIN (Turkey): The fragile nature of peace and stability in the Middle East has once again been confirmed by the tragic events that took place in Lebanon last month. Once again we have witnessed heavy losses of human life, cruel and large-scale destruction and the plight of thousands of refugees. Turkey has deplored the eruption of new violence in the Middle East and made clear that it stigmatizes the violation of Lebanon's sovereignty and the recourse to unwarranted military action.

478. The Security Council, which convened immediately after the events, has acted with commendable speed and effectiveness. We fully support the objectives of resolution 425 (1978), which calls upon Israel immediately to cease its military action against the territorial integrity of Lebanon and to withdraw forthwith from all Lebanese territory. The Council decided also to establish a United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. In this connexion, we wish to express our deep appreciation to the Secretary-General for the successful and diligent efforts he has undertaken to organize UNIFIL.

479. We support the provisions of the resolution just adopted on the financing of UNIFIL for which we have voted. The Turkish position on the wider issue of the establishment of lasting peace in the Middle East has previously been clearly and repeatedly spelled out in several United Nations organs. It is our firm belief that there can be no peace in the area without Israeli withdrawal from all the territories occupied by it in 1967, without the fulfilment of the legitimate and inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and Statehood, and without the creation of conditions which will enable all States in the area to live within secure and recognized boundaries. It is within that general framework that we underline the necessity for strict respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon.

480. We urge Israel to comply with the Security Council resolution and to complete, without any further delay, the evacuation of Lebanese territory.

Closing statement by the President

481. The PRESIDENT: We have just concluded our work. Allow me to thank all representatives, especially the members of the Fifth Committee, for the work they have done in order to bring the eighth special session of the General Assembly to a fruitful end. In doing this we have succeeded within two days by responding to an urgent need to act speedily with the aim of safeguarding peace and security in one of the most sensitive areas of the Middle East, southern Lebanon, in adopting the indispensable decision on the financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), in pursuance of the decisions of the Security Council and of General Assembly resolution 32/214, entitled "Unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for the biennium 1978-1979".

482. Permit me to express not only my hope but also my firm conviction that, in adopting this decision, the eighth special session of the General Assembly will contribute towards an early surmounting of the dangerous consequences of the Israeli intrusion into southern Lebanon and that, in conformity with the decision of the Security Council, Israeli forces will withdraw from the entire occupied territory immediately and forthwith; moreover, that peace and security will be restored to the long-suffering people of Lebanon.

483. The General Assembly, by this special session, has fully lived up to its responsibilities and effectively discharged the task entrusted to it under the Charter for the purpose of safeguarding peace and security.

484. I should like, before closing this session, to thank members most sincerely for their meaningful co-operation which has made possible a timely and successful conclusion of the eighth special session of the General Assembly today.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Minute of silent prayer or meditation

485. The PRESIDENT: I now invite representatives to stand and observe one minute of silent prayer or meditation.

The representatives stood in silence.

Closure of the eighth special session

486. The PRESIDENT: I declare closed the eighth special session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 10 p.m.