

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR

2385th MEETING: 29 JULY 1982

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2385)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 4 June 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15162);	
(b) Letter dated 28 July 1982 from the Permanent Representatives of Egypt and France to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15316)	1

UN LIBRARY
SEP 18 1991
UN/ISA COLLECTION

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/...) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

UN DOCUMENTS
1964
1964-1965

2385th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 29 July 1982, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. Noel G. SINCLAIR (Guyana).

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2385)

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

The meeting was called to order at 4.40 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

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

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

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

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

2. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the representative of Lebanon, on whom I now call.

3. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): Preliminary consultations for the present meeting have been brief and decisive. They have enabled the Council to engage in the first phase of what promises to be a lengthy but, we hope, a productive debate, one that may pave the way for a major breakthrough in the Middle East question.

4. Yet we cannot fail to remember that you, Mr. President, have in the past weeks been conducting with admirable patience, skill and wisdom other consultations on the more specific question of the hostilities in Lebanon. More than once you were confronted with a difficult choice: either lending the Council's forum to our natural sentiments of revulsion and frustration or accepting the course of pragmatism whereby the Council would intervene only if and when it could assume an executive role in the search for peace. May I be allowed to express my delegation's sentiments of appreciation and admiration for your attitude of authority and your concern for what may become a historic responsibility in words and deeds.

5. My delegation has asked to be heard today in order to express with utmost clarity our support for the initiative of France and Egypt. We have listened carefully and with extreme interest to the representation by the representatives of two nations brought together by their common interest in international peace, the security of nations and the right of the oppressed to freedom, dignity and self-determination.

6. The Lebanese tragedy speaks for itself, and this is not a day for verbal violence. The atrocities need no description. The martyrs will be content with our constant remembrance and infinite love beyond death. As for those who suffer, their desire is not that we lament but that we work for their deliverance. May I therefore be allowed to make the following remarks which I hope the Council will accept as a constructive contribution to its deliberations.

7. First, although the draft resolution [S/15317] is presented as a comprehensive package, it should by

no means lead the Council into delaying the implementation of its resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982). Failure to agree on all the components of the package must in no way prevent the Council from acting at the appropriate time in the light of negotiations being conducted at present by parties concerned, such as those conducted at the meeting that has just been successfully concluded at Jeddah, Saudi Arabia [see S/15329, annex]. Needless to say, operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of Section A of the draft resolution will, in due course, have to be reviewed and amended in a manner that will embody or sanction the accepted results of negotiations undertaken by the American Presidential envoy, Mr. Philip Habib.

8. Secondly, a key element of the draft resolution, as we understand it and support it, is the opening phrase of operative paragraph 1 of section C, which reads as follows:

“Considers that the settlement of the Lebanese problem should contribute to the initiation of a durable restoration of peace and security in the region.”

We welcome in this paragraph a most solemn response to an appeal that we have repeatedly addressed, both to the Council and to the General Assembly, that peace in Lebanon should not and, indeed, cannot wait for the comprehensive settlement of the Middle East crisis. May we hope that recent events have proved beyond doubt that peace in Lebanon should be the beginning, not the end, and that a Lebanon restored to strength and sovereignty will itself become a major factor actively contributing to Middle East peace.

9. Thirdly, in this same perspective, we feel that the Council must be cautioned against the temptation by some parties to seek a so-called comprehensive settlement of the Middle East crisis, one which will allow for territorial, demographic, political, economic or security compensations in Lebanon or at the expense of Lebanon's national integrity. This concern, we believe, is what prompted the Governments of France and Egypt to propose operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of section A of their draft resolution, which support and solemnly confirm Lebanon's policy, clearly and unequivocally expressed in the communiqué of the Council of Ministers of 14 July 1982 [S/15300, annex]. For the sake of emphasis, it may be useful in this context to repeat the three immediate objectives stated in that document, namely, the withdrawal of Israel from all of Lebanon, the withdrawal of all non-Lebanese forces and the deployment of the Lebanese army and security forces.

10. Fourthly, Lebanon's national solidarity with the legitimate right of the Palestinians to self-determination is complemented by Lebanon's interest in the Palestinians' ability to exercise their right of return to their homeland. This we admit very candidly, since

we have often been told, with equal candour, that the Lebanese question is but a by-product of the Palestine question, “the core of the Middle East problem”.

11. Hence, the pressing concern with the cessation of hostilities must not be perceived as a licence to Israel to disperse the demilitarized PLO into the Lebanese community against the national interests of both the Palestinians and the Lebanese. Indeed, my Government wishes to draw the Council's attention to a number of official Israeli declarations that have explicitly advocated a so-called dissemination and dispersion of the Palestinians into the villages, towns and cities, under false humanitarian pretences.

12. Other Israeli declarations spoke with greater frankness of the fear that the reconstruction of Palestinian camps, particularly in southern Lebanon, will re-create the objective conditions conducive to a resurgence of Palestinian nationalism and “terrorism” that will again endanger Israel's security. If asked where the Palestinians should therefore go, we and the Palestinians have and can only have one answer: back to Palestine.

13. I should like to conclude at this stage by saying that Israel's security can be guaranteed only by peace and mutual recognition of every nation's and people's right to exist. The draft resolution before us is nothing less than a charter for such mutual recognition.

14. Being the invaded country, Lebanon can be neither insensitive to the security of others nor oblivious to the imperatives of its own security. Having been a hostage of war for years unending, may we, while expressing our appreciation to France, Egypt and our many other friends, pray before the Council that all members understand us if we insist that the question of Lebanon be addressed as such, on its own merits, solely according to the interests of the Lebanese people, and that its ultimate solution not be made contingent upon the settlement of any other question.

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

16. Mr. MAHMOOD (Pakistan): Mr. President, allow me to thank you and the other members of the Council for inviting me to address the Council during its consideration of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. We are confident that your wisdom and outstanding diplomatic skills will help the Council take the necessary decisions at this critical juncture. I also express our deep appreciation to Mr. de La Barre de Nanteuil, of France, who guided the work of the Council last month with distinction.

17. The wanton Israeli invasion of Lebanon has shocked the world and it poses the gravest danger to peace and to the hopes for a world order based on

international law and the Charter of the United Nations. The people and the Government of Pakistan have expressed in the strongest terms their condemnation of Israeli aggression against Lebanon and have reaffirmed their total solidarity with the Lebanese and Palestinian brethren.

18. Reflecting the profound concern and anguish of the people and Government of Pakistan over the serious situation in Lebanon, and with a view to securing an immediate cessation of hostilities and unconditional Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon, the President of Pakistan, General Mohammad Zia-ul-Haq, has addressed a letter to the heads of State or Government of the permanent members of the Council. I would take this opportunity to read out the text of that letter [S/15288, annex]:

"The tragic plight of the people of Lebanon in the wake of Israel's ruthless military assault on that country and the brutalities perpetrated on the besieged population of Beirut compel me to seek your personal intervention in terminating an intolerable state of affairs.

"Thousands of Arab and Palestinian men, women and children have been massacred. Hundreds of thousands have been uprooted from their homes and reduced to a state of existence unacceptable to a civilized world. West Beirut, totally surrounded by the Israeli army, is being systematically reduced to rubble, and its entrapped people face death by starvation and disease.

"The future of our civilization depends on whether we are still capable of being stirred by such an appalling spectacle. I believe that the moral impulse which keeps the heart of our civilization beating is alive and will not permit us to remain in a continuing state of inertia induced by the sheer audacity of the Israeli assault on a hapless Lebanon. We are all equally answerable for man's unsurpassed barbarity to man which the people of Lebanon have the misfortune of experiencing before our very eyes. History is an unsparing judge and we must tremble at its verdict if we remain unconcerned with the tragedy of Lebanon.

"The world community has a clear duty to stop Israel from pursuing its genocidal war to the bitter end. The primary responsibility to curb Israel rests with the permanent members of the Security Council, particularly the super-Powers, who have the ability and the resources to do so. If Israel is not restrained now the consequences for regional and global peace and security will be incalculable, and neither the great nor the small will be able to escape the impact of the forces that may be unleashed. You bear a special responsibility to uphold the cause of justice and peace in our tormented world. I therefore urge you to use the power and influence at your command to bring about an immediate

Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon. I also appeal to you to join in a concerted effort to ensure the restitution of the inalienable national and human rights of the Palestinian people whose unredeemed sufferings constitute a blot on the conscience of mankind."

19. The Israeli invasion is a stark manifestation of Israel's relentless expansion, its unabated aggression against Arab neighbours and its ruthless design to liquidate the Palestinian nation. Israel has defiantly ignored the numerous resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly which censure its aggressive policy and demand that Israel respect international law. The latest example of this lawless behaviour is to be found in Israel's contemptuous rejection of Council resolutions 508 (1982), 509 (1982), 512 (1982) and 513 (1982), as well as General Assembly resolution ES-7/5, all of which demand that Israel cease hostilities and withdraw its forces beyond the internationally recognized frontiers of Lebanon.

20. Driven by an insane obsession against the Palestinian people and their sole and authentic leadership, the PLO, Israel has unleashed its massive war machine against the defenceless people of Lebanon and the Palestinian people who have taken shelter in that country. Thousands of innocent men, women and children have already been massacred. Hundreds of thousands of others are suffering the terror and travail inflicted upon them by Israel's incessant military onslaught.

21. The siege of Beirut and the destruction of that city by the Israeli army will be remembered as a most tragic chapter in the history of the Middle East. The Israeli invaders have even resorted to such despicable measures as interrupting the supply of water, food, electricity and medical supplies to west Beirut.

22. The Israeli response to serious diplomatic efforts currently under way is indiscriminate bombardment of the city, including hospitals, which in the past week alone has taken the toll of hundreds of innocent lives. In its attempt to silence the voice of the Palestinian freedom fighters, Israel has clearly not ruled out the genocidal option of starving and strangulating almost 500,000 inhabitants in west Beirut.

23. Israel is mistaken if it thinks that its coercion can obliterate the Palestinian people and their leadership. History bears witness that the will and determination of peoples cannot be overpowered by brute force. The voice of millions of Palestinians living under occupation or forced into exile cannot be silenced by genocide. Indeed, such brutality will win their cause even greater recognition. Israel is also mistaken in its view that it can obtain security through violence and the use of force against the Palestinians and other Arab peoples. Peace and security are inseparable from the imperative of justice and law. The leaders of Israel, who are responsible for its con-

tinuing aggression and oppressive policies, must draw a lesson from history and learn from the fate which befell similar and more powerful aggressors in the past.

24. Israeli lawlessness has reached intolerable levels and it carries the most dangerous portents for international peace and security. The world conscience must react to Israeli terrorism and barbarity against the Palestinian people. The United Nations, which is responsible for the creation of Israel, has a solemn responsibility to bring the tragedy of the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples to an end. The failure to do so will irretrievably erode the moral authority of the Organization, on which rest our collective aspirations for a civilized world order. The consequences of such a catastrophe will be universal and will equally affect Israel and its powerful allies.

25. The failure of the Council to act firmly in the face of Israeli defiance of the Council's decisions has resulted in ever-widening Israeli aggression. In the present circumstances, it has become imperative for the Council to proceed urgently, with all the authority and resources at its disposal, to avert a blood-bath in Beirut and to secure the implementation of its resolutions 508 (1982), 509 (1982), 512 (1982) and 513 (1982). In this regard, the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries, held at Nicosia two weeks ago, called upon the Council to apply as a matter of urgency comprehensive mandatory sanctions against Israel under the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter until Israel fully carries out the relevant decisions and resolutions of the United Nations [S/15327, *annex, para. 27 (i)*].

26. We also appreciate the joint initiative of Egypt and France, which, in its immediate purpose, is aimed at bringing about the cessation of hostilities throughout Lebanon. We have also noted that, while addressing itself to this pressing issue, that initiative also takes into account the larger question of the denial of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, which is at the heart of the Middle East conflict.

27. Pre-conditions for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East remain the same, namely, the complete withdrawal of Israel from all occupied Arab and Palestinian territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, and the restoration of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to the establishment of a sovereign State in its homeland. It is also imperative that the PLO, which is the sole representative of the Palestinian people, participate in any peace process on an equal footing.

28. The Council faces a grave challenge in the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. Immediate and effective action is required to stop Israel's genocidal onslaught against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples and to secure withdrawal of the Israeli forces beyond the inter-

nationally recognized frontiers of Lebanon so that the territorial integrity, political independence and sovereignty of Lebanon can be preserved. We hope that the Council will be able to act in a manner which will preserve confidence in the Council's ability to carry out its primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security.

29. Mr. WHYTE (United Kingdom): My Government has continued to follow the situation in Lebanon with the gravest concern. We have repeatedly made clear our vigorous condemnation of Israel's invasion and our support for the resolutions which have been adopted by the Council.

30. The escalation of hostilities which has taken place in the last few days has inflicted further terrible suffering on the Lebanese and Palestinian populations. We are frankly appalled by the continuing reports of civilian death and injury which have resulted from Israel's heavy bombing and shelling of the densely populated areas of west Beirut. We strongly condemn the callous indifference to human life and limb which these actions have so starkly revealed, and we cannot accept that these means are in any way justified.

31. My Government set out its position in the statement issued by the heads of State and Government of the 10 member States of the European Community at Brussels on 29 June [S/15265, *annex*]. This is that a cease-fire must be preserved and should be accompanied, on the one hand, by an immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces from their positions around the Lebanese capital as a first step towards their complete withdrawal, and, on the other hand, by a simultaneous withdrawal of the Palestinian forces in west Beirut in accordance with procedures to be agreed between the parties.

32. In order to achieve peace throughout Lebanon, it is necessary for there to be a complete and prompt withdrawal of Israeli forces from the whole country, as well as the departure of all other foreign forces, except those which may be authorized by a legitimate and broadly representative Government of Lebanon, whose authority must be fully re-established over all its national territory.

33. Such a settlement is urgently required if international peace and security are not to be yet more seriously endangered and if a secure and peaceful future is to be established for the long-suffering people of Lebanon. A strengthened peace-keeping presence is likely to be an essential part of such a settlement.

34. The direct connection between the events in Lebanon and the Palestinian problem cannot be too strongly emphasized. There can be no stability in that part of the Middle East until the political aspirations of the Palestinian people are met. There must, therefore, be an overall peace settlement which takes

account of the Palestinians' right to determine their own future. The only territory in which such an act of Palestinian self-determination can realistically be carried out is the territory of the West Bank and Gaza. What political structures emerge on that territory would be for the Palestinians themselves to determine.

35. Force is no solution to the Palestinian problem. It creates only bitterness and further bloodshed. It is imperative that this should be accepted by all the parties. Even after the bloody events of the last few weeks, the opportunity for a political solution remains. The way forward lies through a mutual act of recognition. Of course, Israel and its people have the right to enjoy security and a life of peace. The PLO must recognize unambiguously Israel's right to exist and to security, while, at the same time, Israel must recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to self-determination. That is the path to a peaceful solution, away from war and towards the negotiating table.

36. For those reasons, my Government warmly supports the draft resolution which the Governments of France and Egypt introduced this morning [S/15317]. We believe that it sets out constructive and equitable principles for a comprehensive solution to the present conflict. We commend them to all the parties concerned and hope that they will give them their most serious consideration with the aim of achieving a consensus in the Council.

37. We are all aware, too, of the important efforts which have been under way for some time outside the Council to preserve a cease-fire and to prevent an all-out assault on west Beirut. We support them and must hope that they succeed. The consequences of an all-out Israeli assault could only be horrendous, both in the immediate pain and suffering which it would cause and in the awful legacy of hatred and bitterness which it would inevitably leave. My Government wishes to leave the Government of Israel in no doubt of the total unacceptability of such an assault. Any settlement achieved under the shadow of Israeli bombardment will not last. It is only through political means that a just and lasting peace will be achieved.

38. Mr. DORR (Ireland): If I had been speaking earlier this month, Sir, I would obviously have expressed good wishes to you on your assumption of the office of the presidency. As it is, in the closing days of the month, I can only thank you for the sustained and dedicated effort which you have made throughout the month to carry out to the full the difficult duties of President of the Council. I congratulate you and the delegation of Guyana on the way in which you have done this.

39. I should also like—even one month later—to thank our colleague the representative of France for the way in which he carried out the very heavy duties of President of the Council in the month of June.

40. Nearly two months ago Israel invaded Lebanon. Attacking by land, sea and air, it swept all before it in the southern half of Lebanon and reached the outskirts of Beirut. It has now besieged west Beirut for more than 40 days. It has continued at regular intervals to shell that part of the city from land and sea, and it has bombed intensively from the air. It has, at times, cut off water supply, electricity and food, and it has maintained the most intense physical and psychological pressure on the beleaguered area in order to oblige the PLO to leave.

41. This is not rhetoric; it is a simple factual description of what has happened since early June. Thousands have died—Lebanese, Palestinians and Israeli and Syrian soldiers. Tens or scores of thousands have been made homeless. In recent days and despite successive cease-fires, intensive shelling and bombing have continued. We deplore and regret all of the deaths which have been caused.

42. Throughout this period there have been continuing negotiations through Mr. Habib and others with a view to bringing an end at least to the devastating fighting in and around Beirut. We hear successively optimistic and pessimistic assessments of these negotiations.

43. These negotiations deserve encouragement and support, as do all efforts which aim at a peaceful solution to the present appalling situation and which look to implementation of Council resolution 509 (1982) and the full restoration of Lebanese sovereignty and authority up to its frontiers.

44. But though there have been frequent temporary cease-fires, always so far the assault has been renewed and the fighting has continued.

45. As one focuses on the day-to-day reports of the negotiations and the calls on Israel to show restraint and patience, it is easy to lose sight of the basic point that the capital of a United Nations Member State has been under virtual siege for nearly two months now by the armed forces of a neighbouring State.

46. How far has the Council for its part been able to act to bring an end to this unacceptable situation? The answer, unfortunately, is that the Council's role so far has been limited and that the resolutions which it has adopted are not being implemented.

47. The last really substantive resolution adopted by the Council was resolution 509 (1982), by which the Council called unanimously for a cease-fire by all parties and immediate Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon. That resolution has not been implemented yet, nearly two months after the outset of the Israeli invasion.

48. Since then the Council has limited itself to adopting two further resolutions of a humanitarian

character, the latest of these nearly one month ago [resolutions 511 (1982) and 513 (1982)]. The Council has also extended the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) for a time and given the Force certain humanitarian functions. But UNIFIL continues to be obstructed and is not allowed to function fully in carrying out even these humanitarian tasks.

49. We believe that it is time now for a new and serious effort by the Council. This should provide for certain immediate steps to stop the present devastating conflict in and around Beirut. But it should also try to address the basic problem in its wider aspects and set these immediate steps in a larger context.

50. Ireland has always felt that the overall situation in the region is one which cries out for an effort to get a real political dialogue under way. What is needed is to find some way—through the Council or otherwise—of opening first a dialogue and then a serious negotiation which would involve all of the parties and address itself to all of the fundamental issues.

51. For our part, we have seen three points as basic to any such dialogue: first, it would have to be based on some kind of minimum acceptance by all parties of the existence of all other parties and of their right to be involved in the dialogue; secondly, it would have to be clear that the principles of Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) provide a starting-point, but that they are no more than a starting-point—that is to say, those principles are necessary but they are not adequate or complete; thirdly, a way would accordingly have to be found to complete them. In our view, a key missing element would have to be added: the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination within the framework of a peace settlement.

52. We know that such a dialogue may be extremely difficult to get under way. The emotions of all of the parties run deep. We know—though from outside we can hardly comprehend fully—the emotional power of the memory of the sufferings of the Jewish people in Europe a generation ago which has given the people of Israel a determination never again to be passive in the face of persecution or attack. We know, too, the deep emotions which animate the Palestinian people, dispersed as they are, deprived of a homeland and forced to live in scattered communities and often in refugee camps throughout the Middle East.

53. But, difficult as it is, we believe that only such a dialogue, leading to a negotiation and then to a comprehensive settlement, can bring peace at last to the region, a peace which would offer true security to all of its States and justice to all of its peoples.

54. It is against that background that we have approached the initiative taken by Egypt and France in the Council this morning. We believe that the draft

resolution which they have submitted [S/15317] is indeed a serious and valuable effort along the lines I have outlined. We welcome in particular the fact that it provides for immediate measures relating to the situation in Beirut and that, at the same time, it situates these immediate steps in a wider context. I would express Ireland's appreciation for this initiative by the Governments of Egypt and France and for the efforts by their representatives here at the United Nations.

55. It will be clear from what I have just said that we support the general lines of the draft resolution introduced here this morning. Some parts of the text could perhaps be improved or amended in further discussions, and we are glad to hear that the sponsors are flexible and open in their approach.

56. The first part of the draft—that is, sections A and B—provides for specific measures to help resolve the immediate crisis in Beirut. We see this as the highest priority and we trust that the parties concerned will consider these measures as a first step to full implementation of the existing resolutions of the Council—in particular resolution 509 (1982)—so that the full sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon will be restored.

57. That part of the draft resolution in particular focuses on a possible United Nations presence in and around Beirut. We fully support the principle of practical United Nations involvement in seeking to establish and maintain peace. Two such ways in which the United Nations could be involved are envisaged in the draft.

58. The first is in section B, paragraph 1, which requests the Secretary-General immediately to station United Nations observers, by agreement with the Government of Lebanon, to supervise a cease-fire and disengagement. We believe this could be a very helpful step and we hope that such United Nations observers could be put into place as soon as possible.

59. The second way in which United Nations involvement is envisaged is in section B, paragraph 2. The Secretary-General is asked to report on the prospects for the deployment of a United Nations peace-keeping force in the Beirut area. We agree that this is a possible option. But we also see certain problems that might arise in present circumstances. We would therefore hope that the issue will be discussed fully in the Council and that all the implications of such a move will be fully considered before a formal decision on such a force is actually taken.

60. Those are all measures to deal with the immediate situation. The second main part of the draft, section C, is an effort to find a way out of the apparently endless cycle of violence by placing these immediate measures in a wider context. The aim of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace settlement in the Middle East must sometimes seem like a distant

mirage. But we continue to believe that only such a settlement, taking full account of all aspects of the problem and involving all the parties, can really bring peace on a lasting basis.

61. Ireland joined with its partners in the European Community in stating views on these general lines in the Venice declaration of 13 June 1980 [S/14009]. Central to that declaration was the idea of a reconciliation, through negotiation, of the right of all States, including Israel, to a secure and peaceful existence and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination within the context of a peaceful settlement. I should add that Ireland, for its part, has recognized the role of the PLO in representing the Palestinian people in negotiations for a comprehensive peace settlement.

62. This part of the present draft resolution, in its general thrust, accords well with this whole approach that we have long advocated. It is also in general accord with the position of the 10 member States of the European Community as set out by the European Council on 29 June last [S/15265, annex].

63. Resolution 242 (1967) was adopted by the Council 15 years ago. It was widely welcomed at the time and it is of continuing importance. But it is now seen as not wholly adequate. In recent years—in 1976, in 1979 and again in 1980—efforts were made within the Council to adopt other resolutions on the fundamental question. Those efforts did not succeed.

64. It has already been said and will no doubt be said again that this present effort is too ambitious and that it is doomed to failure. In our view, however, it is an effort to bring the immediate and tragic loss of life in and around Beirut to an end and at the same time it represents a serious and realistic effort to make real progress at last on one of the most difficult and dangerous international problems of modern times.

65. We therefore support in principle the initiative which Egypt and France have taken and we support the general lines of the draft resolution which they have offered to the Council. It is our hope that the Council will give this text the most serious consideration in the coming days.

66. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, we have had very few opportunities this month publicly to acknowledge the work being done by you this month and by your predecessor, the representative of France, last month. My best wishes go to both of you. You have both demonstrated great ability and competence in conducting the deliberations of the Council, especially in cautious and delicate work that is at times done in private but that is just as important as the work we do in public. My congratulations go to both of you.

67. In connection with the draft resolution presented by France and Egypt [S/15317], my delegation con-

siders that it represents a laudable effort within the framework of the Council's efforts to find a solution to the unsettling problem of Lebanon.

68. My delegation not only firmly supports the spirit underlying that draft resolution but it has, on very diverse occasions, defended the same principles and demonstrated its willingness to go even further, especially as regards the recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people.

69. However, in my statement at this time I shall not confine myself to the draft resolution presented jointly by the delegations of Egypt and France. We shall on a future occasion comment further on it, but I can indicate that we support it since, as I have already said, it reflects most of the points that my delegation advocates. The important thing now is this: in accordance with the instructions that I have received from my Government, I wish to submit for the Council's attention a draft resolution which I would appreciate being put to the vote as a matter of priority, preferably today.

70. This is a humanitarian draft that is not at all intended to interfere with the draft resolution presented by the delegations of Egypt and France. I shall read it out so that members of the Council may understand its significance and scope and the purpose of the Spanish Government in asking that I submit it to the Council. I reiterate that I would appreciate its being given the highest priority, given its merits and the fact that it deals with a purely humanitarian question. It reads as follows:

"The Security Council,

"Deeply concerned at the situation of the civilian population of Beirut,

"Referring to the humanitarian principles of the Geneva Conventions of 1949¹ and to the obligations arising from the regulations annexed to the Hague Convention of 1907,²

"Recalling its resolutions 512 (1982) and 513 (1982),

"1. Demands that the Government of Israel lift immediately the blockade of the city of Beirut in order to permit the dispatch of supplies to meet the urgent needs of the civilian population and allow the distribution of aid provided by United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations, particularly the International Committee of the Red Cross;

"2. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit the text of the present resolution to the Government of Israel and to keep the Security Council informed of its implementation."

That is the text of the draft resolution that I submit for the urgent consideration of the Council.

71. My Government and country are seriously concerned at the tragic situation of the city of Beirut. At this time we do not wish to refer to any other matters pertaining to the Middle East, not even to the general problem of Lebanon. We request that priority be given to this draft resolution, the purpose of which is to put an end to the siege of the city of Beirut, where the civilian population has been suffering from hunger, thirst, war and death.

72. It is time that the Council acted and acted as a matter of urgency. Furthermore, in relation to the draft resolution submitted by Egypt and France—which they told us this morning was not so urgent as to require priority voting—we hope that those two countries will understand the urgent need that motivates my Government's submission of this draft resolution.

73. The PRESIDENT: In the course of his statement, the representative of Spain orally presented a draft resolution for which he is requesting the Council's priority attention. The Secretariat will proceed immediately with the reproduction of the text in all the official languages of the Council and it will be distributed as soon as possible thereafter.

74. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I wish to associate myself wholly with the humane gesture and the most urgent request of my colleague the representative of Spain. This is really the most urgent matter facing the Council.

75. I wish to mention here a letter addressed to the President of the Council by the representative of Lebanon in which he transmitted the text of an appeal made by the Minister of National Economy, Mr. Khaled Jumblat, and the Minister of Industry and Petroleum, Mr. Mohammad Youssef Beydoun, on behalf of the Government of Lebanon [S/15324, annex]. The appeal reads as follows:

"The blockade of west Beirut, imposed by the Israeli forces a fortnight ago, is continuing despite all intensive diplomatic efforts and efforts by the International Committee of the Red Cross, the representatives of the United Nations and United Nations agencies.

"Food and fuel supplies have not been allowed to enter west Beirut, with the exception of negligible quantities of bare necessities. The siege has dramatically affected the life of the civilian population and created conditions of hardship for innocent men, women and children, let alone conditions in hospitals, orphanages and schools.

"Such inhuman acts by Israel constitute a flagrant violation of all international law and, more partic-

ularly, the Geneva Conventions, as well as Security Council resolution 513 (1982).

"On behalf of the men, women, children and the aged, we ask all those who are in a position to help that they urgently exert their utmost influence to lift the blockade and allow food supplies and basic necessities to enter west Beirut. The civilian population of west Beirut feels entitled not only to its basic human rights but also to a concerted universal effort to alleviate the suffering of the innocent.

"West Beirut, besieged and surviving without water and electricity, cries for help and is grateful to all those who will prove by their support that the world will not tolerate a systematic starvation and destruction of its people."

That letter speaks for itself.

76. I hope that, as soon as we get in final form the draft resolution read out by the representative of Spain, we shall proceed to vote on it. I wish to thank the Government of Spain for taking the initiative in presenting this humane and most urgent draft resolution.

77. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): I too should like to begin by stating my Government's and my own personal congratulations to you, Sir, for your occupancy of the presidency for this month and most especially our esteem for the serious and skilful manner in which you have conducted the Council's affairs so far this month. I think the Council is indeed fortunate to have so serious and skilful a President during a time when we are considering such serious problems.

78. The United States is never indifferent to the suffering, insecurity or deprivations of human beings caught in war, occupation or natural disasters. Certainly, we have been deeply concerned with the hardships visited on the people of Lebanon during the current conflict. The Lebanese people, we know, have suffered violence too long at the hands of unwanted intruders, unwelcome invaders and occupiers.

79. The concern of my Government for the people of Lebanon has been and is being actively expressed in the large contributions for emergency humanitarian aid made by my Government and in the appointment of a Special Administrator for Aid to ensure the implementation of extensive humanitarian aid programmes in the region. President Reagan has asked the Congress to provide a total of some \$65 million in humanitarian emergency aid for the people of Lebanon. The President's special envoy, Mr. Philip Habib, has worked indefatigably in his efforts to restore peace to Lebanon and a degree of territorial integrity and sovereignty which that Government has not enjoyed for too many years.

80. There is, I believe, no room for doubt among reasonable men and women about the commitment of the United States Government to the peace, independence and sovereignty of Lebanon—indeed, our commitment to peace, national independence and sovereignty of all nations. Yet we see serious problems with the draft resolution submitted by my friend and colleague the representative of the Government of Spain, for the following reasons: first, because of inadequate time either to gather or to confirm the facts about the situation in Beirut and the problems of access; secondly, because of an inadequate opportunity to consult with our Government; and, thirdly, because this draft resolution, we believe, is lacking in a certain serious balance which would give it greater weight.

81. It is surely, in the first instance, the PLO which imposes itself on the civilian population of Beirut. But the draft resolution submitted by my colleague from Spain does not ask that that armed force abandon its occupation of Beirut or desist in its military activities. It calls only on Israel. Yet everyone understands that Israel seeks to affect supplies to the PLO forces, not to the civilian population of Beirut.

82. The United States welcomes the concern of the Council and of the humanitarian agencies of the United Nations for the suffering in Lebanon, as we welcome the concern of this body for an end to human suffering everywhere. We feel, however, that a one-sided appeal in a two-sided conflict suggests purposes that are political as well as humanitarian, and we cannot support them—certainly not on the basis of inadequate notice and inadequate information. We therefore call upon the Council to take the time necessary for a more careful and balanced consideration of this most serious, wrenching problem. I ask for suspension of this meeting to permit consideration and consultation with our Government.

83. Mr. de La BARRE de NANTEUIL (France) (*interpretation from French*): With the agreement of the representative of Egypt, I should like to state that we are in entire agreement that priority should be given to the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Spain and that it should be voted on as quickly as possible.

84. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States, to whom the Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure at its 2374th meeting. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

85. Mr. MAKSOUD: I wish to express to you, Mr. President, and through you to the members of the Council, the thanks of my organization for the kind invitation you have extended to me to participate in this debate and to make a statement. I need not reaffirm our congratulations to you as President of the Council this month, nor need I felicitate your pre-

decessor in that post, the representative of France. I am cognizant of the depth of your commitment to solving this crisis and alleviating its tragic consequences for the people of Lebanon and the Palestinian people.

86. We are meeting today in a situation that is perhaps without precedent in modern history. It is as if a repeat performance is being held of events that occurred in the mid-1930s, when the international body of that day was reduced to a debating body, when its effectiveness and credibility, as well as its resolutions, were ignored and neglected, and when, as a result of a Hitler and a Nazi Germany unchecked by international consensus and the requirements of international legitimacy, war was unleashed. We are in a way approaching the same situation. We have an Israel undaunted and using its arsenal of weapons to unleash and conduct a war of annihilation, a war, to quote Mr. Sharon, of "destruction, destruction, destruction", as if by the repetition of that apocalyptic term Israel is attempting to deter the people of Lebanon from insisting on their independence and sovereignty, or the people of Palestine from persisting in their legitimate struggle to achieve an independent State in their homeland.

87. The world community is expected to sit on the sidelines and to allow the efforts of Mr. Habib—well-motivated efforts, I must admit—to take their course in an attempt to defuse and to eradicate the causes of the tragedy now taking place in Lebanon and, more drastically, in Beirut. The Security Council and the United Nations, and the international community as a whole, have demonstrated their willingness, which is perhaps unfortunate, to allow the United States to pursue its efforts to defuse the crisis because of that country's special relationship with Israel. The United States has asked us all to allow it to occupy a middle ground between right and wrong, between victim and victimizer, in order that it can placate the violator of Lebanese sovereignty, the destroyer of Lebanese towns, soften its blows and mitigate its strangulation, all in order that Israel not "lose its patience".

88. The United States, a super-Power, has asked the world community not to press too hard to make Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) effective and credible too soon. It has asked us Arabs to be patient and to allow the nobly motivated efforts of Mr. Habib to bear fruit other than the harvest of death and destruction that we are witnessing daily, especially now in the city of Beirut. We have been asked by the United States to desist even in the humanitarian matter of verifying whether there has been an interruption of the power supply or in the supply of food, medicine and amenities by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), because if we adopt any humanitarian draft resolution, such as the one submitted by the representative of Spain, we might risk showing bias against Israel and that in turn might endanger Habib's mission. For, in the final

analysis, Israel has made it clear, even here in New York during Mr. Begin's visit, that it will give in to no pressure and that its immunity from pressure and leverage, whether moral or diplomatic, must be respected and feared.

89. Hundreds and thousands of people have been killed or maimed. Last night, after 9 o'clock, Beirut time, when the cease-fire negotiated by Mr. Habib was announced by the Prime Minister of Lebanon, Mr. Habib telephoned the Prime Minister and told him that Mr. Sharon had requested an hour-and-a-half postponement because, apparently, Mr. Sharon could not relay the orders to the army of Israel. Between 9 p.m. and 10.30 p.m., Beirut time, all hell broke loose again—from the air, from the sea and from the mountains and hills in the proximity of Beirut.

90. In the mean time, the children's section of Al-Makassed Hospital was destroyed and at least 30 more people were killed, in addition to the injured and the wounded, who, according to Dr. Amal Shammaa, are usually dead by the time they arrive at the hospital.

91. And yet we are asked to be patient—otherwise, Mr. Begin might lose his patience again.

92. For how long can the world community remain, not silent—because it has not been silent—but ineffective because of our delegation of authority to Mr. Habib, whose well-motivated attempts are deeply appreciated?

93. I know that the draft resolution, which was submitted as a matter of urgency, is aimed at lifting the siege of Beirut in order to allow a regular flow of power, food supplies and water. Nearly half a million people are being strangled on the assumption that there are Palestinians among them. If the number is correct, there are 6,000 of them. Does that warrant the indiscriminate killing and the bombardment of apartment houses which house the Swiss and the Canadian Ambassadors? These are not really "PLO strongholds".

94. Apparently what is intended is that the world community become adjusted to the continuous bombing of Beirut because it will then become a side-show in world concerns. In order for it not to become a side-show in world concerns, a humanitarian draft resolution has been submitted on a priority basis. I regret the assessment of the United States representative that there was inadequate time and opportunity to verify the evidence [*para. 80 above*]. Inadequate time? Perhaps—because every emergency resolution is supposed to be dealt with urgently. But do we guarantee, can Mr. Habib guarantee, can the United States guarantee that if adequate time is given to verify the evidence, during that time hundreds more civilians will not be killed in Beirut?

95. On behalf of the League of Arab States and as a Lebanese, I would say: let us not deal with this as a

matter of priority if during the "adequate time" there is a cease-fire which is credible and the flow of water and food is guaranteed. We would unquestionably accept the guarantee of the United States Government.

96. So it is not a resolution that we are seeking so much as avoidance of the continuation of the massacre, which is assuming genocidal dimensions.

97. I request you, Mrs. Kirkpatrick: please, although you might have reservations about what you call the objectivity of this draft resolution, request adequate time to verify the evidence. I will grant that perhaps you need to have a more objective assessment of the evidence. But I would appeal to you, if the Council grants more time, that in the mean time the cost of this time not be further bleeding in the city of Beirut because of Israeli bombardments and the killing of civilians in Beirut.

98. Needless to say, hovering over our debate today is the unfolding tragedy that touches many of us in our conscience, in our families and in our very existence. But more important perhaps for the purposes of this debate is the submission by France and Egypt of a draft resolution [*S/15317*] that seeks to alleviate the dangers that have emerged from the tragedies in Beirut and Lebanon and to set the outlines of a comprehensive, just and durable settlement. In order for a settlement to be durable, it must be just, and in order for it to be just, it must be comprehensive.

99. In pursuing this, the League of Arab States and the Arab States seek to contribute to this effort. We want our input to be commensurate with the requirements of seeking an immediate peace. Because of that, and in order to make a contribution not only to the defusing of the crisis, but also to the remedying of the tragedy and the lessening of the consequences of this tragedy, the League of Arab States—in the wake of its meeting to study and analyse the findings of the ministerial Arab League delegation that visited several capitals of the world community—has made the following announcement tonight, which I shall paraphrase because I shall be translating from Arabic.

100. We urge you, and through you the world community, to bring about compliance with an immediate and sustained cease-fire in Lebanon. We note furthermore that the Government of Lebanon and the PLO have agreed on the modalities for redeployment of PLO military forces, to be carried out in stages, in conjunction and agreement with the Lebanese Government. We urge the lifting of the siege of Beirut and its suburbs by the immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces. The Lebanese Government should take all effective measures to ensure the security and safety of all the inhabitants of the city of Beirut and its suburbs, and they should be joined in that task by international forces. The Arab countries will undertake all political, economic and other measures and make all arrangements to assist Lebanon fully to implement Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982).

101. An official translation of what was agreed at that meeting will be made available to the United Nations later today. Its significance, and the significance of the meeting itself, lies in its unanimity. A more immediate significance is that it entailed an agreement between the Lebanese Government and the PLO; another aspect of its significance is that redeployment of Palestinian military forces is an option which has been accepted by the PLO. The cumulative effect of all this would undoubtedly be to help deliver an Arab commitment to whatever attempt may be made by the international community.

102. Thus, we should like the Council, in its deliberations in the search for a comprehensive and durable solution, to realize the immediate effect of the agreement that was made tonight in Jeddah. It signals to the world community readiness, flexibility and genuine patience and provides it with the means to bring about international legitimacy, as well as making the Arab world available to help in that task. This must come about in circumstances that would entail no humiliation for anyone in Lebanon. It must be done in such a way that the withdrawal of Israeli forces from their siege of Beirut would be the first step, so that any decision or commitment made by any of the parties should be durable and deliverable. For, as the representative of the United Kingdom has stated, no commitment, decision or policy on anybody's part can be durable and deliverable if it is made under duress or as a result of the coercion of the strangulating siege that has been imposed.

103. When this has taken place, the holocaust with which we are threatened in the city of Beirut will have been averted. Then the ability of the Lebanese and Palestinians to articulate their commitments will develop and be revealed in an atmosphere that preserves the integrity and legitimacy of the Lebanese Government's commitments and of the commitment of the PLO to any undertaking it makes. This will bring about the unfolding of the plans necessary to ensure the total and absolute sovereignty of Lebanon and the restoration of its legitimate authority over all its territories, and to ensure that the Palestinian people, and the PLO in particular, will not become trapped in any tunnel they enter at the behest of the international community, but will see light at the end of that tunnel. That light is the exercise of the right of self-determination in their homeland, including the right to establish an independent State.

104. In the last few weeks, and more particularly in the last few days, we have witnessed an attempt to mythologize Council resolution 242 (1967), as if that resolution were sacrosanct and as if through repetition it would come about that that resolution is the only basis for security and that the PLO must recognize it. I shall attempt to de-mythologize it presently, but first I would note that everybody has joined in an international consensus that the basis of the relevance of this resolution is its description of territorial param-

eters—in other words, the territory from which Israel must withdraw. That resolution has been violated by the annexation of Jerusalem and the Golan Heights and by the proliferation of many settlements in the occupied territories of Palestine. Therefore, those who are seeking to make resolution 242 (1967) credible must make it implementable, at least in terms of its territorial basis, by describing precise parameters.

105. Even former Senator Ribicoff of Connecticut, when he represented the United States at a General Assembly session, said—admittedly during a *pro forma* affirmation of resolution 242 (1967)—that there is a basic defect in that resolution, especially regarding its description of the Palestinian problem exclusively in terms of refugees, and without even naming them, and its tendency to deal with the central issue more in terms of philanthropic solutions than in terms of political consequences and political solutions.

106. Thus, even the United States assesses resolution 242 (1967) to be inadequate, at least in that operative part; and the international community, as noted by the representative of Ireland, has tried several times to re-examine and recast it, not in order to ignore it or to deny its validity, but because of a recognition of its inadequacy and of the fact that it cannot provide a total formula for the resolution of the Palestinian question, and in order to correct those defects.

107. Everybody in the world—the non-aligned, Islam, the European Community, Latin America—has realized that, although in most of its operative parts, resolution 242 (1967) constitutes the definition of international consensus, it remains inadequate in terms of the refugees. To say that resolution 242 (1967) is inadequate does not mean that it is totally irrelevant; it means only that it is inadequate. Therefore, in that light and from that point of view, the Council has repeatedly attempted to bring about a new resolution that seeks to factor in the relevant and operative parts of that resolution but to correct its deficiency pertaining to Palestinian rights.

108. So instead of being bombarded every day with the fact of that Council resolution, it is high time that we de-mythologized it—not rejected it but de-mythologized it. Our attempt, as well as the latest agreements by the League of Arab States in Jeddah tonight, has been to welcome all efforts in that direction in order to secure immediate relief for the people of Beirut from the siege, strangulation, hunger and killing which they are experiencing, and to see to it that the Lebanese Government achieves its full sovereignty, integrity and unity and that the modalities are worked out, in harmony and not in conflict, for the total withdrawal of Israel from Lebanon and for the simultaneous search for a way to enable the Palestinian people not to remain permanently disenfranchised—as Israel seeks to render them—by either decimating or subjugating them, as it is doing in the West Bank, Gaza and Jerusalem.

109. Israel's attempt at subjugating the Palestinians in the occupied territories by decimating the Palestinians in Lebanon is one of the cruelest acts in modern history, nearly equal to the cruelty that Nazi Germany committed against the people of the Jewish faith.

110. The PRESIDENT: I shall now suspend the meeting for 10 minutes.

The meeting was suspended at 6.15 p.m. and resumed at 6.40 p.m.

111. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council now have before them the draft resolution contained in document S/15325, the text of which was orally introduced by the representative of Spain. The document is now available in the official languages.

112. In connection with this text, the representative of the United States formally requested a suspension of the meeting in order to allow for consultations. If there is no objection, it is now my intention to suspend the meeting for consultations.

113. Mr. OZORES TYPALDOS (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation is opposed to a suspension of the meeting and a delay in voting on the draft resolution.

114. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United States has proposed that the meeting be suspended. The representative of Panama has opposed that proposal and would like the draft resolution to be put to the vote immediately. I shall therefore now put to the vote the proposal by the representative of the United States that the meeting be suspended.

115. Mr. DORR (Ireland): On a point of order, Mr. President, I believe that in your earlier statement you said that the meeting would be suspended to allow for consultations. Is that the intention of the suspension? I do not wish to breach the rule that this motion should be decided without debate; I merely ask the question on a point of order.

116. The PRESIDENT: That is indeed what I stated. I therefore now put to the vote the proposal by the representative of the United States that the meeting be suspended for consultations.

117. First, I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

118. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): I should simply like to make it clear that the request of the United States is that the meeting be adjourned for two hours to allow for consultations with Governments.

119. The PRESIDENT: I should like to make it clear that it was not my understanding at the time the proposal was made that it was for a suspension for

two hours. It was my understanding that it was a suspension to go into informal consultations, but that the period would also be used for consultations with Governments.

120. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): Because of the urgency of the problem, I firmly oppose the suspension of this meeting. I associate myself with the representative of Panama in opposing such a suspension and request that the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Spain [S/15325] be put to the vote immediately.

121. The PRESIDENT: We therefore have a proposal by the representative of the United States that the meeting be suspended for two hours, and that proposal is opposed by the representatives of Panama and Jordan.

122. I now put to the vote the proposal of the representative of the United States.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Ireland, Japan, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Against: China, Guyana, Jordan, Panama, Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Abstaining: France, Spain, Uganda

The result of the vote was 6 votes in favour, 6 against and 3 abstentions. The proposal, having failed to obtain the required majority, was not adopted.

123. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the request of the representative of Spain, supported by the representative of Panama, the Council will now vote on the draft resolution contained in document S/15325.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The draft resolution was adopted by 14 votes to none (resolution 515 (1982)).

One member (United States of America) did not participate in the voting.

124. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who have asked to be allowed to make statements after the voting on the draft resolution just adopted.

125. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): I should like to say that the United States found it impossible to participate in the vote. It strongly objects to the procedure employed here today and suggests that it will be impossible for the Council to function if members are not to be provided an opportunity for consultation with their Governments.

126. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to express my gratitude to the members of the Council, who have almost unanimously supported our draft resolution. As we understand it, humanitarian draft resolutions should receive priority. I should like to remind the Council in this regard that there were consultations on resolution 513 (1982), adopted by the Council on 4 July, and that we came back immediately to the Council chamber and voted on the text in the version with blue-coloured type.

127. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): In very simple terms, I should like to express the gratitude of my countrymen to the Council for adopting the draft resolution, and I should particularly like to thank my friend the representative of Spain for having spontaneously proposed it.

128. Mr. NOWAK (Poland): Mr. President, allow me to associate the Polish delegation with those other delegations that have expressed admiration of the serious and highly skilful manner in which you, the representative of friendly Guyana, have conducted the work of the Council during the month of July. Our thanks go also to the previous President, the representative of France, who gave proof of eminent diplomatic skills in the Council during the month of June.

129. I shall try to be brief.

130. The representative of Lebanon has today noted with subtlety that the Lebanese tragedy speaks for itself. Indeed, the tragedy of the inhabitants of Beirut speaks for itself; the tragedy of the Palestinian people speaks for itself. We have been strongly impressed by the letter from the Lebanese representative [S/15324] today and by the images of Beirut we see almost every day on our television screens.

131. My delegation had a chance on 18 June to explain my Government's position [2379th meeting], and I shall not dwell on it again since everything my delegation said then remains in force. Let me only reiterate that my Government demands that an end be put to the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, that the authority of the Council be used to bring about the withdrawal of the Israeli forces, that the territorial integrity of Lebanon be safeguarded and that the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people be exercised, including their right to statehood.

132. Peace and an honourable solution cannot be achieved by protecting the aggressor, but should result from peace negotiations with the participation of all the parties concerned and taking into account their vital rights and interests.

133. Those are the primary objectives that my delegation takes into account when evaluating the proposals presented here in this context. Without prejudice to the realization of those primary objectives,

we are in favour of all steps that at this very moment, in the mean time, may alleviate the plight of the victims of Israeli aggression. This is a simple humanitarian move, a little gesture in fact. It was in this context that we reacted to the draft resolution introduced by my distinguished neighbour here, the representative of Spain, and that is why we voted in favour of it. Indeed, when people are suffering and dying we cannot argue that some political balancing should take place and thus cause such a humanitarian proposal to be washed out.

134. In conclusion, I should like to express my delegation's satisfaction with the vote on that draft resolution, which we consider accorded with all the appropriate rules of procedure.

135. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, I should like most cordially to congratulate you on the very effective and successful way in which you are performing the duties of President of the Council.

136. We should also like to express our gratitude to the representative of France for his very noteworthy work as President last month.

137. In connection with the draft resolution just adopted by the Council, we should like to make the following statement.

138. Israel is using the most barbaric and the most inhumane means against the Lebanese and Palestinian populations in occupied southern Lebanon and in Beirut.

139. First, this is anti-humanitarian action on the part of Israel in order to blockade Beirut, to break off the supply routes for food and electricity. Various humanitarian organizations are being prevented from carrying out their work, including the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, to organize assistance for the Palestinian refugees. This is not only an essentially anti-humane action by Israel; it is a gross violation of Council resolutions 512 (1982) and 513 (1982). Therefore, the Council was perfectly correct in confirming those resolutions and requiring that Israel put an immediate stop to its blockade of Beirut. We, like 13 other members of the Council, supported the draft resolution.

140. In our consideration of the draft resolution that was presented to us we heard from one of the members of the Council a very strange statement to the effect that this is not the appropriate time for the adoption of a humanitarian draft resolution of this kind. One wonders if the United States considers the actions of Israel appropriate. Is it appropriate for troops from Israel to occupy southern Lebanon and the capital of Lebanon? Does the United States consider that appropriate?

141. The yardstick used by the United States must be monstrous and strange if it can fail to support an elementary humanitarian draft resolution.

142. In addition, in Lebanon, Israel is utilizing the most barbaric ways and means of waging war: cluster and phosphorous bombs and, as numerous press reports have shown, poisonous substances. And where does Israel obtain these means of waging war? Who has made it possible for them to be used by Israel? Once again, in the foreground we see the United States, which, for example, supplied Israel with cluster bombs. If they had not had those supplies, they would not have been able to use them. We wonder why the United States has made these supplies available to Israel. Is it in the name of humanitarianism? In this connection, one quite legitimately wonders where the American concept of humanitarianism is being formulated: in the United States, or in Tel Aviv. I am not asking the representative of the United States to answer this rather difficult question.

143. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Israel, on whom I now call.

144. Mr. BLUM (Israel): At the outset, Sir, permit me to pay my respects to you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of July.

145. Those among us here whose objective is to contribute to the restoration of Lebanon's sovereignty, which has been virtually eroded over the past decade to the point of having become non-existent, those among us who seek the restoration of peace and stability to that war-torn land, which is essential for the stability of the entire region, have very serious doubts about the usefulness of this meeting and indeed about the intentions of its sponsors.

146. I will therefore confine myself to a brief recapitulation of our well-known position of principle on this issue.

147. The position of the Government of Israel regarding the question of Lebanon has been made clear many times both in this forum and in the General Assembly. Most recently, on 26 June, I stated it at the seventh emergency special session of the General Assembly in the following words:

"Israel fully supports the restoration of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon. Israel stands for the restoration of the territorial unity of Lebanon within its internationally-recognized boundaries, under the authority of its lawful Government and free from any foreign intervention."³

148. No one in the Middle East is as eager as Israel to see Lebanese sovereignty restored, its internal strife resolved, the Syrian occupiers removed, the PLO subdued and freedom and tranquillity returned

to that sorely tried land. Israel wants peace in and with Lebanon. Israel has no quarrel with Lebanon, only with those who have subjugated it.

149. Let me therefore reiterate again today that Israel has no territorial ambitions whatsoever in Lebanon. We do not seek to acquire even one square inch of Lebanese territory. We do not want to stay in Lebanon, or in any part thereof. But we are entitled to demand that proper arrangements be made so that Lebanon should not again serve as a staging ground for terrorist attacks against Israel's civilian population. We are entitled to demand that concrete arrangements be made that would permanently preclude hostile action against Israel and its civilians from Lebanese soil.

150. Lebanon must cease to be a centre of international terrorism, and arrangements must be made to ensure that it does not become such a centre again in the future. Any attempt or initiative aimed at enabling the continuation of the terrorist presence on Lebanese soil must therefore be resisted both as being short-sighted and as running counter to the true interests of international peace and security in Lebanon itself and in the Middle East as a whole.

151. We fully concur with the representative of Lebanon, who told the Council this afternoon that "a Lebanon restored to strength and sovereignty will itself become a major factor actively contributing to Middle East peace" [para. 8 above].

152. Consequently, the terrorist PLO, this leading component of international terrorism, cannot, should not and will not be a partner to any negotiations, let alone to any international arrangement concerning the Arab-Israel conflict or any of its aspects.

153. When we speak of the restoration of Lebanese sovereignty, we have in mind the restoration of genuine sovereignty over Lebanon to its own people, and not a mere ritualistic lip-service to such sovereignty, used as a façade behind which alien interests seek to perpetuate their stranglehold over Lebanon and its people. The experience of recent years has clearly demonstrated that the sovereignty of Lebanon has become a sham and has ceased to exist in anything but name, having been abused by those who have converted Lebanon into a base for aggression and international terrorism. This must not be repeated. It is therefore essential that all non-Lebanese elements without exception remove themselves from Lebanese soil and that the Lebanese people be enabled to take their destiny into their own hands. Israel, for its part, will oppose the repetition of the mistakes of recent years and any initiative that would perpetuate any non-Lebanese presence on Lebanese soil. Lebanon, rightly and properly, belongs to its own people, and to them alone.

154. We reject any attempt to interfere in any form whatsoever with Council resolution 242 (1967). That

resolution is a carefully balanced document. As was pointed out in the Council by one of its main authors, Lord Caradon, the then representative of the United Kingdom, on the day the resolution was adopted,

“the draft resolution is a balanced whole. To add to it or to detract from it would destroy the balance and also destroy the wide measure of agreement we have achieved together” [1382nd meeting, para. 59].

155. Resolution 242 (1967) serves as the only agreed basis for a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict. The Camp David framework accords for peace in the Middle East and the Egypt-Israel peace treaty based on them are also firmly grounded in that resolution, as well as in its companion resolution, resolution 338 (1973).

156. As will be recalled, the texts of both these Council resolutions were appended as annexes to the Camp David accords. Thus, any attempt to tamper with resolution 242 (1967) in any form whatsoever can only undermine the delicate framework on which the entire Middle East peace process is based.

157. The Camp David peace process has already yielded spectacular results in the form of the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt. Moreover, that framework carries within it the potential for an overall solution of the conflict in all its aspects. And, despite protestations to the contrary, that framework is now firmly embedded in the political reality of the region and has produced one of the few islands of stability in the midst of a large and deeply troubled sea of turmoil and convulsion.

158. Before concluding, I should like to refer briefly to some of the statements made here earlier today.

159. With regard to the brief statement made by the representative of Lebanon this morning, I should like to set the record straight. The Israel Defence Forces have strict instructions to facilitate the passage of ICRC convoys to west Beirut. In this connection, I should like to state that my country fully supports any genuine humanitarian concern designed to alleviate human suffering. But my country rejects and will resist any attempt to abuse humanitarian concerns for the purpose of attaining political objectives totally unrelated and extraneous to any humanitarian concerns.

160. Needless to say, it would have been easier to believe in the genuinely humanitarian concern of many speakers here had they not ignored studiously and with callous indifference the agony of the Lebanese people over the years, involving the death of 100,000 Lebanese, the wounding of a quarter of a million Lebanese and the displacement of more than 1 million Lebanese—not to speak of their indifference to such massive human tragedies as Kampuchea and Afghanistan. When the representatives of the Soviet

Union, Poland and so forth become humanitarians, one must certainly pause to think and to ponder the real motives of these and similar humanitarians.

161. With regard to the intemperate statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom, I wish to tell him that we roundly and unreservedly reject his empty and utterly irresponsible accusations against my country. At the same time, we are profoundly grateful for and appreciative of his statement that Israel and its people have the right to enjoy security and a life of peace. I wish to assure him that Israel fully supports the right of the United Kingdom and its people to enjoy security and a life of peace.

162. Frankly, it is somewhat surprising that any representative of the United Kingdom should these days display such a high degree of callous indifference to problems confronting a country that faces the scourge of terrorism. Admittedly, my country does not enjoy the luxury of conducting its wars at a distance of 8,000 miles from its borders. Neither does it enjoy the luxury of conducting wars in such densely populated locations as San Carlos Bay, Goose Green or Teal Inlet.

163. The representative of Jordan has treated us once again to a display of his customary integrity and honesty. I shall refrain from commenting on the many deliberate distortions and falsifications that punctuated his statement and confine myself to one or two points.

164. Mr. Nuseibeh bemoaned the fate of the PLO terrorists in Beirut. He seems to have forgotten—not for the first time—that in September 1970 it was his Government and his King that treated the PLO guests in Jordan to affectionate expressions of hospitality and that those PLO guests in Jordan who were still alive at the end of that hospitality treatment were then gently permitted to flee Jordan for their lives—many of them, incidentally, to Israel—after having defended Amman in the manner they are now defending west Beirut. It was then that most of those PLO guests imposed themselves on Lebanon and gradually destroyed its sovereignty.

165. It therefore ill behoves the representative of Jordan to deny Lebanon and its people the right which Jordan claimed for itself in 1970—namely, the right to defend itself against PLO terrorism and subversion. Mr. Nuseibeh seems to have forgotten this—but Mr. Nuseibeh is an honourable man.

166. The representative of Jordan also referred to the plight of the civilian population in west Beirut, who—as was recently pointed out by *The New York Times*, in an editorial on 22 July—have become the victims of “the biggest hijacking in history”. For reasons that have manifestly to do with Mr. Nuseibeh’s well-known intellectual integrity, the Council was not told who is responsible for depriving civilians in

Lebanon, including Palestinians, of food these days. Nor was the Council told by him of the shelling by the terrorist PLO of an ICRC ship in Juniyah carrying food for civilians in Lebanon, although that event occurred only one or two days ago.

167. Interestingly enough, Mr. Nuseibeh did volunteer a revealing piece of information—namely, that the PLO terrorists in Beirut—whom, for some reason, he termed indigenous fighters—do have ample food and water. In other words, the PLO terrorists in Beirut are depriving the civilian population, hijacked by them, not only of their freedom but also of food and water. Since Mr. Nuseibeh has been less than candid with the Council, let me provide the Council with some pertinent information which I believe must have been available to Mr. Nuseibeh, as it was published only yesterday in the form of a United Nations press release of 28 July 1982, which reads as follows:

“Vienna, 27 July (UNRWA)—Emergency relief operations by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) for some 30,000 displaced Palestine refugees in west Beirut, and the movement of supplies from Beirut for distribution to homeless families in south Lebanon, have been stopped since 19 July by the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO).

“An armed five-man unit of PLO at the gate of UNRWA’s warehouse in Verdun Street, west Beirut, posted ostensibly to prevent UNRWA’s supplies from being plundered, has orders to prevent any UNRWA supplies from entering or leaving the warehouse without written authority from PLO.

“Contacts with PLO undertaken since 19 July have met with no practical effect, and a convoy of two trucks loaded with rice and sugar for the Palestine refugees in Sidon was not permitted to leave the warehouse this morning (27 July).

“Distribution teams in west Beirut have been without flour, rice, sugar, corned beef and skimmed milk powder to issue to displaced Palestine refugees for over a week, and in Sidon, UNRWA teams have been deprived of the 48 tons of food supplies which were scheduled to have been delivered last week and today.”

168. Here we have a clear description of what has been happening in the field of food distribution in Beirut and elsewhere in Lebanon. The PLO terrorists, being the seasoned criminals they are, are depriving not only the Lebanese civilian population, but even the Palestinians on whose behalf they claim to act, of the food earmarked for them by international relief agencies. One wonders what reference can be found to these events, documented by the United

Nations itself, in the resolution adopted a few minutes ago here.

169. All this was not mentioned by Mr. Nuseibeh—but Mr. Nuseibeh is an honourable man.

170. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I wish to make a few brief remarks in reply to the allegations of the representative of Israel.

171. First, I would give him some sincere advice, that is, that he keep silent instead of straining to defend the indefensible: the holocaust that is now, as we are meeting here, being perpetrated against the Lebanese people as well as against the Palestinian people, the refugees whom Israel threw out of their homeland at the point of the bayonet in 1947 and 1948 and whose villages were destroyed and their inhabitants massacred, as all of us know. It is not surprising that Israel has done what it has done today, since it is simply a continuance of its long-standing policy of bloodthirsty massacres regardless of consequences.

172. The representative of Israel might perhaps draw a lesson in moral behaviour from what an Israeli senior commander of a mechanized brigade said only a couple of days ago in requesting to be relieved of his post. When asked by Prime Minister Begin why he had done so, he said—and this senior officer had fought the Palestinian refugees and Lebanese civilians in Tyre, Sidon and elsewhere, up to the environs of Beirut: “Well, wherever I looked around I saw only children, and my conscience can no longer carry the burden of continuing to massacre them.” Perhaps the Council could pass a moral judgement on the chemistry of the two men.

173. It is indeed an affront to the intelligence of the Council, not to speak of the world community, for the representative of Israel to be talking about peace while his authorities are causing a holocaust unprecedented in recent history. The devastated cities and the uncounted victims of the carnage perhaps answer his claims more eloquently than any words could.

174. The representative of Israel referred to September 1970. I happened to be then the Ambassador to Cairo, but I can tell him exactly what happened because I have been in the Government since 1968. The entire Government of Jordan gave full-fledged support to the Palestinian people, in every way possible, because it felt it to be its duty to assist them to mount resistance against the occupiers of their homeland. This support continued at all levels until towards the end of 1969. As a result of the burgeoning enthusiasm for enlisting in the resistance movement, there entered some unruly elements which may have engaged in some disorderly behaviour, and the Government’s action was no more than an effort to restore law and order.

175. Secondly, this happened after three years of the kind of shelling and bombardment to which Jordanian villages and Palestinian refugee camps were subjected all through 1967 and up to 1970, in which thousands of people lost their lives and in which the Israelis destroyed the east Ghor canal which irrigates the Jordan Valley, culminating in their savage attack against Karamah and the Jordan Valley in east Jordan. Everybody knows that there assembled, like a troupe producing a film, a horde of journalists to report on Israel's glorious victory. They waited at the Kalia Hotel until 2 p.m., when they were advised to go back to occupied Jerusalem because the Jordanian army knew how to deal with them.

176. The Government of Jordan still supports, and will continue to support, the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people in every way possible and with every means at its disposal.

177. When the representative of Israel talks about the "hijacking" of Beirut, one wonders who has hijacked whom. Beirut is there, in the centre of Lebanon; it is the capital of Lebanon. Hundreds of thousands of Palestinian refugees, uprooted from their homes in Palestine, have been living in Lebanon for 34 years awaiting repatriation and redemption, but to no avail. And yet the Israelis have the audacity to claim that they are trying to restore peace to Lebanon by committing an act of full-fledged genocide against those hundreds of thousands of Palestinian refugees, and just as many Lebanese.

178. What has hijacked Beirut has been the invading army. Despite the international community's consensus resolutions calling upon Israel to withdraw to Lebanon's internationally recognized boundaries, Israel has refused to do so and is now laying siege to the city of Beirut.

179. Where would the representative of Israel want those Palestinians to go? Does he want to bomb them into the Mediterranean? Their only abode, in which they have been living for 7,000 years, is right in Palestine, the country which they were forced to leave at the point of the bayonet. I can submit compilations regarding what has happened to those hapless Palestinians. Now they are being ruthlessly pursued, even in their status of refugees. That is the humanity that Israel claims to have.

180. I do not want to speak for too long, but I should like to make a substantive point which is very relevant to the basic theme of our discussion, namely, the commendable French-Egyptian initiative [S/15317].

181. The representative of Israel states that Council resolutions are adopted in their totality and that any tampering with them would spoil the entire set-up. I should like to inform him that Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) were adopted to resolve the consequences of the 1967 conflict, not to solve the

question of Palestine or the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, on which there are hundreds of standing resolutions.

182. Israel was created as a result of a United Nations act [*General Assembly resolution 181 (II)*] partitioning Palestine and assigning a far larger area to the Palestinian State than that comprised by the West Bank, Gaza or what is now called Arab Jerusalem. And yet the Israelis never gave a chance to the Palestinians either to vote in a plebiscite or to say what they thought of it. They launched an all-out attack against the totally disarmed Palestinian civilians three or four days after the adoption of that partition scheme and occupied four fifths of Palestine—even before the end of the Mandate and before a single Arab soldier had entered the country to save the remnants of the Palestinian people in whatever places remained in Palestinian hands.

183. Now we have an initiative which tries to solve not only the immediate problem of Beirut and Lebanon as a whole—and it is extremely urgent to do so—but also the question of Palestine and the right of the Palestinian people, and by corollary the entire Middle East crisis.

184. Does Council resolution 242 (1967) even mention the Palestinian people? As I said, resolution 242 (1967) was designed to liquidate the consequences of the 1967 war, but what we are dealing with now is the search for a fair, just and comprehensive solution to the question of Palestine and the Middle East. It is therefore very, very timely that France and Egypt have submitted a draft resolution to introduce the dimension missing from resolution 242 (1967), namely, the question of Palestine, so that at long last the Middle East can enjoy a semblance of stability, prosperity and peace.

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

186. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): I must admit that I have been watching you, Sir, very closely through the month of July in these very, very crucial moments, and I admire your skill, your patience, your perseverance and your behaviour as President of the Council, as well as all the sincere efforts and endeavours you have made to put an end to the bloodshed, siege and brutality of the invading forces—acts that have been protested and even rejected by conscientious members of those Israeli forces, by other Israelis and by peace-loving peoples all over the world. All I can say, Sir, is thank you.

187. At times one wonders whether we learn from history. The battle of London is still alive in our minds, as are the siege of Leningrad and the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto. All that is now being directed against Beirut will justify the Nazi crimes against the free world in the 1940s.

188. There is a misconception about what is happening in Beirut. It is not only the PLO but the Lebanese people as well that are standing up in defence of their country, their capital, their families—almost 500,000 civilians; the Lebanese, too, are joining in to defend their city and their people. We happen to be there so we have joined in the defence of that city in order to secure and ensure the survival of the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples in that besieged town.

189. On 2 July, three distinguished personalities, all of the Jewish faith—I am referring to Nahum Goldmann and Philip Klutznick, both former Presidents of the World Jewish Congress, and Mr. Pierre Mendès France, a former Prime Minister of France—issued a joint statement, from which I shall quote the following:

“The real issue is not whether the Palestinians are entitled to their rights, but how to bring this about while ensuring Israel’s security and regional stability. Ambiguous concepts such as ‘autonomy’ are no longer sufficient, for they too often are used to confuse rather than to clarify. Needed now is the determination to reach a political accommodation between Israel and Palestinian nationalism.

“The war in Lebanon must stop. Israel must lift its siege of Beirut in order to facilitate negotiations with the PLO, leading to a political settlement. Mutual recognition must be vigorously pursued. And there should be negotiations with the aim of achieving coexistence between the Israeli and Palestinian peoples based on self-determination.”

190. Chairman Arafat replied on 4 July in the following words:

“Coming at this precise moment from three Jewish personalities of great worth, world-wide reputation and definite influence at all levels, both on the international scene and within their own community, that statement takes on a significant importance. I wish they might use their influence to put an end to the war of extermination to which the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples are subjected, and I invite them in these crucial and difficult days to visit the Palestinian camps in Lebanon so they can check for themselves the massacres and crimes committed by the Israeli forces.”

191. To us, and to the world, that should have been no surprise. The Palestine National Council, our parliament and the legislative branch of the PLO constitutional structure, which is of course our highest authority, has on several occasions affirmed the importance of relations and co-ordination with democratic and progressive Jewish forces and organizations, both within and outside the occupied homeland. Such relations have been continuing since then. Only a few days ago, Uri Avneri, a former member of the Knesset and an activist for peace, was received

in besieged Beirut by Chairman Arafat. I need not repeat what he said. We all saw it on television and read about it. Uri Avneri may be brought to trial on some trumped-up charge by those who reject and undermine peace efforts.

192. On 1 October 1977, the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Cyrus Vance, exchanged views regarding the situation in the Middle East with the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and in a joint communiqué the two countries expressed their belief that:

“Within the framework of a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem, all specific questions of the settlement should be resolved, including such key issues as withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the 1967 conflict; the resolution of the Palestinian question, including ensuring the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people; termination of the state of war and establishment of normal peaceful relations on the basis of mutual recognition of the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence.”

The two Governments also expressed their belief that:

“in addition to such measures for ensuring the security of the borders between Israel and the neighbouring Arab States as the establishment of demilitarized zones and the agreed stationing in them of United Nations troops or observers, international guarantees of such borders as well as of the observance of the terms of settlement can also be established.”

193. At that time, the PLO did not hesitate for a moment to state that it welcomed such a move, for we saw in it light at the end of the tunnel and hoped that peace would eventually reign over the area. Our hopes were further strengthened when the Government of the United States declared on 30 November 1978 before the General Assembly: “We acknowledge that that resolution [242 (1967)] does not deal with the political dimension of the Palestinian issue”.⁴ We hoped that the United States would take up the matter seriously and participate actively in the search and endeavours to resolve the Palestinian problem in all its aspects, particularly the fate of the Palestinian people, as well as the political dimension.

194. On 19 April 1981, the Palestine National Council decided to welcome a further approach to solving the question of Palestine and the Middle East conflict. That approach presented a historic opportunity. It included the following words:

“If there is to be real peace in the Middle East, the Israeli occupation of all Arab territories captured in 1967 must be ended. The inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine must be secured, up to

and including the establishment of their own State. It is essential to ensure the security and sovereignty of all the States of the region, including those of Israel."

Those were the basic principles of that approach, and the Palestine National Council decided to welcome it. On the same date, among other decisions, the National Council also unanimously adopted a decision condemning internal terrorism and international terrorism. I mention this only in order that those who do not want to know of this may perhaps benefit from what we say here.

195. The Security Council and the General Assembly have adopted many resolutions which are in one way or another related to the question of Palestine and all of which are aimed at resolving the conflict and at bringing peace to the Middle East. Of course, many resolutions have also been adopted by the United Nations that deal exclusively with the question of Palestine. A great number of resolutions have been adopted by the Council. One would think that all those resolutions would be given equal respect and be equally accepted and carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

196. The other day, Chairman Yasser Arafat signed a document before a delegation of United States congressmen who were visiting besieged Beirut. In it, he affirmed the commitment of the PLO to accept all United Nations resolutions relevant to the question of Palestine. There have been some attempts to single out one or two resolutions and to deal with such resolutions in isolation. That selective approach will not serve any good purpose. I am certain that the ensemble of those resolutions will be acceptable. So much has been said about resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) that it would seem that those are the only resolutions the Council has adopted on the situation in the Middle East and the question of Palestine. The time has come to view and consider all those resolutions as inseparably linked.

197. The representative of Ireland in his statement has told us about the Council's efforts since 1976 to bring about peace in the Middle East and about how those efforts have been frustrated. I shall forbear repeating his words. But one question might be asked, and for good reason. To what extent has resolution 242 (1967) been adhered to or violated? Has the principle of "the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war", as set forth in that resolution, been respected and adhered to? How would one classify the presence of more than 120,000 Israeli troops on Lebanese territory?

198. The immediate issue before the Council is the presence of the forces of the Israeli invasion, and the responsibility of the Council, in accordance with resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), is to see to it that

these troops are withdrawn unconditionally and immediately. The issue before the Council is the holocaust of the 1980s; the issue is the hundreds of thousands of displaced persons; the issue is the scores of thousands of detainees, wanton arrests and detentions, the disappearance of hundreds of Palestinian and Lebanese men, women and children, including doctors and medical teams.

199. The immediate issue in besieged Beirut is water for the thirsty, medical supplies for the civilian victims of the indiscriminate and barbarous bombing and shelling by Israel. The issue is the sovereignty and territorial integrity and unity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. The issue is the fate of more than 4 million Palestinians.

200. Earlier this evening the representative of the League of Arab States paraphrased for us some of the decisions adopted in Jeddah. I am now in a position to read out those decisions, and with the Council's permission I shall now do so:

"The Committee of Six of the Council of the League of Arab States met in Jeddah on 28 and 29 July 1982 under the chairmanship of Prince Saud Al-Faisal, the Foreign Minister of Saudi Arabia.

"The Committee discussed the current situation in Lebanon in all of its aspects, and agreed unanimously on the following points:

"1. To exert continued and sustained efforts to abide by the cease-fire.

"2. The Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) announces its decision to move its armed forces from Beirut. The safeguards and guarantees for this move as well as the safety of the refugee camps will be determined in an agreement between the Lebanese Government and the PLO in Beirut.

"3. To work towards lifting the blockade of the city of Beirut and its suburbs by securing the withdrawal of Israeli forces."

If I may interject here, I am so grateful to the Council for having adopted, almost unanimously, the draft resolution earlier this evening. Here I can see how the minds of peace-loving people work together. I continue reading out the decisions adopted at Jeddah:

"4. The Lebanese Government is to take all effective measures to ensure the security and safety of the inhabitants of the city of Beirut and its suburbs, including the Palestinian refugee camps.

"5. The participation of the international forces in the task of establishing security and safety of Beirut and its suburbs.

"6. The Arab States are to undertake the necessary political action to assist Lebanon in order to

attain the full implementation of Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982)" [S/15329, annex.]

201. We have before us a draft resolution introduced by Egypt and France [S/15317]. On this I should like to state the following.

202. The PLO, and in particular Yasser Arafat himself, have welcomed the initiative and called for giving it encouragement and full support. We fully appreciate the motive: to find a solution, a global solution, a just and comprehensive solution for the conflict in the Middle East through the just solution of the question of Palestine in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. We note with satisfaction that the sponsors of the draft resolution have shown their willingness to consider amendments. As a matter of fact, the PLO has already presented some amendments, and we sincerely hope that the sponsors will accord them due consideration.

203. We also heard with satisfaction the statement of the representative of Egypt when he presented the draft resolution. We note that his statement contained a reaffirmation of the right of all States to live in peace within recognized international boundaries. We note it, and we hope that it will eventually appear in the final draft.

204. We noted also the statement that the draft resolution deals with the role of the United Nations to supervise the cease-fire and disengagement in and around Beirut by stationing United Nations military observers therein.

205. But then we come to something very close to us and to the core of the issue. We note that the representative of Egypt added that the Palestinian people has the right to self-determination with all its implications and the right to statehood in the West Bank and Gaza, territories that were occupied in 1967 and from which the United Nations has decided that Israel should withdraw. We further note the statement that the Palestinian people shall be represented in the negotiations and, consequently, that the PLO shall participate therein.

206. Those are, I would say, constructive elements and we trust that eventually they will find their way into the draft resolution now before us.

207. Today the Secretary-General has issued a statement to which we believe it is important to refer. He recalls in particular paragraph 1 of Council resolution 512 (1982). The statement appears in press release SG/SM/3315. I am sure that he would not have issued such a statement if he were not fully aware of the situation in Beirut.

208. I am grateful, again, to the Council for having adopted, almost unanimously, the draft resolution despite the non-participation of one of its members.

209. Some reference has been made to UNRWA stores in Beirut. It must be realized that Beirut is under siege, that not even water or electricity or food is brought in, that Beirut has thousands of refugees, thousands of victims, human beings—and here we will not differentiate as to whether they are Palestinian or Lebanese. We do know that in the warehouses there was and is some food that will help the people in their plight. What was read out from the press release was transmitted to Beirut, and I shall now read the reply of Chairman Arafat to the statement by UNRWA:

"We are surprised by the statement issued by UNRWA headquarters in Vienna. It does not reflect the truth. The armed men we posted were put there to guard the warehouses from looting by civilians, especially since the city is completely besieged. The inhabitants refuse to have food and supplies taken out of the city. We, the Palestine Liberation Organization, have offered, and we still do, to UNRWA headquarters to buy whatever is needed from any source outside Beirut, and we are ready to pay the price. We were surprised by this strange statement that was issued by UNRWA. Please inform Mr. Urquhart and UNRWA headquarters in Vienna about the situation and of our readiness to pay for whatever they would buy from outside Beirut in any quantity UNRWA wishes, for the relief of our people in the south. We hope that this can be implemented immediately."

210. I wonder what city under siege would permit the contents of its warehouses to leave the city, especially in this case where there is no guarantee that the Palestinian refugees—who, I stress, are supposed to receive these rations from UNRWA—will eventually get them. At the end of this morning's meeting, the representative of Lebanon told the Council that, as of noon today, even ICRC was being prevented from bringing medicines into the capital [2384th meeting, para. 80].

211. Finally, I must recall that even while the world is involved with what is happening around Beirut and in Lebanon, even while the Israelis are committing all these crimes, they are at the same time committing crimes against the Palestinian people under occupation. The description of one such crime—a desecration—is to be found in annex II of document S/15318. In brief, on 28 July, the sanctuary of Haram al-Sharif was to have been raided by some 150 Israelis. They raided two private houses, forced the dwellers out of their homes and then attempted to invade Haram al-Sharif by climbing down a wall.

212. I would also stress again the ill-treatment of prisoners and detainees, and the fact that not even ICRC has been able to trace the hundreds of people who have disappeared. We hope that in time ICRC and other international agencies will be able to locate them.

213. The PRESIDENT: I call next on the representative of the United Kingdom, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

214. Mr. WHYTE (United Kingdom): The representative of Israel, in the course of a few rather disobliging comments on the statement that I made earlier in this debate, made a surprising reference to some recent events in San Carlos, Teal Inlet and Goose Green. He added that the Government of Israel did not enjoy the luxury of fighting its wars 8,000 miles away from home [*para. 162 above*].

215. I suggest that if the representative of Israel wishes to draw any kind of analogy between those events and what is now happening in Beirut, he should get it into rather sharper focus. Let me remind members of the Council what was going on at the time in those Falkland Islands. British troops in that neighbourhood were engaged in repossessing British territory, territory which had been the victim of armed invasion by Argentina. They were acting in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations in exercise of the right of self-defence, following the total failure of Argentina to respond to a mandatory resolution of the Council which called for the immediate withdrawal of all Argentine troops from the Falkland Islands [*resolution 502 (1982)*]. Moreover, the British troops and the British Government were doing all this in order to safeguard the right of self-determination of the inhabitants of the Falkland Islands.

216. What is now happening in Beirut is that a massive invasion of another sovereign nation is being conducted by the Israel Defence Forces in order to seek to deal with a problem which arises precisely because the Palestinians, over many years, have been denied that right of self-determination. If the Palestinians had been accorded that same right, Beirut would not now be in ruins. In the view of my Government—as I indi-

cated in my statement earlier—it is not by the particularly brutal methods which are being used by the Israel Defence Forces and the Government of Israel at this moment in Lebanon that the Palestinian problem is about to be solved.

217. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply, and I call on him now.

218. Mr. BLUM (Israel): It is not my intention, and it was not my intention, to go into the merits of the recent conflict in the Falkland Islands (Malvinas). There was one point I wished to make, and to that point the representative of the United Kingdom has not addressed himself. The United Kingdom claimed the exercise of its right of self-defence 8,000 miles from the borders of Britain. I do not wish to go into the merits of that claim, but surely a country which is being attacked from beyond its borders and whose civilian population is being terrorized and harassed from across the border is entitled to invoke its legitimate right of self-defence, just as the United Kingdom asserted that right with regard to events that happened some 8,000 miles away from London.

The meeting rose at 8.10 p.m.

NOTES

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, Nos. 970 to 973.

² Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *The Hague Conventions and Declarations of 1899 and 1907* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1915).

³ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Emergency Special Session, Plenary meetings*, 24th meeting.

⁴ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-third session, Plenary meetings*, 65th meeting, para. 88.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

如何购取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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