

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

NOV 18 1986

UN/DA COLLECTION

**2214<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 14 APRIL 1980

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2214) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 10 April 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13885);	
Special report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/13888 and Corr.1) .....	1

#### NOTE

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

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

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

## 2214th MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 14 April 1980, at 3.30 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Porfirio MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Bangladesh, China, France, German Democratic Republic, Jamaica, Mexico, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2214)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the Middle East:  
Letter dated 10 April 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13885);  
Special report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/13888 and Corr.1)

*The meeting was called to order at 4.15 p.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

#### The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 10 April 1980 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13885);  
Special report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/13888 and Corr.1)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings [2212th and 2213th meetings], I invite the representative of Lebanon to take a place at the Council table, and I invite the representatives of Israel, Jordan and the Netherlands and the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon) took a place at the Council table and Mr. Blum (Israel), Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan), and Mr. van Buuren (Netherlands) and Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to inform the members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Ireland and Italy in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mulloy (Ireland) and Mr. La Rocca (Italy) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The first speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations, to whom the Council has extended an invitation [2213th meeting] under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

4. Mr. MAKSOUD: The question before the Council today is clear. Until when can the United Nations allow Israel to flout its resolutions, defy the international consensus and treat its functions, activities and institutions with contempt? Until when can Israel literally get away with murder? Until when can Israel pose as if it is insulated from the world community and behave as if it is immune from its sanctions and from the impact of its inevitable condemnation?

5. Israel considers what takes place here to be an exercise in futility; the veto power of its only ally and sponsor can invariably paralyse the will of the Council. If the veto is not forthcoming, then Israel proceeds to defy the resolutions of the Council in a manner that gives the impression that the United Nations is helpless where Israel is concerned and useless where the Arabs are concerned.

6. Perhaps, Mr. President, under your guidance and stewardship, a formula can develop that would render the resolutions of the Council, as they pertain to the south of Lebanon, fully capable of implementation, and allow the mandate given to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) to be interpreted in such a manner as to deter Israel from the continued pursuit of its aggression and violation of Lebanon's sovereignty.

7. The question before the Council today concerns a founding member of the League of Arab States. Lebanon, in modern times, was the anchor of the intellectual and cultural renaissance and revival of the Arab nation. Lebanon has repeatedly played the role of catalyst; a conceptual catalyst inasmuch as people of diverse religious affiliations and ethnic backgrounds can constitute a common national entity, a common citizenry; an operational catalyst, inasmuch as the reinforcement of Arab national cohesion required a throbbing awareness of the historical cross-currents influencing the mind of the modern man; a humanist catalyst inasmuch as Lebanon transformed its geographical status as the crossroads of three continents to that of a cross-fertilizer of ideas and ideals and an experiment in ongoing humanist synthesis.

8. The immediate problem before the Council has been created by Israel's entry into Lebanese territory. This is the latest manifestation of Israel's ongoing aggression against the south of Lebanon. That the United States, because of its special relationship with Israel, has been able to "persuade" Israel to withdraw its troops from Lebanon is a very marginal aspect of the crisis. The United States, it must be admitted, has done that frequently and repeatedly. Yet, this has been the pattern: Israel dispatches its armed forces into south Lebanon frequently and repeatedly; the United States, in order to minimize dangers to its over-all policy in the Middle East, "asks Israel to pull back its troops", and this goes on. What does that mean? It means that Israel arrogates to itself the right and the freedom to transgress Lebanon's borders at will and on any pretext. Consequently, the ability of Israel to undertake acts of military aggression against Lebanon—in the south of Lebanon—is unchecked and the deterrent that would disable Israel is rendered inoperative. For that reason, the Council has found itself, since March 1978 when its resolution 425 (1978) was adopted unanimously, lacking the adequate capability to ensure the full implementation of that resolution pertaining to the south of Lebanon.

9. Why? The reasons are clear and the problem this poses has to be dealt with by the Council head on. It can no longer be dealt with hesitantly, shyly and apologetically. The Council must signal that it not only sticks to its resolutions pertaining to the south of Lebanon but that those resolutions must be fully complied with in so far as their execution is concerned. Anything short of full implementation of resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) in all their parts and within a time-frame that the Council will spell out now would be construed by Israel, as usual, or as always, as licence for it to pursue its objectives by undermining the authority of UNIFIL and preventing the full implementation of the aforementioned resolutions.

10. The report of the Secretary-General [S/13888] clearly shows that UNIFIL is gradually being disabled

in the performance of its tasks by the so-called "*de facto* forces". I should like here to make an observation which, although semantic in nature, implies major political consequences and connotations. The term "*de facto* forces" as applied to the Haddad forces gives the impression that these are in some way forces distinct from the Israeli military establishment. In the south of Lebanon, they are not distinct but, to all intents and purposes, an integral and organic part of the Israeli strike force and an instrument of Israel to undermine the full implementation of resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978). Not only are these forces considered to be composed of mutineers, renegades and traitors by the legitimate authority of Lebanon and by the people of Lebanon, but they are crudely and openly used by the Israeli strike force against Lebanon. Hence, if the term "*de facto*" has to be applied, it has to mean that these are the "*de facto* forces" of the Israeli military presence and, as such, their existence constitutes a violation of Lebanon's sovereignty and of the ability of the central Government of Lebanon to exercise its authority, and have to be treated accordingly.

11. In other words, these forces which have been attacking UNIFIL in the last few days are forces of the Israeli strike force; they are used as a cover under which Israel cynically defies the international will. In its use of them Israel crudely underestimates the intelligence and the perception of the international community and the Security Council. The other attribute that is usually affixed to these mutineer elements is that of "Christian militias". That the usurpation of the word "Christian" should be so frequently made in this case implies a travesty of the Christians of Lebanon, of their national and patriotic commitments and of their identification with the legitimate central authority of Lebanon.

12. Parenthetically, Israel's claim to be a "protector" of Christians in south Lebanon is not worthy of comment. But it would have had a semblance of a chance to acquire temporary credence at least, if the Christian citizens of northern Israel had been allowed to return to their homes in Ikrit and Kafr Bar'am during the last 25 years since they were forcibly evicted from their homes. So, before claiming "protection" of Christians in south Lebanon, let Israel protect its own Christian citizens in the north of Israel and Galilee.

13. We are dealing with a situation in the south of Lebanon that, if allowed to continue, will constitute a very serious and imminent threat to peace not only in the south of Lebanon but also in the region as a whole. That is so obvious and clear that it does not warrant any further elaboration.

14. However, the contribution of the League of Arab States to the Council's deliberations requires that we seek to shed some light on the nature of the limited and long-range objectives of Israel in Lebanon, in order to explain the causal factors that lie at the roots

of Israel's behaviour in the south of Lebanon and to explain the level of arrogant cynicism with which Israel treats the question of its aggression in the south of Lebanon. What are these objectives? Let me briefly outline the principal Israeli objectives in this respect.

15. First, Israel seeks to discredit UNIFIL in order to perpetuate Israeli capacity to undermine the authority of the United Nations, its resolutions and functions, not only in the south of Lebanon but throughout the region. In this respect, nothing will deter Israel from further defiance except the imposition of economic, political and military sanctions. Hence, after Israel had occupied the south of Lebanon, it complied nominally with the injunction pertaining to withdrawal, while cynically replacing its forces, or most of them, by its proxies. By doing so, Israel sought to maintain its military control in the south of Lebanon while creating conditions that prevented further implementation of the aforementioned Council resolutions. Israel has for many years sought to discredit the United Nations in order to forestall its own growing isolation in the world and render United Nations resolutions inoperative so as to destabilize the various peace-keeping forces and mechanisms of the United Nations in the Middle East. In its attempt to discredit UNIFIL and to undermine its operations and functions Israel gives the task, as the report of the Secretary-General amply shows, to the renegade forces in order to contrive an impression that the challenge to Lebanon's central authority is an "internal" political question rather than a continuation of Israel's violation of Council resolutions.

16. I should like at this point to reply very briefly to some of the allegations and statements made this morning by the representative of Israel [22/3th meeting]. First, he alleged that at the Arab Summit Conference held in Tunis the Palestine Liberation Organization and President Sarkis had differed on the interpretation of the resolutions of the Summit, as reported by Reuters. I should like to state very categorically that President Sarkis is a signatory of the resolutions of the Tunis Summit. Lebanon, the PLO and all the Arab States are committed to the implementation of those resolutions. The signature of the President of Lebanon is binding and provides a more credible description of his position than does a Reuters report, cited by the Israeli representative. My second correction concerns the statement that the solution of the problems of Lebanon can be handled by the removal of "alien forces". Let me state that what are called "Syrian forces" in Lebanon are Syrian units under the umbrella of an Arab League force, called the Arab Deterrent Force. They are there by virtue of a resolution of the Arab League and at the invitation of the Government of Lebanon, to remain until their functions are deemed terminated by their own Commander-in-Chief, who happens to be the President of Lebanon. Until then they are to be considered part of Lebanon's legitimacy. Any attempt to distort these facts is an attempt to distort the reality of Lebanon.

17. With respect to the PLO, its relationship with Lebanon is a relationship between two members of the Arab League. The PLO is not defined as the Israeli representative seeks to define it, but as it is perceived not only by the Palestinian people but by the Arab Governments, including the Government of Lebanon, namely as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. The Palestinian people regard the PLO not only as their own spokesman and fighter on behalf of their rights, but as the framework of the Palestinian people.

18. Secondly, Israel seeks to perpetuate the crisis in the south of Lebanon as one of its regional bargaining cards. In this respect, Israel realizes that the United States, in view of its special relationship with Israel, can exercise credible leverage on it on any particular issue at any particular time. Because of the so-called Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty, Israel has concluded that the United States wants to show some "results" on the West Bank-Gaza issue. Therefore, the thrust of United States potential for pressure has to be diverted and diffused and can be if another issue on another front remains open. Let me explain. The United States, Israel believes, must be able to hand President Sadat some "progress" on the so-called autonomy negotiations. This is due to the fact that if no "progress" is made and no tangible results emerge, then President Sadat's stature within the Arab world will be further damaged and this, in the United States view, would further compound his problems within Egypt itself. That is how Israel reads the American position. Hence, in order to keep United States pressure diffused, there must always be another issue on another front. That is one of the basic reasons for Israel's continued aggression in the south of Lebanon. The Israeli Government believes that if the United States is faced with the two problematic issues at the same time, then its potential for pressure will be diluted and it will have to postpone using its leverage on Israel, if not remove that leverage altogether. That will help Israel to buy time to achieve its objectives both in the West Bank-Gaza area and in the south of Lebanon.

19. Thirdly, Israel seeks to achieve in the south of Lebanon final strategic military hegemony. The south of Lebanon, in Israel's view, must be cleared of any military presence at the moment, whether Lebanese or United Nations. In this respect, I should like to welcome the announcement made this morning [*ibid.*] by Mr. Tuéni, the representative of Lebanon, that the Lebanese Army has decided to participate, within the operational framework of UNIFIL, in the implementation of the role of UNIFIL under its mandate. It is hoped that the necessary interpretation will be given to the mandate of UNIFIL that will provide it with deterrent capacity and the ability to implement the tasks entrusted to it.

20. Israel has sought to extend its military hegemony up to the Litani River and that extension, Israel thinks,

must be recognized in return for Israel's acceptance of a form of administrative presence, perhaps a legal presence, for the Lebanese authority. If Israeli strategic hegemony over the south is acquiesced to and recognized, then Israel can take it as a precedent to be applied to other contested borders and other violated borders. With a demilitarized Sinai and an emptied south Lebanon, Israeli claims to strategic hegemony over the Golan Heights in Syria and to establish colonial, military settlements in the Jordan Valley and in the West Bank will not be seriously challenged by the United States or by those who refuse Israel's *pax hebraica* objectives. Besides, Israel will then be able to project its "success" in the south of Lebanon as an application of a three-year-old suggestion that the legal borders need not be the "secure borders of Israel".

21. Fourthly, in that respect, Israel has another objective in the south of Lebanon, namely, preparing the ground for gaining control over the waters of the Litani River under the pretence of "sharing the waters", as it is doing in the West Bank today. It is evident from the report of the Secretary-General that the south of Lebanon is viewed by Israel as a variation on the West Bank. It is true that Israel's challenge to Lebanese sovereignty over the south is not so glaring, but it is quite clear.

22. Fifthly, by challenging Lebanon's central authority and preventing it from deploying its forces in the south, Israel seeks to keep Lebanon in a state of what I should call "manageable turmoil" so that Israel itself may become a determining political factor in an Arab State. I use the term "manageable" deliberately, because an unmanageable turmoil in Lebanon would be too exacting and perhaps too costly for Israel. On the other hand, it is Israel's perception that turmoil must continue so that Israel may share in the management. With that view in mind, Israel seeks to cut off the south of Lebanon from Lebanon itself, to all intents and purposes, in order to expand the area of vulnerability so that Israel can, at a later stage, determine most of the developments in the region. Israel will then be recognized not only as a State but as a Power in the area and then its "right to exist" will become coterminous or synonymous with the right to dominate.

23. Sixthly, if Israel succeeds in perpetuating the haemorrhage in southern Lebanon, it then anticipates the failure of the pluralist experiment in Lebanon. Israel is planting the seeds of disintegration throughout the country. Since zionism was the driving force in building the usurping racist entity and State of Israel, zionizing the region by bringing about its disintegration is intended to impoverish the national will and to weaken the propensity in the Arab world to build modern and viable States. In other words, Israel seeks to impugn Arab national existence through Lebanon's continued turmoil and disintegration.

24. That is a broad sketch of Israel's motives and objectives in the south of Lebanon. In other words, Israel seeks, in a small geographical area called the south of Lebanon, to settle big accounts. It seeks to keep the United Nations peace-keeping forces and other United Nations mechanisms off balance. It seeks to keep the drive for Lebanon's national unity and cohesion off balance. It seeks to keep Arab commitments to a just and comprehensive peace in the region off balance. It seeks to keep the Palestinian ability to achieve what the international community recognizes as legitimate national rights off balance. It seeks to dismember the Palestinian people by dividing it into a variety of Palestinian constituencies. In that respect, Israel seeks to generate conditions in which the Palestinians, wherever they may be, would consider hopeless their right to have a State in their homeland and start a quest for a substitute homeland in the various areas of their transitional residence. That hopelessness could become the means of fuelling demographic disruptions and of drying out the demographic potential for a Palestinian State in the Palestinian homeland.

25. It is those objectives that render the crisis in the south of Lebanon much more far-reaching and much more ominous. That is why the incidents mentioned in the Secretary-General's report cannot be dealt with in isolation from the overall context of Israel's strategic, territorial, demographic and ideological objectives in Lebanon. That is why the League of Arab States and all the Arab States are committed to seeing to it that resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) are fully implemented or that this Council addressed itself to the causes and reasons for their not so far having been fully implemented. If the reasons for their defective implementation show that a redefinition of the mandate of UNIFIL is required, then let there be a redefinition. If a new resolution is required that will provide the mandate of the Council with additional teeth to enable it fully to implement its will, then let there be a new resolution.

26. In the mean time, let not the fact that Israeli troops entered and withdrew, whether partially or fully, be an excuse for distracting the Council's attention from the urgent need to evolve a credible deterrent to Israel and its proxies, so that Israel will realize that its transgressions are costly, that its pampered arrogance is no longer tolerated and that the exceptional treatment it seeks is at an end.

27. That Lebanon should reinforce its national unity, exercise full authority over all its territories and recover its creative role after five years of tragedy are not only a Lebanese necessity, a Palestinian necessity, an Arab necessity and an international necessity but also a human necessity. Lebanon's resilience will trigger a speedy recovery in direct proportion to the credible implementation of the Council's will and resolutions.

28. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of Jordan, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

29. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): The last person to be speaking about terrorism and children is the representative of the Zionist entity, whose terrorist arsenal, from the air, by sea and on land, has killed and maimed literally tens of thousands of innocent Palestinian refugees, including thousands of children. Of course, they do not appear on the television screens, but still they have been killed and maimed.

30. Now, those people, who should never have been in refugee exile in Lebanon but on their ancestral soil in Palestine—an exile of three decades, or is it 32 years?—are the victims of almost daily shelling and aerial and sea bombardment, in addition to territorial incursions by Israeli troops or Israel's notorious henchman and surrogate, who has gone to the extent, of proposing that Lebanon's boundaries be moved up to the Litani River when he suggested the other day that the permanent Armistice Agreement personnel operate near the Litani, and not on Lebanon's international borders.

31. The Israel army's reprehensible and aggressive action against Lebanon during the past week has very ominous overtones indeed, for more than one reason.

32. For one thing, it is a flagrant violation, with a total lack of concern, of the inviolability and territorial integrity of a sovereign independent Member State. This undercuts the principal tenet of the Charter. Whether the invading force was a battalion or a division is a peripheral consideration which does not mitigate or diminish the essential fact of aggression and invasion. Such acts of aggression must not be allowed to pass without the most serious repercussions and punishment, if the integrity of the world organization is to be preserved. If lawless and aggressive Israel can commit such aggression with impunity, then you can only expect repeat operations at the whim and will of reckless Zionist military commanders, who have hardly disguised their scorn for the United Nations and its affiliates and for everything it stands for. The price, of course, is paid by hundreds of thousands of constantly roaming Lebanese citizens and Palestinian refugees, and in the ruins of ancient and historic towns and villages like Sur, Sidon and countless others. They are there for all to see.

33. Moreover, there are the audacious shelling of UNIFIL's headquarters at Naqoura, the shameless imprisonment and ill-treatment of the personnel of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine (UNTSO), and the injuries which that shelling inflicted upon the United Nations personnel and equipment, equipment which must be upgraded to enable them to defend themselves, at least. Those lightly-armed and valiant officers and men, repre-

senting scores of respected countries and regions, representing the world, went to the Middle East as an interim peace-keeping force to separate combatants but not to assume a combat role. The cowardly attack against them by the Israeli aggressive forces and the mercenary on their payroll, Major Haddad, goes a long way towards exposing the true nature and ugly face of an entity whose dark history has been stained with blood, violence and hate long before and since its inception. And yet it is still a member of a world body dedicated to eradicating lawlessness and violence.

34. And what is it that prompted those Israeli commanders to commit their outrageous attacks against Lebanon and the emissaries of the United Nations—our emissaries? They claim that UNIFIL and UNTSO had failed to detect the raiders of an Israeli colony, Misgav Am. But if the Israeli aggressors had had any sense of restraint, any sense of proportion, or respect for the United Nations, they would have easily recognized that the mission of both UNIFIL and UNTSO is not to police internal security within Israel, for if that were their mandate, then Israel should allow them to be stationed across the Armistice Line within Israel, to operate as a fourth or fifth electronic fence against any incursions. And we all recall that UNIFIL was prevented from taking over the whole strip of territory along the border between Lebanon and Israel, and that the Israelis handed over that territory to their agent, who commands what are known as the *de facto* forces. Now, if the pervasive and extensive security apparatus of the Israelis failed to detect an incursion, under what formula or by what mathematical computation does one expect a token force to perform in a fool-proof manner, when the armed camp—which is Israel—failed to protect itself?

35. Indeed, having seen UNTSO officers at work in the mid-1950s and before the 1967 Israeli aggression, I can testify not only to their objectivity and dedication but also to their highest proficiency. They know a footprint or the type of sole from a shoe if they find one. I understand—although I would welcome correction if my information is incomplete—that the UNTSO personnel, who have three decades of honourable tradition behind them, were unable to detect any traces of footprints or severed electronic wires. This clearly suggests that the raid on the Israeli settlement could have been carried out by resistance personnel from within, and not by incursion from without. This perhaps also explains the shameful manner in which UNTSO personnel—unarmed officers and men—were roughed up, taken captive and immobilized. The Israelis evidently did not wish those impeccable officers to seek the facts and report them, as they have always done during the past three decades, to United Nations Headquarters and the Security Council. Not only were those valiant officers taken captive: their observation posts were simultaneously wrecked, their immobility assured.

36. The representative of the Zionist entity in Palestine has shed crocodile tears over the child whose

death we all deeply regret. But who shot that child? It is clear from all reports that the child was the victim of precipitate and incessant attacks by the Israeli armed forces upon the premises in which the five resistance youths had taken up positions. The death-toll included all five youths, as well as Israelis, among them 16 wounded Israeli soldiers. This was reported in the press. The encounter lasted for almost nine hours, and the building was rocked by extensive gun fire. It is a miracle that the casualty toll within the premises was not much higher, especially among hapless children.

37. In similar situations which have occurred in many parts of the world, security forces do not act with reckless haste but resort to arms after exhausting all other peaceful options—or at least some of them. This is not because the security forces of those countries lack the overwhelming fire-power to overcome resistance; it is because all those countries have a healthy and laudable respect for the lives and dignity of innocent human beings who are inadvertently caught up in situations beyond their control. But in their reckless arrogance and irresponsibility, the Israeli troops, forgoing responsible restraint for bravado, could not care less who gets killed, and the quicker the better, even if it assuredly involves some of their citizens, even the children. Everybody knows that the five youths who lost their lives were on a one-way journey of no return, so why imperil the children's lives by reckless and precipitate military action?

38. It is the duty of the Council to take effective measures to ensure that no aggressor shall be permitted to go berserk. The Council must ensure the total withdrawal of all Israeli armed forces from Lebanese soil promptly and unconditionally in accordance with its own resolutions. The Israelis are playing cat-and-mouse with all of us, and the Secretary-General informed us this morning [2213th meeting] that he could not verify that all the Israeli forces had withdrawn from Lebanese soil. Likewise, it is incumbent upon the Council to safeguard at least the honour and safety of United Nations emissaries, if not the aggrieved victims of prolonged Israeli occupation, oppression and brutality. We have all seen, but were hardly surprised by, the Israeli armed vandals attacking, killing, maiming and breaking the bones of innocent Palestinian students and children in the occupied territories in various colleges and schools, even though they had had nothing to do with what happened in the Israeli colony.

39. But what could we expect from an entity that, with American financing, technical know-how and sale of the most sophisticated engines and equipment—10 days ago, one of the prime General Electric engines used for jets was sold to the Israelis—has become a merchant of death and one of the top exporters of arms, as we saw with our own eyes on the CBS television programme "60 Minutes" yesterday?

40. In conclusion my last remark is that, unless the Council takes drastic action, including sanctions, the whole Middle East will inevitably find itself plunged into the throes of a devastating conflict that will pose a most serious threat to world peace and security.

41. I take this opportunity to express our deep gratitude and appreciation to the Secretary-General for his persistent and unceasing efforts over the past week in confronting the perils that Israel's aggression had posed to the inviolability of Lebanese territory, as well as to both UNIFIL and UNTSO, whose men are risking their lives in the line of duty in a valiant and thankless task. We pay our deepest condolences to the families of those valiant United Nations officers and men who gallantly gave up their lives, and we wish a speedy recovery to those who were wounded.

42. The fundamental and unalterable fact is that the Palestinian refugees should not have to be in Lebanon in the first place; they should not have to cut through electrified fences in order to reach their land and homes in Galilee, a land that is their birthright, as mandated by the General Assembly in resolution 194 (III) and reconfirmed each year. The usurpers of their lands are the undoubted culprits.

43. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Security Council has convened this emergency meeting to consider the new acts of naked aggression on the part of Israel against the sovereign State of Lebanon.

44. On 8 April, regular units of the Israeli army, with the support of both tanks and aircraft, once again violated the national boundary of Lebanon and carried out a mass incursion into Lebanese territory. In this way, Israel has once again grossly violated the generally recognized norms of international law and overtly violated the numerous resolutions of the Council whose purpose was to preserve Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity from Israeli encroachments.

45. Israel's aggressions have not concealed its intention to establish control over the Lebanese territory by cynically arrogating to themselves the right to carry out patrols in southern Lebanon, to carry out engineering works there and so forth. What we are really talking about is the fact that Israel, while rendering intensive military and material support to its agents in Lebanon, namely the anti-Government forces of Haddad, is also continuing its efforts directly to assert its military presence in the southern part of Lebanon and openly to occupy part of Lebanese territory.

46. Recently the world witnessed the continued escalation of aggressive action on the part of the Israeli military and its right-wing Christian henchmen against



Lebanon. The Israeli aggressors have systematically subjected the southern Lebanese towns of Tyre, Sidon and Nabatiye and numerous villages to artillery and air attack. Under fire from Israeli artillery and air forces, peaceful Lebanese citizens and Palestinian refugees, including women, old people and children, have perished. As a consequence of the massive shelling of 17 March, the premises of the children's medical centre in Tyre were razed to the ground. In fleeing from the shelling and bombing, thousands of peaceful inhabitants have had to leave their homes. Lebanon is suffering tremendous material damage. At the same time as the densely populated areas of southern Lebanon are being shelled, Israeli warships are threatening the Lebanese coastline and Israeli planes are carrying out regular overflights over virtually all the Lebanese territory.

47. With the help of Haddad's units, Israel has made it impossible for United Nations troops to establish control over the Lebanese areas that border Israel. Armed provocation against United Nations forces in southern Lebanon has caused casualties among the military personnel. According to information provided by the Secretary-General, the headquarters of the United Nations forces has been destroyed; and the information available about the departure of the Israeli forces essentially does not change the situation. The dangerous situation that has arisen as a result of Israeli provocations remains.

48. The aggressive and provocative actions of Israel committed against Lebanon and the United Nations troops that are located in Lebanon's southern region are part and parcel of the expansionist policy pursued by the ruling circles of Israel for which military adventures against neighbouring Arab States have long been used as a means for realizing far-reaching plans for annexation. It is also quite obvious that by stepping up military tension, Israel is endeavouring to distract the attention of international public opinion from the ongoing negotiations regarding the so-called administrative autonomy for the Palestinians, the purpose of which, as has been clearly demonstrated during the current discussion in the Council of the question of the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, is to facilitate Israel's consolidation of its annexation of the Arab lands that were occupied in 1967.

49. Today no one can any longer harbour any doubt that the conclusion of the Camp David accords in September 1978 and the signing in March 1979 of a separate Egyptian-Israeli treaty have given free rein to Israel to pursue its increasingly implacable, defiant, aggressive and expansionist policy against Lebanon and the Palestinian refugees located in that territory. This is precisely the reason for the daily increasing number of armed provocations carried out by Israel and the separatist Haddad's units under its control against Lebanon, against Palestinian camps and against UNIFIL in southern Lebanon. Today Haddad and his

Israeli sponsors are ready to dictate to the United Nations where UNTSO observers should be located and where UNIFIL forces should be deployed. Haddad's units have destroyed United Nations forces' helicopters, deliberately fired upon their positions, invaded their posts and seized their personnel.

50. This defiant and cynical policy on the part of the Israeli leadership could not have been pursued had they not enjoyed virtually unlimited support from their powerful protectors. It is no secret to anyone that the United States not only gives Israel the broadest possible and the most generous financial and economic assistance, not only provides it with the most sophisticated forms of weaponry, including offensive weapons, but also prevents the Security Council from taking any resolutions that would condemn the Israeli armed provocations and provide for the adoption of effective measures to put an end to them.

51. War and peace in the Middle East are closely tied up with the interests of many States and peoples in that area. Therefore, a comprehensive and just settlement of the Middle East problem is feasible only provided that due account is taken of the legitimate rights of all the parties concerned, including, of course, the Arab people of Palestine. And for that there is only one genuine basis, which derives from the relevant decisions adopted by the United Nations: Israel's restoration to the Arabs of all the territories that it seized in 1967, the granting to the Palestinian Arabs of the right to self-determination and to create their own State, and the assurance that all States in the area will enjoy an independent and secure existence.

52. As has been shown by the entire course of events in the Middle East over the last year, any attempts to solve the Middle East problem on the basis of separate deals will not bring the Middle East any peace or stability. On the contrary, such deals will simply serve to increase tension in that area, they will further increase Israel's aggressiveness, and they will encourage its designs of usurpation in the neighbouring Arab States.

53. Once again I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the fact that we have very frequently encountered facts attesting to the gross and cynical violation by Israel of both the spirit and the letter of the Charter. Israel has trampled underfoot the resolutions of the Council, which have been designed to bring about a normalization of the situation in southern Lebanon. And once again we are forced to ask: how long does the Security Council intend to acquiesce in such conduct by a Member State? After all, the Council has available to it all the necessary facilities to bring the usurpers of Tel Aviv to heel. How long, one wonders, will the representatives of the United States systematically support Israel in the Council, thus undermining the prestige and effectiveness of the United Nations?

54. In conclusion, I should like to stress that the Soviet delegation believes it essential for the Council, in the light of recent events in the south of Lebanon, to adopt a resolution containing clear-cut and unambiguous terms which would not only call for strict respect of the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within the confines of its internationally recognized boundaries, but also provide for the adoption of effective measures against the Israeli aggressor.

55. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

56. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): At the outset I should like to make it very clear that the Palestinian presence in Lebanon is not the choice of the Palestinians. The Palestinians are in Lebanon as a result of an onslaught, a holocaust, an attempt at genocide by the Zionist armed gangs which have driven the Palestinians out of their homes by force. The Palestinians are in Lebanon in transit until they return to their homes. It should be made very clear that the Palestinian, wherever he is, has the inalienable right to return to his home, that is, Palestine. So there are no Palestinian "infiltrators", there are no Palestinian "terrorists"; there are Palestinians who are exercising their inalienable right to return to their homes. Sometimes violence ensues in that exercise, but in principle it is a right that they are exercising, the right to return to their homes. The Palestinians have no intention whatsoever of taking any other country to replace their own, and they have no plan to usurp the land of others and declare it their own State.

57. On 14 December 1979, the Secretary-General presented a report to the Council in which he stated:

"As I mentioned in my last report, an essential factor in the success of UNIFIL in the implementation of its mandate is the position of the Israeli Government, inasmuch as the *de facto* forces are supported by Israel." [S/13691, para. 58.]

And later in the same document, the Secretary-General stated:

"It is my earnest hope that, given the clear will of the Council, and in the interests of peace, all parties concerned will increasingly extend to UNIFIL the co-operation that it requires." [*Ibid.*, para. 61.]

58. That report was adopted and accepted by a resolution of the Council [resolution 459 (1979)] but what was the result? The result was obstruction and violent harassment, not only by the so-called *de facto* forces which have sought to prevent the re-manning by UNTSO observers of long-established United

Nations observation posts along the armistice demarcation lines, but also by the so-called Israel Defence Forces (IDF). I really do not know what those letters stand for because their whole history is one of aggression and criminal attacks.

59. In the report presented by the Secretary-General on 11 April we read:

"On 24 March, IDF personnel at border pillar 33 fired about 40 rounds of light machine-gun and small arms over the heads of the observers when they appeared on the roof of OP Mar." [S/13888, para. 8.]

I am sure that it has not escaped the members of the Council that this constituted obstruction—the use of arms against the United Nations in the exercise of its mandate to establish observation posts across the frontiers.

60. From that report and from the Secretary-General's reports of yesterday and this morning, we also learn about the acts of the *de facto* forces. I really see no difference between *de facto* forces and the IDF, for, as the Secretary-General has said, the *de facto* forces are mainly supported by Israel. So there is one source—Israel—for the *de facto* forces and the IDF. All these forces, which constitute just one force, are there to obstruct the work of the Security Council and of the United Nations. I see no need to state that since March—as a matter of fact since the beginning of 1980—these obstructions have been laid in the way of implementing Council resolutions.

61. The real issue is the re-manning of the two UNTSO observation posts established along the armistice demarcation lines between Israel and Lebanon on the basis of the General Armistice Agreement of 1949. Well, we all know that these lines are the internationally recognized borders between Palestine and Lebanon and I am not aware of any change in those lines since then.

62. The Israeli plan is very clear. It is to create serious incidents designed—and designed long before 7 April, the date repeatedly mentioned in the course of this discussion—to obstruct the work and also designed for something more serious than that. Two years ago, when the Council was discussing the Israeli invasion of south Lebanon, I had the opportunity [2071st meeting] to mention the Zionist plan and designs on south Lebanon as presented in 1919 by the Zionist Organization. That plan was to include all of south Lebanon—from the vicinity of Sidon and following the watershed of the foothills of Lebanon as far as Karaon and thence to El-Bireh—in the Jewish homeland promised by Balfour. But some friends of mine said, "Zehdi, this is going too far back in history: things change".

63. Well, things do not change. Moshe Sharrett—ex-Moshe Shertok—was the Prime Minister of

Israel in the 1950s and he wrote in his diaries that, at a meeting held on 27 February 1954 with Ben-Gurion, Lavon and Dayan in connection with Israel's plans for an invasion of Egypt and Syria, Ben-Gurion mentioned that he had a concrete proposal outlined to disrupt Israel's most peaceful neighbour at that time—as Sharrett says—namely Lebanon. I shall not read the minutes of that meeting or the annotations on them, but permit me to read out the letter that Ben-Gurion sent to Moshe Sharrett on 27 February 1954. Ben-Gurion wrote:

“Upon my withdrawal from the Government I decided in my heart to desist from intervening and from expressing any opinion on current political affairs so as not to make things in any way, or under any aspect, difficult for the Government. And if you had not called on me—the three of you: yourself, Lavon and Dayan—I would not have, of my own accord, expressed an opinion on what is being done or what ought to be done. But as you called on me, I deem it my duty to comply with your wishes and, especially, with your own wish as Prime Minister. Therefore, I permit myself to go back to the issue on which we disagreed and to insist on it: that is, the issue of Lebanon.

“It is clear that Lebanon is the weakest link in the Arab League. The other minorities in the Arab States are all Moslem, except for the Copts. But Egypt is the most compact and solid of the Arab States and the majority there consists of one solid bloc of one race, religion and language, and the Christian minority does not seriously affect their political and national unity. Not so the Christians in Lebanon. They are a majority in the historical Lebanon, and this majority has a tradition and a culture different from those of the other components of the League.

“Also, within the wider borders—this was the worst mistake made by France, which amplified the frontiers of Lebanon—the Moslems are not free to do as they wish, even if they are a majority there, and I do not know if they are indeed a majority, for fear of the Christians. The creation of a Christian State is, therefore, a natural need. It has historical roots and it will find support in wide circles in the Christian world, both Catholic and Protestant.

“Normally, this would be almost impossible, first and foremost because of the lack of initiative and courage of the Christians”—these are the words of Ben-Gurion—“But at times of confusion or revolution or civil war things take on another aspect, and even the weak declares himself to be a hero. Perhaps now is the time to bring about the creation of a Christian State in our neighbourhood.

“Without our initiative and our vigorous aid, this will not be done. It seems to me that this is the central duty—or at least one of the central duties—

of our foreign policy. This means that time, energy and means ought to be invested in it and that we must act in all possible ways to bring about a radical change in Lebanon. Sasson and our other Arabists must be mobilized. If money is necessary, no amount of dollars”—dollars, mind you—“should be spared, though the money may be spent in vain.

“We must concentrate all our efforts on this issue. This is a historic opportunity; missing it will be unpardonable. There is no challenge against the world Powers in this; everything should be done, in my opinion, rapidly and at full steam.”

64. This is the letter of Ben-Gurion dated 27 February 1954 and addressed to the Prime Minister. It shows exactly what the aims of the Zionists are in Lebanon.

65. But Mr. Sharrett notes on 16 May 1954 the following:

“In a joint meeting of senior officials of the Defence and Foreign Affairs Ministries, Ben-Gurion again raises the demand that Israel ‘do something about Lebanon’. According to Dayan, the only thing that is necessary is to find an officer, be he just a major;”—call him Haddad if you want—“we should either conquer his heart or buy him with money to make him agree to declare himself the saviour of the Maronite population. Then the Israeli army will enter Lebanon, will occupy the necessary territory and will create a Christian régime which will ally itself with Israel.”

And now he comes to the point: “The territory from the Litani southward will be totally annexed to Israel”. These are the aims of the Zionists in invading Lebanon, pretext or no pretext. Again, on 28 May 1954, Sharrett notes:

“The Chief of Staff continues to insist that we should hire a Lebanese officer who will accept to serve as a puppet so that the Israeli Army may ‘respond’ to his appeal to ‘liberate Lebanon from its Moslem oppressors’.”

66. I do not want to take the time of the Council by reading out the entire memoirs of Sharrett and the aims of the Zionist movement and its plans for annexing southern Lebanon. What the Council is considering here is an attack by Israel—call it the *de facto* forces, or call it the IDF—on the United Nations. What is the Council really going to do about it? Should it sit with its arms folded? A medical centre has been blown up; there has been an attempt to destroy the peace effort; helicopters have also been blown up, I understand.

67. Some reference has been made to an incident at a kibbutz. Now, since January we have been sending a number of letters to the Secretary-General drawing his attention to the attacks, almost daily attacks, on

the refugee camps in Nabatiye, in Aiyshieh, in Rihan. In February there were attacks on the Tyre region, with heavy artillery, that continued for hours and people were killed. Again in February, there were more attacks and more artillery fire against our refugee camps, and so on. And there was a really serious escalation in March, which again occurred long before 7 April. We know that on 21 March there was an attack by the Israeli artillery, with 130 weapons on Sidon. Some people were killed, some people were wounded. I could quote their names as they appear in the paper. I was in Beirut in March, and Mr. Walcott was there when we received information that the Israelis were using 175mm artillery.

68. What I am trying to bring to the attention of the Council is this: we do not have those sophisticated weapons, those means of destruction; we do not have aircraft; we do not have 175mm artillery. So, does the possession of those means of destruction mean that the world should remain silent regarding the crimes committed every day by the Zionists against our people? We never saw those things in the media; we never read about them in the press.

69. We are concerned about the way the United Nations has been treated, about the way that UNIFIL has been treated. We wish to convey, through you, Mr. President, our condolences, not only to the

families but to the States from which the UNIFIL martyrs killed by the Zionists in southern Lebanon came.

70. In our opinion, the Council should speak out in the strongest possible terms, not only to condemn, but also to impose sanctions. The Charter speaks of sanctions against those who violate it. What more violation do you want than an attack with heavy artillery, destroying UNIFIL aircraft, destroying United Nations medical teams? This is what we hope that the Council will do: that it will condemn specifically and clearly Israeli violations of the General Armistice Agreement and of the territorial integrity of Lebanon.

71. We trust that, very soon, the Council will be able to tell us that the Israeli forces of invasion have definitely departed from Lebanese territory, that their henchmen are no longer there, that UNIFIL is stationed on the internationally recognized borders of Lebanon and that one step towards peace has been scored in favour of the Council; and perhaps later on the Palestinians can go back to their homes and use the highways instead of having to take the mountain paths.

*The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.*