



UNITED NATIONS  
SECURITY  
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2180  
19 December 1979

ENGLISH

---

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND  
ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 19 December 1979, at 4 p.m.

<u>President:</u> Mr. CHEN CHU	(China)
<u>Members:</u> Bangladesh	Mr. Reaz RAHMAN
Bolivia	Mr. DE ZAVALA-URRIOLAGOITIA
Czechoslovakia	Mr. HULINSKY
France	Mr. LEPRETTE
Gabon	Mr. N'DONG
Jamaica	Mr. NEIL
Kuwait	Mr. BISHARA
Nigeria	Mr. CLARK
Norway	Mr. RIGGARD
Portugal	Mr. FUTSCHER PEREIRA
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. TROYANOVSKY
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. MANSFIELD
United States of America	Mr. PETREE
Zambia	Mr. LUSAKA

---

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room A-3550, Alcoa Building, 866 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 4.35 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

REPORT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE UNITED NATIONS INTERIM FORCE IN LEBANON (S/13691)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. Members of the Council have before them the report by the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for the period from 9 June to 10 December 1979, document S/13691. In addition, the Council has before it the text of a draft resolution, contained in document S/13695, which was drawn up during the course of consultations among members of the Council.

I wish to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Israel and Lebanon, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Israel and Lebanon to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tueni (Lebanon) took a place at the Council table. Mr. Blum (Israel) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): I have received a letter dated 19 December 1979 from the representative of Kuwait, which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request that the Security Council extend an invitation to the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the Security Council's consideration of the item 'The situation in the Middle East', in accordance with the Council's past practice."

This letter will be published as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/13696.

The proposal is not made pursuant to rule 37 or rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, but if approved by the Council the invitation to participate in the debate would confer on the Palestine Liberation Organization the same rights of participation as those conferred on Member States when invited to participate pursuant to rule 37. Does any member of the Security Council wish to speak on this proposal?

Mr. PETREE (United States of America): I wish to state that my Government is not able to agree to the proposal to invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the debate in the Security Council with the same rights of participation that a Member State would have.

We thought the terms of the Council's invitation were inappropriate on past occasions, and we want to repeat our opinion. For this reason we wish the proposed invitation to be put to a vote.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): If no other member of the Council wishes to speak, I shall take it that the Council is ready to vote on the proposal now before it that the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization be invited to participate in the debate.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Bangladesh, Bolivia, China, Czechoslovakia, Gabon, Jamaica, Kuwait, Nigeria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Zambia

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: France, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): The result of the vote is as follows: 10 votes in favour, 1 against and 4 abstentions. The proposal has therefore been adopted.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): In accordance with the agreement reached in the course of consultations, I propose first to put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/13695.

There being no objection, I shall now put the draft resolution to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Bangladesh, Bolivia, France, Gabon, Jamaica, Kuwait, Nigeria, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining Czechoslovakia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

China did not participate in the voting.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): The result of the voting is as follows: 12 votes in favour, none against and 2 abstentions. One member did not participate in the voting. The draft resolution has been adopted as resolution 459 (1979).

I now call upon the Secretary-General, who wishes to make a statement.

The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I have taken note of the resolution just adopted by the Security Council and its decision to extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further six months.

For all the obstacles preventing UNIFIL from fully discharging its tasks, I am convinced that the Force is indispensable in preventing a dangerous escalation of conflict, not only in UNIFIL's area of operation but possibly more widely in the region. I believe there is a clear and increasing recognition of this fact.

I shall of course make every effort to ensure implementation of the present resolution. As a first and essential step, UNIFIL must maintain the cease-fire and consolidate its area of operation. The main objective of course remains the restoration of the sovereignty and effective authority of the Lebanese Government up to the internationally recognized boundary and a return to normalization, including the reactivation of the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission in accordance with the 1949 General Armistice Agreement, the validity of which has been reaffirmed by Security Council resolutions. Needless to say, I shall keep the Council fully informed of any new developments in this regard.

I earnestly hope that in this undertaking all concerned will extend their fullest co-operation to the Force.

(The Secretary-General)

I wish to thank the Government of Lebanon for the co-operation it has consistently extended to the United Nations.

My report describes in some detail the problems we face. To solve them we need the understanding and co-operation of all concerned. I would also hope that members of the Council, especially those in a position to bring their influence to bear, will make every possible effort to help the Force attain the objectives for which it was established. The backing and support of member Governments is of the greatest importance for the achievement of these objectives, which were set by the Council.

May I take this opportunity to express my deep thanks to the troop-contributing countries. I regret having to point out once again that they are far from receiving reimbursements at the levels to which they are entitled under the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. They face an unacceptable burden, which must be alleviated. I therefore reiterate my appeals to the Council and to all Member Governments to assist urgently in this regard.

In concluding, I wish to pay a special tribute to the memory of those soldiers who, during this fourth mandate of UNIFIL, have died in the service of peace in Lebanon. I also wish to express my deep appreciation to the Chief Co-ordinator of the United Nations Peace-keeping Missions in the Middle East, Lieutenant-General Siilasvuo, to the Commander of UNIFIL, Major-General Erskine, to the officers and men of UNIFIL and to their civilian colleagues. They have carried out the tasks entrusted to them with courage, dedication and discipline in the face of circumstances that were often difficult and very dangerous.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): The first speaker is the representative of Norway, upon whom I now call.

Mr. ALGARD (Norway): The Secretary-General's report provides a comprehensive review of UNIFIL's activities and the problems UNIFIL is faced with. The report clearly points out that the past six months have been another difficult period for UNIFIL. Last August the situation reached a critical level that was defused only by the establishment of a de facto cease-fire that is still in force.

(Mr. Algard, Norway)

During the period under review there has been an increasing number of incidents, some of them very serious and leading to the loss of life among UNIFIL personnel. It is regrettable that the armed elements have continued their infiltrations in spite of renewed assurances of co-operation with UNIFIL. The intensification of encroachments by the de facto forces, at times with the support of Israeli defence forces, must be deplored. We note with particular concern that the de facto forces have established four positions inside the UNIFIL area. This is a clear violation of the Security Council's decisions.

(Mr. Algard, Norway)

These positions must be withdrawn without delay. As pointed out by the Secretary-General there seems to be a vicious circle of encroachments and infiltrations. This vicious circle must be broken. We therefore urge the parties to exercise the utmost restraint and refrain from such activities.

It is also a matter of grave concern that during the past six months there has been an increase in the harassment of the civilian population in the area. Such harassment cannot be accepted and must be stopped.

Although the critical situation that prevailed last summer has dissipated, the situation of UNIFIL continues to give rise to serious concern. It is a matter of fact, as stated by the Secretary-General in his report, that UNIFIL's basic problems remain unsolved. The parties concerned have not allowed UNIFIL to assume complete and peaceful control over its area of operation. We urge all parties to extend their full co-operation to UNIFIL. We also urge those in a position to do so to exercise influence on the parties concerned. There should be no armed presence inside UNIFIL's area of operations except that of the forces of the Lebanese State and of the United Nations.

The restrictions on UNIFIL's freedom of movement in the area continues to be a matter of concern. UNIFIL must be allowed full freedom of movement in the area and the establishment of an adequate security zone around the headquarters at Naqoura.

In spite of the serious obstacles with which UNIFIL is faced, the Norwegian Government supported the extension of UNIFIL's mandate for a further period of six months. We did so because we share the view of the Secretary-General that a withdrawal of the force at this juncture would be extremely dangerous and could easily result in resumption of hostilities not only in UNIFIL's area of operation but also elsewhere in the region. For this reason, the Norwegian Government is ready to continue to participate in UNIFIL.

It is now important to make further progress. We therefore welcome the efforts by the Secretary-General and the establishment, in co-operation with the Lebanese Government, of a plan of action setting as a first and essential step the maintenance of the cease-fire and the consolidation of the UNIFIL area of operation.



(Mr. Algard, Norway)

The long-term objective must be the restoration of the sovereignty and effective authority of the Lebanese Government over the entire area up to the internationally-recognized boundary.

We welcome the readiness of the Lebanese Government to co-operate fully towards this end. We hope that all parties will reconsider their positions and give full co-operation to UNIFIL so as to enable it to fulfil its mandate and thereby restore peace and tranquillity to southern Lebanon.

In the present situation UNIFIL has a major stabilizing effect. The present fragility of the situation in southern Lebanon illustrates the inherent dangers in the current situation in the Middle East. UNIFIL must today be seen as a key element in a broader mechanism of conflict control. If UNIFIL were to be withdrawn today, a new major conflict in the whole Middle East area might easily be the result. It is therefore important that all parties searching for a comprehensive and just peace in the Middle East do their utmost to facilitate and hence to ensure the continued functioning of UNIFIL.

In a situation where mutual distrust is a major obstacle to further progress in the peace efforts, active support of UNIFIL from all the parties involved may also have an important confidence-building effect. This may in the long run facilitate the search for a comprehensive settlement also on issues which are not directly touched by the UNIFIL mandate. Unfortunately, lack of support for UNIFIL, or obstruction of its implementation of its mandate, might easily have the opposite effect.

On this occasion I would also like to pay tribute to the Commander of UNIFIL, Major-General Erskine and his staff, and to the officers and men, for the way in which they have carried out their duties in extremely difficult and dangerous situations.

In conclusion, I wish to express concern over the difficult financial situation UNIFIL is faced with. It is regrettable that some countries refuse to participate in the financing of UNIFIL. We urge all Governments to assume their share in the financing of UNIFIL so as to enable it to continue to play its vital role in maintaining peace in a volatile region.

Mr. HULINSKY (Czechoslovakia) (intepretation from Russian): Despite the frequent demands of the Security Council that Israel should immediately halt its military actions against Lebanon, Israel, having freed its hands in the Sinai through the separate agreement with Egypt, is continuing its policy of aggression against Lebanon.

Despite the resolutions of the Security Council, Israel is using all possible means to try to maintain and strengthen its military presence in southern Lebanon, using to that end the anti-Government forces of Hadat, which have recently penetrated even the region controlled by the United Nations Force.

As a result of these actions by Israel, the situation of tension in the region continues to exist and this could have serious consequences on the Middle East as a whole. All of this is very well known. The facts of the situation have been adqeately reflected in the regular reports of the Secretary-General on this matter, including the most recent report submitted to the Security Council on 14 December this year in document S/13691.

The origin of the tragedy of Lebanon is quite obvious, despite Israeli propagandistic arguments that try to shift the responsibility for everything which has happened and is happening in Lebanon on to the shoulders of one of the victims of the aggression, namely the Palestinians. Yet despite the well-known and age-old reasons for the present situation in Lebanon, we have unfortunately to note that there have been increasing attempts to lessen the pressure on the aggressor. At the same time, while Israel is not expressing even the slightest intention of implementing the frequent decisions taken by the Security Council relating to strict respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon, at a time when Israel is trying to bring about a division of the State of Lebanon, there are increasing attempts on to transfer this pressure to the Palestinians. In our opinion such a development not only will not lead to positive developments but, on the contrary, may even aggravate the situation. It is only decisive action by the Security Council aimed at an immediate halt to Israeli acts of aggression against Lebanon that can force Israel not to continue flouting the Security Council's resolutions.

(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

The Czechoslovak delegation advocates a strengthening of the legal authority of the Lebanese Government throughout the country - a normalization of the situation in Lebanon on the basis of respect for its sovereignty, political independence, unity and territorial integrity. We condemn Israel's continued sabotage of Security Council resolutions relating to an immediate halt to acts of aggression against Lebanon.

The Czechoslovak delegation also advocates respect for the legitimate interests of the Palestine opposition movement. We believe that one of the basic prerequisites for the success of opposition against the continued armed provocation by Israel is the strengthening of the unity of those that have become victims of Israeli attacks against Lebanon, namely the population of Lebanon and the Palestinian refugees.

In the vote on the draft resolution in document S/13695, the Czechoslovak delegation once again abstained, in keeping with our position relating to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and also with our position on matters relating to the financing of that Force. Our position has been stated earlier and is reflected in the records of the Security Council meetings on this subject.

Before I conclude what I believe will be my last statement here before my country leaves the Security Council, I wish to make the following short statement.

(Mr. Hulinsky, Czechoslovakia)

Two years ago the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic became a member of the Security Council. We came to the Security Council fully determined to co-operate constructively with all its members so that, with the help of the United Nations and the resources available to it, we would work together in the interests of stabilizing the process of international détente.

Today, I should like to take this opportunity to thank the delegations of all members of the Security Council with which we have worked during these past two years for the spirit of co-operation shown in our relations with them as they developed during the period of our membership of the Security Council.

I should like to wish the other members of the Security Council and also those that will become members of the Council next year every success in their extremely important work for peace and international security.

Lastly, I should like to express our appreciation to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Kurt Waldheim.

Mr. PETREE (United States of America): Four months ago, in response to a dangerous and violent deterioration of the situation in southern Lebanon, the Security Council met on 29 and 30 August, at the request of the Government of Lebanon, to press for an immediate end to hostilities. Ambassador Young said that the random violence then prevalent in the area was an affront to the conscience of mankind. He called for the permanent cessation both of Palestinian attacks on Israel from Lebanese territory and of pre-emptive Israeli military action against targets in Lebanon.

Since then a tenuous cease-fire in southern Lebanon has generally held. Israel has ceased its pre-emptive strikes against Palestinian targets in Lebanon. At the same time, as noted in the Secretary-General's report, the situation in the area remains far from satisfactory. UNIFIL is still not receiving the full co-operation of the parties in carrying out its mandate of peace. Intermittent shelling across the UNIFIL area of operations continues, threatening the lives of the innocent inhabitants of Lebanese villages. Attempts continue to be made to intimidate and coerce the local population, undermining UNIFIL's authority, in defiance of the will of this Council. The de facto

(Mr. Petree, United States)

forces supported by Israel have occupied positions inside UNIFIL's area of operations, and have resisted UNIFIL's efforts to get them to withdraw. Armed Palestinian groups have continued their attempts to infiltrate the UNIFIL area. These actions and counter-actions expose the people of the area and UNIFIL itself to daily threats of attack. Both sides have sought to promote their own partisan goals without regard for the safety or interests of the Lebanese people living in that area. This is intolerable. We strongly support the view of the Secretary-General that this vicious circle must be broken.

We meet today to extend the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further six months. All sides agree that UNIFIL's presence continues to be indispensable and that Security Council resolution 425 (1978) must be implemented in all its parts if peace in the area is to be maintained and the authority of the Government of Lebanon restored. This requires the withdrawal of all armed groups, without distinction, from UNIFIL's area of operation in southern Lebanon.

My Government believes that that objective can be achieved through a series of steps by the parties, in accordance with the plan of action being worked out by UNIFIL and the Lebanese Government to restore Lebanese sovereignty throughout southern Lebanon. My Government is prepared to co-operate actively in the coming months in the efforts of the Secretary-General and the Lebanese Government to arrange a permanent cessation of hostilities, respected by all sides, which will enable the population of southern Lebanon to carry on their daily lives free from violence and fear. This will require restraint on all sides and reliance on UNIFIL as the instrument for dealing with cease-fire violations.

My Government is confident that UNIFIL will continue to report violations of the cease-fire from any source, and that UNIFIL will deal firmly with those who interfere with its mission. All who seek to undermine UNIFIL's authority and to prevent UNIFIL from carrying out its mandate - both the armed Palestinian elements and the de facto forces supported by Israel - must know that in so doing they defy the will of this Council and of the international community.

(Mr. Petree, United States)

The United States welcomes the renewal of UNIFIL's mandate for six months, as provided in resolution 459 (1979). We support UNIFIL unreservedly. We will continue to provide whatever assistance we can in support of the efforts of the Secretary-General and the Government of Lebanon to achieve the full implementation of Security Council resolution 425 (1978). I wish particularly to endorse the resolution's commendation of the men of UNIFIL and their Commander, Major-General Erskine. They are serving far from their homes under dangerous and difficult conditions. They have suffered casualties. Their presence and their performance are constant reminders that the international community can act effectively in the interest of our common objective of peace.

Finally, I should like to take this opportunity to express the warm appreciation of my Government to Lieutenant-General Ensio Siilasvuo, who at the end of this month will complete his term as Co-ordinator of the United Nations Peace-keeping Missions in the Middle East. Lieutenant-General Siilasvuo has ably served the cause of world peace for many years. We commend him highly and wish him well as he returns to his native country.

Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (interpretation from French): The renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL, with which our Council is dealing today, leads us to question the results of the implementation of its mandate since last June. As noted in the report of the Secretary-General,

"... UNIFIL has reached the end of its fourth mandate without adequate progress being achieved in the further implementation of Security Council resolution 425 (1978)." (S/13691, para. 53)

There was, of course, a cease-fire on 26 August last, after the serious incidents which occurred during the months of July and August. I wish to pay a tribute on this occasion to the Secretary-General and to the Commander of the Force for the perseverance and patience which they showed in bringing about that result. Since then, while some of the conflicting parties seem to have acted with restraint, we are bound to note nevertheless that the situation remains precarious. The appeal made by the President of the

EC/7

S/PV.2180  
19-20

(ifr. Leprette, France)

Council on 30 August last to the parties concerned therefore remains fully valid.

The constant harassment of the Force and the difficulties which hamper its efforts to fulfil its mandate are a cause of concern.

(Mr. Leprette, France)

We cannot accept that the freedom of movement of UNIFIL should be constantly restricted in the area of its headquarters at Naqoura. We cannot accept the presence of the de facto forces in the four positions within the UNIFIL zone, which further complicates the task of the Force in putting an end to infiltrations. Likewise, the attempts at intimidation of the Lebanese civilian population under the protection of the United Nations troops are inadmissible.

It is time for the Force to benefit from the co-operation of all elements so that the cease fire may be consolidated and so that stability in the area may be assured.

Therefore my delegation appeals to all the parties concerned to refrain from activities incompatible with the mandate of the Force. In particular, we appeal to Israel to cease its support of the de facto forces.

I should like to recall here that the United Nations Force was constituted for a limited period and that it remains indispensable to ensure the restoration of Lebanese authority in the region in question. Of course, this is no easy task, and we are aware of it; thus it is necessary for all, and in the first place the Lebanese Government, to redouble efforts to attain this objective which remains essential.

It is with those considerations in mind that my delegation has voted in favour of the renewal of UNIFIL's mandate for six months.

Before concluding, I wish to pay a tribute, on behalf of the French authorities and personally, to the five Fijian and Netherlands soldiers who sacrificed their lives in the course of the last six months, and to their comrades who were wounded. The exemplary devotion and courage shown by all elements of the Force deserve the highest praise. Let the Commander of the Force, as well as the civil and military staff of UNIFIL, be assured of the support of my country in the accomplishment of their so often difficult and dangerous mission. To all of them and to the Secretary-General and his assistants, my Government reaffirms its gratitude.



(Mr. Leprette, France)

Mr. President, I do not know whether we are to consider this as the last meeting of the Council in this month of December; our plans in the next few days depend on you. You must know that we shall be willing to attend any meeting you may convene before 1 January, but if this is indeed the last meeting of the year then I should like to say to those who are about to leave us that the French delegation is most grateful for the co-operation we have enjoyed with them. We regret their departure; their contribution to our work has been particularly important. May I express to them our best wishes for the year to come.

Mr. NEIL (Jamaica): As the fourth mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. (UNIFIL) comes to an end, we have to acknowledge that inadequate progress has been made towards the full implementation of resolution 425 (1978). As the Secretary-General has made clear in his report, the essential problem which UNIFIL faces derives from its inability to assume complete and peaceful control of its area of operation as a preliminary to the restoration of the effective authority of the Government of Lebanon in the entire area. It is clear that this continuing situation results not from any lack of effort on the part of the Secretary-General and the men in the field, but from continued obstruction by hostile forces and patterns of activity which frustrate the efforts of UNIFIL to achieve its objectives. The intransigence of the Haddad de facto forces remains a major impediment. These rebel forces have continued their lawless activities in the south of Lebanon. They have continued to maintain the positions occupied from an earlier encroachment in the UNIFIL area of deployment, which represents a great danger to UNIFIL and to the maintenance of stability and peace in the area. We strongly deplore their continued harassment of UNIFIL, their attacks on villages, and the increasing frequency of kidnapping which has been noted in the Secretary-General's report. It is evident that for UNIFIL to become effective in southern Lebanon, these activities will have to cease. As the Secretary-General makes clear in paragraph 58 of his report, it is essential for the Government of Israel to withdraw support from these illegal forces and enable the UNIFIL forces to maintain an effective presence in the southern area of Lebanon.

(Mr. Neil, Jamaica)

It is also essential that Israel should bring to an end its continued armed incursions into Lebanon and refrain from all further acts of interference and intervention in its affairs. We once more urge the Government of Israel to abandon its negative attitude and to co-operate fully with UNIFIL so that peace and stability can return to Lebanon. Jamaica believes that no legitimate interest can be served by continued tension and conflict and by prolonging the suffering of civilians who are the real victims of the tragedy in southern Lebanon.

In the present situation it is essential that priority should be given to the maintenance of the ceasefire and the consolidation of the UNIFIL area of operations. This requires the complete termination of all irregular military operations in the area, and we urge all the parties involved to exercise restraint and to co-operate towards ensuring the cessation of further outbreaks of violence. We also encourage the adoption of measures within the framework of a plan of action towards the restoration of the sovereignty and effective authority of the Government of Lebanon in the entire southern region of the country.

It is clear that in the prevailing circumstances the presence of the Force remains indispensable, and Jamaica accepts the Secretary-General's recommendation that the mandate of UNIFIL be extended for another six months. We do so in the hope that substantial progress will be made during the next six months in implementation of resolution 425 (1978). It should also be borne in mind that UNIFIL is not intended to become a permanent fixture, but a force with a specific mandate to be completed without undue delay. The parties concerned must recognize this fact and recognize that the early fulfilment of the mandate of the Force is in the interests of all parties and represents the best hope for the return of peace and stability and an end to the destruction, violence and suffering which has persisted for too long in Lebanon.

Finally, my delegation wishes to pay tribute to the UNIFIL officers and men who deserve high commendation for their courage and discipline in the very difficult and dangerous circumstances in which they have been placed. We deeply regret the casualties that have occurred and we offer our sympathy to the families of those who have died in the noble cause of peace.

Mr. de ZAVALA (Bolivia)(interpretation from Spanish): Once again my delegation wishes to express its concern at the events continually occurring in Lebanon, a situation which in our opinion will be resolved only when there is a joint and global solution to the problem of the Middle East, to which Latin America and Bolivia have devoted and will devote their most determined efforts.

Bolivia, which in the past has suffered many international aggressions - as a consequence of one of which it lost its extensive access to the ocean - cannot fail to point out once again in this assembly its clear and definite position in accord with the principles of the Charter which establish that Members of the United Nations shall refrain from having recourse to the use of force against the integrity or political independence of any State.

In the coherent and always reasonable report submitted by the Secretary-General in document S/13691, as well as in his statement in June last, the complex and arduous conditions under which the provisional forces are discharging their mandate under resolution 425 (1978) of this Council stand out.

In the present crisis which has become more painful because of the continued suffering caused not only to the civilian population of Lebanon - with whose situation Bolivia once again expresses its complete solidarity - but also within the United Nations Force which has to bear numerous losses, the relevance of the words of our Secretary-General and his recommendations acquire greater significance because, unless they are complied with, an intensification of the conflict could occur throughout the region and not only in the zone of operations. Hence, my country recognizes the indispensable function of UNIFIL in Lebanon, and it is for this reason that we voted in favour of draft resolution S/13695 extending UNIFIL's mandate for an additional six-month period, and we shall support all concerted efforts to achieve regional peace and restore authority in the area.

(Mr. de Zavala, Bolivia)

In the light of this, my delegation wishes to appeal to all the parties concerned in all sectors - however antagonistic their interests may be, and for the sake of the peace which the international community seeks - to co-operate actively with UNIFIL so that it can fully discharge its mandate.

The tragedy of Lebanon has lasted too long. In awareness of this, we wish at this time to urge that respect be given to the territorial integrity of this long-suffering country as well as to its unity and its political independence.

Lastly, allow me to reiterate on behalf of my delegation our appreciation for the personal, cautious and highly objective efforts of the Secretary-General and efficient work of all his assistants in their efforts to contribute to the solution of this problem, so fraught with tensions, obstacles and diverse interests.

At this time I also wish to express our admiration and gratitude to General Erskine and to the valiant troops which he commands under such difficult and arduous conditions.

Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Security Council is once again considering the question of the activities of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. During the six months that have elapsed since the last renewal of the mandate, the situation in the area in which the Force operates has remained tense. Israel and the separatist troops which it supports under the command of Haddad have continued to commit acts of armed provocation against the population of southern Lebanon. They have shot at and bombed populated areas in Lebanon and Palestine

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

refugee camps. They have carried out raids into the area of operation of the United Nations Force and in several cases they have attacked the Force's positions and shot at the headquarters of individual units of the Force. Moreover, during this period the separatist forces have penetrated the area controlled by the United Nations Forces, and within it they have established four new positions from which, despite the frequent appeals by the command in Lebanon, they have refused to withdraw.

In July and August the situation in southern Lebanon became much more serious as a result of the provocative acts of aggression by Israel and the separatists that it supports, to such an extent that the Security Council was obliged to take up this matter at its meetings. Recently, disturbing reports have still been coming from southern Lebanon about the continuing tense situation in the region. Any aggravation of the situation would threaten to have serious consequences for the Middle East region as a whole.

The continuing acts of aggression by Israel against Lebanon once again confirm that the Israeli leaders have expansionist aspirations, and military adventurism has become a means for them to attain broad strategic objectives. As a result of the armed provocation by Israel against the civilian population of Lebanon and the Palestinian refugees, there have been countless tens of thousands of victims among the civilian population. Many towns in southern Lebanon have been reduced to ruins; Tyre, Sada, Nabatia and the Palestinian refugee camps have suffered in particular. The crops have also suffered greatly. The barbaric shootings and bombings have led to a situation in which about 270,000 people, or about 10 per cent of the Lebanese population, have been left without house and home.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

At the same time Israel is stepping up aid to the anti-Government divisions of Haddad, whose actions are becoming increasingly flagrant and defiant. These facts are recognized and reflected in the report of the Secretary-General, which is now before us.

As is well known, in its resolution 450 of 14 June of this year, the Security Council once again called on Israel immediately to halt its actions against the territorial integrity, unity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon and, in particular, called upon Israel to halt its raids into Lebanon and the assistance which it continues to provide to the irresponsible armed groups under the command of Haddad. However, the Security Council's decisions designed to end the acts of aggression by Israel against Lebanon and to protect the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon, has remained unimplemented.

It is perfectly clear that the full blame for the continuation of this abnormal and impermissible situation lies with Israel. With time it becomes increasingly clear that the separate Egypt-Israeli treaty concluded in March of this year has freed Israel's hands in the Sinai and enabled it to intensify its expansionist and military adventurism against other Arab States, primarily Lebanon. This explains the fact that the armed provocations by Israel and the separatist forces under Haddad that it sponsors against Lebanon are becoming increasingly defiant and unacceptable. This is felt not only by the Lebanese and the Palestinians but also by the armed forces of the United Nations in Lebanon, which are facing increasingly blatant demands by the aggressors. Moreover, they are reluctant - and this is not even covered up by demagogy - to implement the decisions of the Security Council relating to southern Lebanon.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

The Soviet Union's position of principle on the need to halt the aggressive actions of Israel against Lebanon is well known to everyone here. It was recently reaffirmed in the joint communiqué of 15 November this year relating to the visit to the Soviet Union by a delegation from the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), headed by the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization, Yasir Arafat. The communiqué stated, inter alia:

"Having considered the situation in and around Lebanon, the parties condemn the continued Israeli aggression, which is enjoying the support of imperialist forces in southern Lebanon. The victims of this aggression are the civilian Lebanese population and the Palestinian refugees.

"The parties call for an immediate halt to these aggressive actions by Israel against Lebanon. They condemn Israel's intervention in the internal affairs of the country of Lebanon and attempts to bring about a division in the Lebanese State.

"Having reaffirmed their aspiration to promote a normalization of the situation in Lebanon on the basis of respect for its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, the parties called for a strengthening of the legal authority of the Lebanese Government throughout the territory of Lebanon and respect for the legitimate interests of the Palestine opposition movement in Lebanon."

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

In this connexion, we should like to express our firm opposition to any attempts to try to justify Israel's actions and the actions of its henchmen which hinder the deployment of United Nations forces along the Lebanese-Israeli frontier. In particular, we find quite unjustified the attempts to transfer the blame for the tense situation prevailing in the region to the Palestinian armed groups. The Soviet delegation cannot agree with the view that there seems to be no way out of the situation. There is a way out. The solution is for the Security Council firmly and without any further delay to condemn Israel's continuing sabotage of the Security Council's decisions calling for an immediate halt to acts of aggression against Lebanon and for the Security Council to require Israel to abide strictly by those decisions. It is only a firm decision by the Security Council that can put an end to Israel's cynical disregard of the Security Council's demands.

However, we must note with regret that, as a result of the position of some members of the Council, the resolution adopted by the Security Council does not contain a clear condemnation of Israel for its continuing acts of aggression against Lebanon.

The Soviet delegation would like to stress once again how important it is that the United Nations Force in southern Lebanon not be used for purposes incompatible with its mission of eliminating the consequences of Israel's aggression in Lebanon. We have constantly drawn attention to the fact that the United Nations Force should not assume duties that are not incumbent upon it in connexion with the implementation by the Lebanese authorities of effective control in southern Lebanon. Any attempts to involve the United Nations Force in matters relating to the internal affairs of Lebanon are contrary to the decisions of the Council and could lead to extremely dangerous consequences. Accordingly, the Soviet delegation has strongly opposed and opposes, any attempts to broaden the mandate of the United Nations Force in Lebanon which might lead to intervention in the internal affairs of Lebanon.

The Soviet delegation, guided by the position of principle of the Soviet Union regarding the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, abstained in the vote on the draft resolution in document S/13695.



(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

The Soviet delegation would like to state that it maintains its position, in particular regarding matters relating to the Security Council's supervision of those forces, the principle of the selection of national contingents and the system for financing such forces. We should once again like to stress that all expenses involved in eliminating the consequences of Israel's aggression against Lebanon should be borne by the aggressor itself.

Mr. MANSFIELD (United Kingdom): Remembering the tense circumstances in which this body last met to discuss the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) and south Lebanon, the casual observer is tempted to conclude that there has been some improvement in the situation. It is true that the Israeli Government has not since August continued with its policy of pre-emptive strikes against strongholds of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) on Lebanese territory; it is also true that a cease-fire of sorts has prevailed in southern Lebanon since late August.

But there is no room for complacency. In the Secretary-General's clear and comprehensive report we are told that there have recently been some renewed exchanges of fire. Without a greater degree of co-operation with UNIFIL from all parties the chances of making progress on an over-all political solution are remote. Worse, there could be a return to the deplorable situation which obtained during the early stages of the last mandate period and which resulted in the Lebanese Government's seeking a meeting of the Council on 29 August.

My Government has declared before, and will do so again, its total condemnation of this lack of co-operation. The description in the Secretary-General's report of the incidents involving both the armed elements and the de facto forces is a clear reminder that the situation remains inflammable. The casualty rate has been unacceptable and our sympathy goes out to the Governments and families of those who have lost their lives or been wounded. It is clear that until the infiltration attempts by armed elements are halted, the risk of a recurrence of the type of incident which resulted in the tragic death of three Fijian soldiers in August is high.

(Mr. Mansfield, United Kingdom)

Equally, my Government deplores the fact that far from heeding previous Security Council calls and withdrawing from the area, the de facto forces continue to harass UNIFIL positions and have even encroached further into UNIFIL's area of operations. This and the reported harassment of Lebanese villages under UNIFIL protection are intolerable.

Evidence of the presence of the Israeli defence force in the area controlled by the de facto forces continues to mount. The de facto forces are clearly largely dependent on Israeli supplies for their continued acts of obstruction. We repeat our demand that these activities should cease. Moreover, we appeal to the Government of Israel to use its undoubted influence upon the leaders of these forces to adhere to Security Council resolutions and to co-operate with UNIFIL.

We accept the Secretary-General's recommendation that the mandate of UNIFIL should be extended for a further six months. We agree that its presence in south Lebanon is currently indispensable but echo the warning that the mandate cannot be extended indefinitely. The early implementation of the relevant Security Council resolutions is urgently necessary, not just to relieve the already excessive suffering of the Lebanese people but because of the dangerous implications for the region as a whole if the current situation is allowed to continue.

I referred earlier to the unacceptable casualty rate sustained by UNIFIL in the last six months. The task facing the Force and its commanders remains one of enormous complexity coupled with as great a degree of danger as any to have confronted a United Nations peace-keeping operation since that in the Congo. To General Erskine, to his officers and men go our deep admiration and gratitude.

Mr. Reaz RAHMAN (Bangladesh): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution just adopted by the Security Council, for obvious reasons.

The basic goal we are all striving for is the restoration of the sovereignty and effective authority of the Government of Lebanon within its internationally recognized borders. The most viable means towards that objective was the mandate entrusted to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) by resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) to augment its military credibility and control in the area of its operations in southern Lebanon and to promote a return to normalcy in the region.

That goal and the means to achieve it have been frustrated and impeded. UNIFIL has ended its fourth mandate with little progress, if any. Its task has been constricted, even subverted. Its primary objective in the face of a rapidly deteriorating situation is currently reduced to that of maintaining a precarious cease-fire. It is yet to consolidate its hold over its area of operations, to deploy its forces effectively and fully, to enjoy freedom of movement or communications - even to secure the safety of its own headquarters. The zone remains a scene of instability and pervasive tension. The fundamental objective of restoring the unity, territorial integrity and political independence of Lebanon has receded even further in time through attrition.

No one can objectively question who are the prime movers of this untenable situation and who can benefit from its continuance. The Secretary-General in successive reports, including his latest, has unambiguously indicted the guilty parties - the de facto armed forces of the outlaw Major Haddad, who continues to be fed, fueled and supported by Israel for its own purposes. Chief among these is to manipulate UNIFIL's mandate so that it serves in essence to protect not the parties who are victims of invasion and aggression, but the interests of those who inflicted the crisis in the area. Southern Lebanon remains a de facto security belt for the aggressor. If Israel's perceived security interests give it license for launching armed aggression across international frontiers at will and

(Mr. Reaz Rahman, Bangladesh)

seizing, directly or indirectly, control of foreign territory, such a prescription would have incalculable consequences for peace and security in the world. In the immediate instance, Israel's intransigence and defiance continue to impede the achievement of a just, comprehensive and durable peace in the Middle East.

The task of this Council, therefore, is clear. It must concert actively in implementing the plan of action formulated by the Secretary-General and the Government of Lebanon in pursuit of the objectives laid down in resolution 425 (1978) and 450 (1979) - the plan of action elaborated in paragraph 29 of the Secretary-General's report in document S/13691, including the reactivation of the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission, in accordance with the 1949 General Armistice Agreement.

The illegal armed forces of Haddad must be dispersed and their activities of harassment, encroachment and intimidation of the local population stopped. Pressure must be brought upon Israel to co-operate in the fulfilment of UNIFIL's mandate. All parties must be called upon to exercise restraint and refrain from actions inconsistent with the objectives established by this Council, particularly the use of armed force.

It goes without saying that the presence of UNIFIL in the area continues to be indispensable in the fragile situation which obtains, and we fully support the continuation of its mandate for another six months, in conformity with resolution 426 (1978). Its role and presence must be maintained and made more effective, and this includes its ability to defend itself.

We cannot conclude without paying a tribute to the Government of Lebanon for its own efforts to reassert its sovereignty and restore its civilian and military authority in the area. Our gratitude and commendation are extended also to the Secretary-General for his continued dedication and concern, to the Chief Co-ordinator of the United Nations Peace-keeping Missions in the Middle East, and to the Commander, officers and men of UNIFIL for their courage, determination and, indeed, exemplary heroism in carrying out their difficult assignment.

Mr. N'DONG (Gabon) (interpretation from French): Once again the Security Council is called upon to extend the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) for a six-month period. That means, on the one hand, that the parties concerned have not implemented the relevant Security Council resolutions - which is a matter of deep disappointment to my delegation - and, on the other hand, that at the end of its fourth mandate UNIFIL is still far from having achieved the objective assigned to it by the Security Council in its resolution 425 (1978) - namely, to confirm "the withdrawal of Israeli forces, restore international peace and security and assist the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area ...". (resolution 425 (1978), para. 3)

Moreover, the Secretary-General confirms this in his report on UNIFIL in document S/13691, when he states:

"For all the difficulties which UNIFIL continues to face, any move to withdraw or reduce the Force at this juncture would, in my view, be extremely dangerous, for it could easily result in a resumption of hostilities not only in the UNIFIL area of operation but also elsewhere in the region. In fact, I believe that there is an increasing general recognition that the Force's presence is indispensable in preventing a dangerous escalation of conflict." (S/13691, para. 59)

That is an implicit appeal to the Security Council to continue "preventive diplomacy" - to use Dag Hammarskjold's phrase - for the benefit of Lebanon; that is, the assistance provided by the United Nations to certain States to enable them to disengage politically and militarily and, therefore, to ensure a reduction of tension in certain regions of the world.

In fact, without UNIFIL's presence, the situation in southern Lebanon, taking into account the many grave incidents referred to by the Secretary-General in his report, would be even more complex and would inevitably degenerate into an armed conflict involving the entire region.

It was for all those reasons that my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution that the Security Council has just adopted.

(Mr. N'Dong, Gabon)

I should like to appeal urgently to all the parties involved in the settlement of the Lebanese problem to co-operate effectively with UNIFIL so that it can complete its mission successfully. That co-operation is all the more indispensable because UNIFIL's mandate cannot be indefinitely prolonged, in view of the heavy financial sacrifices that it entails for Member States.

In conclusion, I should like to congratulate and thank the Secretary-General for his unceasing efforts to find a solution to this delicate problem. I wish to pay a tribute to the Co-ordinator of the United Nations Peace-keeping Missions in the Middle East, to the Commander of UNIFIL, Major-General Erskine, to his military and civilian staff, and to the officers and soldiers in the UNIFIL contingents for the devotion and courage they have displayed in carrying out the delicate mission entrusted to them by the Security Council.

Mr. FUTSCHER PEREIRA (Portugal): The development of the situation in southern Lebanon has been one of the major concerns of this Council since the Israeli invasion in March last year. We have on several occasions deplored the endless escalation of violence in the region and the repeated violations of Lebanon's territorial integrity. Despite our concern at the incidents that have recently occurred in the area, we found it encouraging to read in the report of the Secretary-General of 14 December:

"The de facto cease-fire brought about through UNIFIL on 26 August defused a situation which was highly dangerous..." (S/13691, para. 53)

We feel that, fragile as it may be, the existing cease-fire is a basic and preliminary condition of any process conducive to a true normalization of the situation in the area.

We voted in favour of the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months in the hope that its continued presence in the area would prevent a resurgence of violence and contribute to the consolidation of the cease-fire. We voted in favour of the resolution just adopted also in the hope that it would help to create the necessary conditions for the search for a true and lasting peace in Lebanon. In our view, the pursuit of those aims above can justify the enormous sacrifices involved in the whole UNIFIL operation.

In this context, I wish to express the full agreement of my delegation with the objectives of the plan of action formulated by the Secretary-General in co-operation with the Government of Lebanon, aiming at the restoration of Lebanese sovereignty, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of this Council, particularly resolution 450 (1979). No solution can be successful, though, without the co-operation of all the parties involved. Therefore we urge them to collaborate with UNIFIL in the fulfilment of its mandate, to comply with the decisions of this organ and to respect the will of the Lebanese people and their right to live and work in peace.

Before I conclude, allow me to pay a tribute to General Erskine and all those serving with him in UNIFIL for the courage they have displayed in the accomplishment of their difficult and dangerous mission and to thank the Secretary-General and his staff for their determined efforts to deal with this complex situation.

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): Resolution 459 (1979), which has just been adopted and which my delegation fully supports, is consistent with our understanding of the Secretary-General's report (S/13691). The main objective of the resolution is to extend the life and the mandate of UNIFIL for another period of six months. Secondly, it is intended to underscore the Council's commitment to ensuring the restoration and re-establishment of the sovereignty of Lebanon over all its internationally recognized boundaries and territory. — Thirdly, the resolution is aimed at upholding the principles of strict respect for territorial integrity, national unity, political independence and non-interference in the internal affairs of States, as embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. Nowhere is the application of these principles more necessary than in Lebanon today, and we wish to acknowledge the gallant efforts of the Government and people of Lebanon to resolve their problems in most difficult circumstances.

As a troop-contributing country, Nigeria has two additional concerns in the resolution we have just adopted. The first is with regard to the continuance of the grave situation in Lebanon in particular and in the Middle East in general, which has remained a very grave threat to international peace and security and the intransigent character of which tends to undermine the authority of the Security Council. As the Secretary-General observes in his report (S/13691), there have been continued violations of the cease-fire, there have been frequent and premeditated attacks on UNIFIL, and there has been tendentious legal and physical harassment of individual UNIFIL personnel by the traitorous forces of Haddad and the Israeli authorities. There is an apparent lack of the will, or even deliberate refusal, on the part of some of the parties concerned, particularly Israel, to respect the mandate of UNIFIL and indeed the authority of the Security Council. Consequently UNIFIL has not been able to secure a cessation of hostilities, to ensure the peaceful character of the area of operations and, above all, to ensure the effective restoration of Lebanon's sovereignty throughout its territory.

The fourth term of the Force having ended, it is the sincere hope of my Government that its fifth lease on life will permit the difficulties and obstacles in the way of the implementation of the mandate of UNIFIL to be removed without further delay and that the deliberate inconveniences and molestation to which UNIFIL personnel are exposed will be checked forthwith.



(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

Our other concern, of course, is the financial burden of UNIFIL, which is not equitably shared by all the Member States. This not only threatens the responsibility of the United Nations for peace-keeping but tends to penalize Governments which have volunteered troops in order to carry out their obligations under Article 25 of the Charter. We should have liked to see this aspect of the work of the Council more adequately addressed.

I should like to conclude by saying how proudly Nigeria has tried to fulfil its role and its share of UNIFIL's work, and how appreciative we are of the truly commendable services of Major-General Erskine of Ghana and the other men of UNIFIL in the cause of the United Nations. We also wish to take this opportunity to pay a warm tribute to the memory of those gallant men of Fiji who have lost their lives in the service of UNIFIL.

Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): I should like to express our gratitude to the Secretary-General and his staff for their dedicated efforts to ensure the effectiveness of UNIFIL in its area of operations. I should like also to pay a sincere tribute to the Chief Co-ordinator, General Siilasvuo, to the Commander of UNIFIL, Major-General Erskine, and his staff and to the officers and soldiers, who are making an enormous sacrifice in a noble cause. The Governments that have contributed contingents deserve our profound thanks and appreciation.

Turning to the report of the Secretary-General, he writes:

"I am aware that the mandate of UNIFIL cannot be extended indefinitely unless there is reasonable assurance that the objectives of the relevant Security Council resolutions will be fulfilled without undue delay"

(S/13691, para. 61)

The delegation of Kuwait agrees with that conclusion. We believe that a renewal that comes about automatically, even imperceptibly, every six months is not in the interests of UNIFIL especially in the present circumstances, which offer no sign of hope for the full implementation of the various

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

relevant resolutions. This feeling is reinforced by what the Secretary-General wrote in his report:

"an essential factor in UNIFIL's success in the implementation of its mandate is the position of the Israeli Government, inasmuch as the de facto forces are supported by Israel. The attitude of Israel as regards southern Lebanon is apparently dictated by Israel's perception of its own over-all security..." (ibid. para. 58)

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

Thus the problem is the opposition of Israel to the full deployment of UNIFIL up to the internationally recognized borders. Last year Israel outmanoeuvred the United Nations by handing over the southern tip of Lebanon to its obedient agents. In fact, there is no difference whatsoever between the outlawed militia, the de facto forces as they are called in United Nations language, and the Israeli forces. In paragraph 46 of his report, the Secretary-General says:

"As regards the area controlled by the de facto forces, IDF personnel" - that is, the defence forces, or the Israeli army - "were frequently observed crossing into Lebanese territory." ( ibid., para. 46)

They were enjoying a Roman holiday - unlimited, free, to the southern tip of Lebanon - the Israeli army. That is contained in the report of the Secretary-General; let us make no bones about it.

In paragraph 44 the report gives the number of acts of harassment of UNIFIL. By whom? By the outlawed militia, by Haddad. In spite of the efforts of UNIFIL, the agents of Israel - Haddad, or whatever you call them - still threaten defenceless Lebanese villagers in order to force them to join their ranks. Paragraph 40 of the Secretary-General's report shows the new policy of the agents of Israel. What is this new policy? I shall return to this policy later, in my second statement. It is the policy of widening the area under their control. Instead of UNIFIL pushing southwards, towards fulfilment of its mandate, it is being pushed northwards, towards Lebanon, towards Beirut. And by whom? By the supporters of Israel. And who are these supporters? Who are these agents? They are the running dogs of Israel. Let us be frank about that. It is the policy of widening the area under their control, Israeli control. There is a new code of expansion in the Middle East; expansion by proxy. The report of the Secretary-General states that

"... the de facto forces had already shown by early June a tendency to use force, not only in order to frustrate the UNIFIL objective to deploy more widely in the area under their control but also" - this is a new element - "to encroach into the UNIFIL area of deployment. That tendency increased markedly in late July and early August, when the de facto forces established four positions inside the UNIFIL area at Jebal Basil, Rshaf, Bayt Yahun and Et Taibe." ( ibid., para. 40)

Those are villages that I do not know, but Ambassador Tueni does. As is stated in

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

the report of the Secretary-General, those agents have so far refused to remove their four positions from the UNIFIL area, in defiance of the Security Council resolutions, in defiance of all the efforts of UNIFIL.

The question, then, is who is behind those forces? Who encourages them? On whom do they depend for their survival? Let us be frank about this. On whose behalf do those forces act? Whose interests do they defend, or demonstrate, or serve? Who controls them, and who pushes them towards the north, in their acts of defiance? The answer, as everybody knows, as the report states, is the Government of Israel. No amount of sophistry, no amount of linguistic stunts and acrobatics, can change that, can conceal it. The report of the Secretary-General states the glaring truth about the defiance of Haddad and his supporters and followers. The report of the Secretary-General, to whom we are very grateful, is an indictment of Israel. Let us not conceal that truth. When the resolutions of the Council are challenged, it is unacceptable to avoid clarity. A famous philosopher, Dante, once said: "The hottest parts of hell will be reserved for those who at times of moral crisis maintain neutrality". I am always accused of quoting Shakespeare; this time I have quoted Dante instead.

For how long will Lebanon bleed: For how long will the people of Lebanon suffer: It is true, as we say in Kuwait, that pain has increased the originality, the creativity and the inventiveness of the Lebanese people. But it is also true that the Lebanese and others want an end to that pain, notwithstanding the fact that it generates creativity. The Lebanese have lived with pain to such an extent that they extract jokes, laughter and happiness from it. Even so, they yearn for a normal life.

I am not a Lebanese, but I have seen Lebanon. I have seen the creativity of Lebanon. I admit how much they have contributed to the intellectual thoughtfulness of our area. In their pain, they have contributed more than in their normal life. Notwithstanding that, we want to see normalcy rather than diaspora in their country.

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

As with UNIFIL, the problem of Lebanon and the Lebanese is caused by Israel. Once Israel stops its support for and its endorsement of its running dogs, Haddad and his followers, life will be better. But the question is this, and I should like to hear an answer in this chamber: will Israel stop its support for Haddad? That is the key, that is the watchword in the report of the Secretary-General. If we have a thriller we know there will be a denouement. But for how long will Lebanon suffer in a thriller that has no denouement?

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

The Council is entitled to know the answer as to whether Israel will stop its support for Haddad. We should not listen to hot air in this chamber.

I say that the Council and, indeed, the General Assembly are tired of linguistic meanderings which hide the facts and the truth. But the truth itself becomes more glaring, no matter how much linguistic meandering is used to suppress it.

My delegation takes note with hope of the Secretary-General's report (S/13691) and his reference to the determination of the Government of Lebanon to send more troops to the south. In the final analysis, UNIFIL is an interim force, and therefore the Lebanese must assume their responsibilities in their own country. To my friend Ambassador Tueni of Lebanon, I say this: others may help, but in the end, as we say in Kuwait and as you say in Lebanon, "no one's fingers can scratch your back as effectively as your own".

We voted for the draft resolution just adopted in the hope that Lebanon would take advantage of the next six months to assert its authority in southern Lebanon. Indeed, we are not happy that the resolution does not condemn Israel not only for not obstructing Haddad and his agents but for pushing them northwards to occupy territories in the UNIFIL area. The failure to condemn Israel is the product of a compromise that took five days of hard labour and to which, unfortunately, I was a party.

Israel defies UNIFIL; it disregards Security Council resolutions. Yet, here on this bleak day I am sure that the representative of Israel will try to make white black, red blue and purple some other colour.

My delegation hopes that Lebanon will be able - and in this it should be assisted - to restore its authority and sovereignty in the south. Otherwise all the efforts made by the United Nations and outside the United Nations concerning the area will remain an academic exercise. My delegation hopes that Lebanon will be able to read the writing on the wall, which the intense talks that led to the draft resolution just adopted by the Security Council gave such clear signals.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): The next speaker is the representative of Lebanon, on whom I now call.

Mr. TUENI (Lebanon): Once more the Security Council is meeting, as if in a periodic ritual, to renew the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) - a ritual, let us admit, which was this time preceded by some very painful and, I dare say, frustrating discussions about forms and words, which made it appear that the fate of peace-keeping, of human beings and of the land was contingent upon paragraphs and resolutions. I say to the Ambassador of Kuwait that no one knows that better than we do. Whereas, in fact, the future of south Lebanon, the land and the people, will, as everybody, and we in Lebanon in particular, knows, be decided by greater determination on the terrain - a determination by the Lebanese authorities, which should and will continue to enjoy the unanimous support of the Security Council and an unequivocal understanding of the objectives of peace-keeping.

When we last met on this subject in June some of us were so naive as to imagine that it might be the last such renewal. I for one was among the naive. And I recall expressing a feeling that I shared with many members of the Council, that UNIFIL had already probably been overstretched, that we should not take UNIFIL for granted and that some basic, some historic, decisions should be taken if we were to maintain the Force in any significant manner.

With his usual frankness and great intellectual honesty, the Secretary-General opened the debate by stating that if certain conditions could not be met

"it may well become necessary even to envisage the withdrawal of the Force before it has fulfilled its mandate, despite all the dangers that this would entail". (S/PV.2147, p. 6)

It must be very frustrating for the Secretary-General and, indeed, for us all that six months later, after what appeared to be a turning-point in peace-keeping in Lebanon, the same warning should now have been reiterated in no equivocal terms at this table, and with the same authority of wisdom and objectivity by the Secretary-General in his report (S/13691).

Yet the mandate just had to be renewed, since it was felt - again in the words of the Secretary-General - that

"any move to withdraw or reduce the Force at this juncture, would ... be extremely dangerous, for it could easily result in a resumption of hostilities not only in the UNIFIL area of operation but also elsewhere in the region." (S/13691, para. 59)

(Mr. Tueni, Lebanon)

It is in that spirit that my Government has supported the renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL, for in no way would we want, at this very critical juncture in the Middle East, further to endanger peace and security.

On the contrary, we earnestly hope that, under your wise guidance, Mr. President, this august body will find it possible to cope with situations that appear to be so much more threatening and delicate and of far-reaching consequence.

Whereas it is customary, Sir, to congratulate the President on the assumption of his task of leading this Council, allow me rather to congratulate the Council and, in particular, those members that now feel the importance of strengthening its authority, on having you in the Chair, the representative of a world of patience, a heritage of legendary wisdom, a political culture in which a natural sense of dimensions blends marvellously with a traditional concern for morality and dignity. You therefore find it easy to understand the feelings of a country that has now been a hostage for years: a hostage of war and now a hostage of its very yearning for peace.

But how much longer should the situation be allowed to continue? How much longer can the world tolerate a situation in which people are dying every day of every month of every year in my country, through no fault of their own, while gallant soldiers of peace imperil their own lives as witnesses of a war that they are not allowed to prevent?

While expressing my country's gratitude for the peace-keeping forces and their officers, commanders and men, and its commitment to the objectives of this Council, I wish to make the following remarks very clearly and without ambiguity:

First, my Government has no illusions about the success of UNIFIL, if the present context of violence and defiance continues, as described in the Secretary-General's report. The vicious circle referred to in the report must be broken. Our territorial integrity, our independence and our sovereignty cannot be subjected to any non-Lebanese imperatives; more specifically, it cannot be subjected to Israel's aggressive ambitions disguised as "Israel's perception of its own over-all security" (S/13691, para. 58). Not only is this situation immoral and a flagrant violation of international law, it is also self-defeating and conducive to further warfare, further bloodshed, further suffering and greater peril to each and all.



(Mr. Tueni, Lebanon)

Secondly, whereas we realize that the question of Lebanon, and particularly of southern Lebanon, may be considered - and I stress "may" - to be related to the over-all situation in the Middle East, which is what is once more suggested in paragraph 58 of the Secretary-General's report, we wish to reiterate once again and beyond any doubt that peace in the Lebanon cannot, should not, and indeed shall not wait for a final settlement of the Middle East problem. Quite to the contrary, we strongly believe that continued violence in Lebanon, which many may find convenient, will serve only to complicate the Middle Eastern problem and to imperil the chances of a just and lasting settlement. A Lebanon in crisis has proved to generate, far beyond its borders, forces of destabilization and turmoil - ideological, revolutionary and even religious - that need not be described here. A Lebanon with restored sovereignty and national unity will, within the framework of Arab solidarity, contribute as nothing other can to the settlement of the Middle East question based obviously on the full recognition of legitimate Palestinian rights and the fulfilment of the Palestinian national identity in a Palestinian - not a diaspora - homeland. By its natural democracy a peaceful Lebanon can and will become again a factor of progress and a significant contributor to peace, justice, liberty and political stability in the whole region.

Thirdly, our opposition to any linkage between the question of South Lebanon and the Middle East question is well founded in this Council's proceedings. For whereas we are here concerned with resolution 425 (1978) and the ensuing resolutions, the Middle East problem should find its solution by the implementation of resolution 242 (1967), to which we are not associated in any manner or form. Nay, even more: we refuse to be trapped into becoming - even through an accidental linkage - part and parcel of a broader scheme within which some may be tempted to view us as a negotiable or probably a dispensable country. In this attitude we have the unqualified support of the members of the League of Arab States who committed themselves, at the Summit Meeting in Tunis of November 1979, to the implementation of resolution 425 (1978) and to the defence of Lebanon's sovereignty, independence and national unity.

(Mr. Tueni, Lebanon)

Allow me, before concluding, to address myself to a few practical problems.

The present resolution must not be viewed as an automatic renewal for a peace-keeping force that will soon fall into the oblivion of a desperate situation. My delegation has insisted that the renewal be related to a plan of implementation. We take this plan very seriously and we look upon the reactivation of the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission (ILMAC), with the assistance of the Secretary-General, as a major contribution to the restoration of our sovereignty and territorial integrity, as well as a major instrument in the implementation of the Council's basic objective of peace. Should no progress be possible within a reasonable period, we shall come to the Council before the new mandate expires seeking, under paragraph 10 of the new resolution, resolution 459 (1979) "practical ways and means in accordance with relevant provisions of the Charter" to restore Lebanese sovereignty over all of Lebanon's territory up to its internationally recognized boundaries.

In this respect, we note with the greatest appreciation the Council's call for respect of our territorial integrity. We feel that the Council was really echoing a universal concern expressed by almost every delegation from the rostrum of the General Assembly. We are indeed very proud and very encouraged by the fact that rarely has such a small country received such great support and that we should have been remembered in a very singular and significant manner by Pope John Paul II. To His Holiness and to all those who prayed for us, to those who expressed their sorrow or their confidence, or their revulsion, we say here that Lebanon will remember the trust and the challenge. We want them to know that we shall neither cede nor forget.

We are all the more encouraged by the fact that today's resolution so symbolically mentions, in what may appear an unconventional form, the city of Tyre as a heritage of interest to all mankind. Is it not tragic that the 6,000 years of uninterrupted history represented in that city should also be threatened, as are the lives of so many innocent human beings, by the most senseless and arrogant war?

(Mr. Tueni, Lebanon)

Never before has the world felt how much could be expected of international institutions such as the Security Council in particular. So let us together, large and small, prove that peace cannot be sought outside this framework; and that the most powerful are no less vulnerable than the weakest if lawlessness is allowed to prevail and if force, no matter how minimal, is allowed to become a licence to act against international justice, the law of nations and fundamental human rights. For our part, although living in crisis, we shall always stand with international law and order and with those who defend the rights of man and of nations alike.

Mr. President, I wish to thank you and the members of the Council once more for your support and your patience, and for having allowed me to speak. I also want to thank in particular the Governments of the countries whose support has expressed itself, over and above their statements here, in the most precious of contributions: contingents of their own men, of their armies which must always be looked upon as a unique expression of international responsibility. I wish also to thank those Governments that have contributed financially and by material support towards what appears to have become a very costly peace-keeping operation. I can only wish that those contributions had been universally borne by all and that we had found means of spending so many millions on reconstructing rather than on preventing further destruction.

This is the last meeting in which some of the members here present will discuss the question of Lebanon. I wish to address to those members my deepest feelings of brotherly friendship and esteem. I should like to single out one of them, the representative of Kuwait, my friend Abdalla Bishara, a friend of long years past and, I hope, of long years to come. Ambassador Bishara, as a representative of the Arab Group in this Council, has lived with us the agony of long hours of consultation, private and public, formal and informal, and of long hours of debate, and has also shared in making decisions that were sometimes palatable neither to himself nor to others. His great intellectual integrity has helped reconcile many irreconcilable attitudes and his culture - Shakespearean as well as Arab - has given some of the dry words of resolutions and of speeches a living dimension.

(Mr. Tueni, Lebanon)

I should like also to take this occasion to express my deep thanks to Lieutenant-General Siilasvuo, who is now concluding his term of office as Co-ordinator of the United Nations forces in the area. His contribution in Lebanon has been invaluable.

I want also, in particular, to address once more to Major-General Erskine, her present, my great encouragement for the very ungrateful task which he is performi

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): The next speaker is the representative of Israel. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

Mr. BLUM (Israel): Mr. President, at the outset, let me pay my respects to you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month.

I should like also to take this opportunity of expressing Israel's appreciation of the exemplary manner in which the representative of Bolivia carried out his duties as President of the Council last month. Since Bolivia will be leaving this Council at the end of this month, I wish to express to Ambassador Palacios de Vizzio our appreciation of the statesman-like manner in which he has represented his country in this Council - a country with which Israel has close and friendly relations.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

Once again the Security Council has considered the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). It has before it the Secretary-General's report, document S/13691, of 14 December 1979, which focuses narrowly on the situation in southern Lebanon, with little regard to the situation in Lebanon as a whole, even though it is recognized by all that the situation in the south cannot be treated in isolation.

Having listened to some of the statements thus far, one might almost conclude that everything in Lebanon north of the Litani River is blissful. Peace and quiet, sweetness and light reign everywhere. The Syrians and their army of occupation have long gone home to tend their fields and orchards. The terrorist PLO has restored Beirut to its rightful owners. Lebanese authority is fully re-established and honoured by all. In Beirut the barricades have long come down, the gutted streets have been rebuilt and the luxury hotels have reopened. Even the casinos are back in full swing.

By contrast, the situation in the marginal area south of the Litani River is radically different. To describe it, Ambassador Bishara has even mobilized Dante. There, and only there, the scene is one of constant violence and bloodshed. The dramatis personae are presented as follows. On the one side, there are the "armed elements," made up of the PLO, who are peace-loving, pastoral and innocent, and their supporters in the so-called Lebanese National Movement, who are equally passive and inoffensive. Confronting them are the "de facto forces," sometimes called "Christian and associated militias," who are evil through and through because, as local Lebanese, they have the gall and the temerity to withstand and defend themselves against alien elements, that is, the PLO. Supporting those "Christian and associated militias" are the biggest villains of them all, the Israelis.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

Frightful as this situation may be, it providentially lends itself to a quick and neat solution: Disband the "Christian and associated militias," stop the assistance they receive from Israel, and the blissful tranquillity and paradise up north will automatically be extended to embrace the tormented south. It is almost as simple as that.

As we all know, the reality both in the north and in the south of Lebanon is very different. Anarchy prevails north of the Litani, with daily outbreaks of violence of all kinds. Only on 12 December, last week, there was a bloody clash in Beirut between Syrians and Christians in which 12 people were reported injured, four seriously. In the northern city of Tripoli there are frequent clashes and incidents, principally because of the tensions between local Sunni Moslems and the Syrian army of occupation. In parallel, there are frequent confrontations between different terrorist groups belonging to the PLO. Thus, for example, on 12 and 13 December, there were reports of exchanges of fire between Fatah and a pro-Iraqi gang of terrorists in a refugee camp near Tripoli.

Not only do Syria and the PLO continue to exploit the plight and turmoil of Lebanon, but other Arab States also continue to see in the crisis of Lebanon a means of advancing their own partisan aims within the well-known web of inter-Arab rivalries. This tragic phenomenon came out into the open at the tenth Arab League Summit, held a month ago in Tunis, from which the terrorist PLO emerged declaring that it would continue to use Lebanese territory as a staging ground for its criminal activities. Thus, having been instrumental in creating havoc in Lebanon and in subverting

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

the sovereignty of that country and the authority of its Government, the PLO still maintains about 15,000 armed men in that country, of whom about 1,500 are in the so-called Tyre pocket, stretching to within eight miles of Israel, and several hundred more are in UNIFIL's area of operations.

UNIFIL's function is described in the present report, as in previous ones, as a "two-stage operation". According to paragraph 19, the first stage was to confirm Israel's withdrawal from Lebanon - which was in fact completed and confirmed on 13 June 1978 - and the second to establish and maintain an area of operations.

This description of UNIFIL's function misconstrues its threefold mandate, as originally set out in Security Council resolution 425 (1978). At the time that resolution was adopted, the Council took cognizance of the problem of Lebanon in its entirety, recognizing that the presence of 30,000 Syrian troops, plus 15,000 PLO terrorists on Lebanese soil constituted a major obstacle to the re-establishment of Lebanon's authority over its own territory and to the restoration of international peace and security.

With those considerations in mind, the Council called for:

"...strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence" -

and I stress, political independence -

"...of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries". (resolution 425 (1978), para.1)

and UNIFIL was entrusted with an appropriate mandate.

It was established not only for the purpose of confirming the withdrawal of the Israel Defence Forces, but also for:

"...restoring international peace and security and assisting the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area". (ibid., para.3)

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

In order to achieve this purpose, UNIFIL was ordered to prevent the infiltration of armed personnel into the area under its control, an instruction aimed at preventing the PLO from returning to the region - which was free of their presence at the time - this being a necessary condition for the establishment of international peace and security.



(Mr. Blum, Israel)

I am sorry to say that the report before us is slanted in favour of the PLO and against the local Lebanese forces in the south. Let me first give one small example which is characteristic of the way the facts are presented. In paragraph 56 of the report, attempts at infiltration by the PLO are said to be "explained" by them and their allies as being defensive measures, necessitated by actions or intentions of the de facto forces. When it comes to the de facto forces, however, they are said in the same connexion, to "seek to justify" their activities, and so forth. It is not just that this lack of balance runs throughout the length of the report, but what is also happening is that the de facto forces which are made up of local Lebanese villagers in the south defending their homes and families are treated with greater disfavour than alien elements which have illegally infiltrated into UNIFIL's area of operations.

Let me give several more examples of what I have in mind. A worrisome situation with potentially dangerous implications has been created by the fact that the number of terrorists within UNIFIL's area of operations has increased, especially since the cessation of fire of last August entered into force. Attempts at infiltration by terrorists literally under the eyes of UNIFIL have intensified in the period under consideration out of all comparison with those which took place during the previous six months. Paragraph 21 of the Secretary-General's report for January to June of this year, document S/13384 of 8 June 1979, indicated that UNIFIL stopped some 40 major infiltration attempts involving 140 terrorists. By contrast, paragraph 36 of the present report mentions 110 infiltration attempts involving almost 800 terrorists; which is to say that the rate of attempted infiltrations has gone up almost three times, and the numbers of terrorists involved almost six times. This serious phenomenon indicates the true extent to which the PLO is prepared to "respect" UNIFIL and the cessation of fire.

This is by no means the end of the story. The total number of terrorists stationed within UNIFIL's area and "recognized" by UNIFIL has grown considerably. While in the past, the United Nations used to refer to the presence of about 200 armed terrorists in its area of operations, today it is a fact that there are about 700 armed terrorists located in about 25 positions there - which for some reason are not mentioned at all in the report. These 700 armed terrorists within UNIFIL's area are, of course, additional to the 1,500 PLO terrorists who, as I have already indicated, are located in the so-called Tyre pocket.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

The large terrorist presence in UNIFIL's area of operations and the increasing frequency of their attempts to infiltrate that area not only demonstrate how serious the terrorist activity is. They also point to the fact that many terrorist infiltrators have escaped UNIFIL's notice. In addition, they suggest that even those who have been caught are likely to succeed in infiltrating into the area the next time around.

Reference is made in the report to the exchanges of fire and shooting in the area since the cessation of fire of last August. What is omitted, however, is the fact that most of the shooting has been initiated by the PLO against Lebanese villages on the border with Israel without provocation from any quarter. Much of the PLO's fire has been directed from their positions in and around Beaufort Castle. A recent example of this reprehensible phenomenon was noted by a UNIFIL spokesman on 13 December with reference to the serious shooting incident the day before.

However, when the report mentions, in paragraph 20, the withdrawal last July of the United Nations liaison observer team from Beaufort Castle, the only reason given is the shelling of the area by the de facto forces. No mention is made of the PLO positions in and around the castle which, as just indicated, constituted and still constitute a major source of tension and violence in the area.

In paragraph 48 of the report, the planting of mines in the UNIFIL area is described as "a disturbing development of relatively recent occurrence". In the several incidents listed, one UNIFIL soldier was killed and three were wounded. The paragraph concludes that in all cases "it has been impossible to determine the identity of those responsible for planting the mines". The fact is that the mines in question were of Soviet manufacture and it is well known that only the PLO terrorists and their associates use such mines. Why then the mystery about the identity of those responsible for laying them?

In this connexion, it should be borne in mind that the five UNIFIL soldiers who lost their lives as a result of hostile action in the last six months were killed, directly or indirectly, as a result of PLO activities, which have been the cause of the overwhelming majority of the 19 fatalities which UNIFIL has suffered in the line of duty since its inception in March 1978.

As in the past, the report refers to the PLO as "armed elements". For the first time, however, the intention of this esoteric phrase is spelled out and its meaning is given as the PLO. Thus, the confusions which have arisen in the past will perhaps be avoided and so, for example, the representative of Zambia will not have to assert that the "armed elements" are abetted by Israel, and then go on to draw totally erroneous conclusions, as happened in the Council's meeting on 30 August 1979, as can be seen from document S/PV.2165, page 21.

Turning to the broader dimensions of the problem, let me reiterate that the Government of Israel supports the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. Israel wants peace in and with Lebanon. It has no territorial claims on Lebanon. On 31 May 1979, 12 June 1979 and 29 August 1979, I drew the attention of this Council to a formal invitation to negotiate peace with Lebanon made by the Prime Minister of Israel in the Knesset, Israel's Parliament, on 7 May 1979. Israel still awaits Lebanon's response to that invitation.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

Israel's position concerning the 1949 General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Lebanon remains consistent.

As I pointed out during the last debate on the renewal of UNIFIL's mandate - and here I am referring to document S/PV.2147, page 37 - the Government of Lebanon has made it clear by its declarations and actions that it considers the 1949 General Armistice Agreement to have come to an end. Consequently, it is also totally inadmissible for the Lebanese Ambassador, among others, to attempt, as he did in his memorandum of 30 May 1979 (S/13361), to make others party to a now-defunct bilateral treaty. The essence of the Armistice Agreement was summed up in article III, which, inter alia, prohibited "paramilitary" - including "non-regular forces" - from operating from the territories of either party. As long as Lebanon does not comply with that fundamental obligation, reference to the Armistice Agreement and the frameworks established under it can scarcely be meaningful.

As mentioned in the report, Israel has continued to co-operate with UNIFIL and extend help to it.

I should like to take this opportunity to pay a special tribute to Lieutenant-General Ensio Siilasvuo, Chief Co-ordinator of the United Nations Peace-keeping Missions in the Middle East. As has been announced today, General Siilasvuo will relinquish his post at the end of the year, after long and distinguished service in the cause of peace in the Middle East. In the course of that service, General Siilasvuo has earned the respect and appreciation of all the parties. On behalf of the Government and people of Israel, I wish to express to him our gratitude and respect.

We wish also to salute the Commander of UNIFIL, Major-General Emanuel A. Erskine, and his staff, as well as the soldiers of all ranks serving with UNIFIL in the most arduous of circumstances. Lapses and irregular activities by individual members of the Force do not reflect on the commendable performance of the Force as a whole.

In this connexion, Israel would like to extend its deepest condolences to the families of the five UNIFIL soldiers, of all nationalities, who have lost their lives in southern Lebanon over the last six months. Similarly, Israel would like to express its wishes for a full and speedy recovery to the 15 officers and men who have been wounded during the period under consideration.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

Before I conclude, let me return to the fundamental issue. It is that to detach the question of southern Lebanon from the situation in Lebanon as a whole will not solve any problems and will not enhance the cause of peace. As is recognized in paragraph 59 of the Secretary-General's report (S/13691), the situation in the south of Lebanon has implications for the Middle East region as a whole. The converse of this proposition is also true, and without exaggeration one may safely say that the situation in the north of the country not only affects the situation in the south, but indeed is also the dominant factor in the south.

Consequently, peace cannot be restored in Lebanon and the Lebanese Government cannot re-establish its effective authority anywhere in the country while a massive Syrian army of occupation holds down the bulk of the country and while PLO terrorists, trained and armed by the Soviet Union, are given free rein on Lebanese soil.

Until the nettle of the fundamental problem plaguing Lebanon is grasped, nothing will be achieved. The PLO and its allies must cease operating in and from Lebanon. The Syrian occupation of the country must be ended. Until these basic requirements are achieved, there is no way that Lebanon can be reunited as a free and independent country.

To that end, the resistance shown by groups of local Lebanese in the south - Christians, Moslems and Druze alike - should be seen for what it is; namely, a willingness and determination to defend Lebanon from the alien forces threatening the country's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Finally, since in all likelihood this will be the last Council debate in which I shall participate before the end of the year, I should like, with your permission, Mr. President, to take my leave of the representative of the geographical region of which my country is a part. From January 1980, we shall miss dearly the presence of the representative of Kuwait - although I must confess quite frankly that on occasion I had serious doubts whether he had the interests of his entire constituency at heart. We shall miss Ambassador Bishara's wit, his elegance, his literary forays, his expertise in Shakespeare, in Dante - and in the rules of procedure.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): The next speaker is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization. I now call on him.

Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization)(PLO): Mr. President, I wish to thank you and, through you, the other members of the Security Council for extending an invitation to the Palestine Liberation Organization to take part in this debate - whether they did that openly or by omission.

I wish to stress at this juncture the significant fact that since 1965 the People's Republic of China has maintained the best and most cordial relations with the representatives of the Palestinian people, the Palestine Liberation Organization. We have always had comradely relations. The People's Republic of China, in addition to according diplomatic recognition to the Palestine Liberation Organization, actively and materially supports us by opening their colleges and academies to Palestinians who have been forced out of their homes. Some of these Palestinians have found in China a parental reception, and they are pursuing their studies there. I wish to reiterate our thanks to you, Sir.

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

Before commenting on the report before us, I wish to state that the news agencies have brought us news that since midnight last night the Israelis have been shelling the regions around Nabatiyeh, Arnoun and Shouwaykee with heavy artillery. This shelling has continued for several hours, and, according to the news agencies, this is the fourth time in a week - and this is only Wednesday - that Israeli shelling of south Lebanon has been reported. Perhaps this is the best answer that Israel gives us as regards the atmosphere in this debate at the present juncture.

Turning to the report of the Secretary-General, I would say in all fairness that the Secretary-General has reiterated a very strong point, which should be the only point, and there should not be any diversion or deviation from the discussion of it in regard to the actions of UNIFIL.

He says:

"As I mentioned in my previous report, an essential factor in UNIFIL's success 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)

I think it is there that the illness lies. That is where the disease is. That is where the cancer is. It is on this point that we should concentrate our discussion, and we should not discuss what is happening in Tripoli or what is happening somewhere in the jungle. It is from this that UNIFIL's mandate starts, because, I would recall, resolution 425 (1978) made it clear that UNIFIL's mission was to confirm the withdrawal of Israeli forces from southern Lebanon. Those forces have not yet been withdrawn and this is where the root of the evil is.

The statement of the Secretary-General is not accidental. Looking at the report submitted by him for the period from 16 June 1978 to 15 June 1979, which is contained in document A/34/2, on every single page from page 3 all the way to page 19, I dare say, one will find statements of this kind - and I will quote from only one.

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

"Major problems had confronted UNIFIL after the fourth and last phase of the Israeli withdrawal on 13 June, when, with minor exceptions, the withdrawing Israeli forces had handed over control of the evacuated area not to UNIFIL but to the Lebanese de facto armed groups in the area commanded by Major Haddad." (A/34/2, para. 11)

The report goes on to say that the Secretary-General

"pointed out that the current situation, through no fault of UNIFIL, was unacceptable, since the fact that the Israeli forces handed over control of the border area to de facto armed groups rather than to UNIFIL had prevented the full deployment of the Force and the restoration of the authority of the Lebanese Government in the whole area of operation." (ibid., para. 12)

There are, of course, many references and many statements to the same effect in this report, and that is what we should deal with. We should not try to search for some escape from the facts and deal with so-called fictitious vicious circles. It is not a question of vicious circles or of strife in southern Lebanon among some Lebanese and some Palestinians or others. It is the Israeli intervention, as the Secretary-General says very clearly in his report.

It was no accident that when the Sixth Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries met in Havana last September - immediately after the meeting the Council had to hold in August - the non-aligned countries adopted, among other things, a resolution condemning Israel for its continued aggression in Lebanon and its refusal to withdraw from certain positions which it continued to occupy. In that resolution at that summit conference the non-aligned countries asked that the Council apply against Israel measures set forth in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter in order to dissuade it from continuing its aggression against Lebanon and to halt the worsening of the situation in the region. There are sometimes unbelievable, or rather irresponsible, statements made in this Council which equate the legitimate rights of Palestinians resisting foreign occupation with the shelling and bombing and the dropping of cluster bombs on refugee camps by the Israeli racist, anti-semitic forces who are trying to eliminate a people, the



(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

Palestinian people. This is something that is tantamount to an attempt at genocide. Yet in this Council we hear that equated with the resistance and the explosions of some bombs in the occupied territories. I see no connexion between legitimate acts of resistance by the Palestinian people against the Israeli forces of occupation and Israel's acts of terrorism against our people in refugee camps in southern Lebanon.

When this debate started, when the invasion of Israel came in March 1978, the same story was told: that it was these criminal Palestinians who were taking a free hand in Lebanon. On that occasion, I would recall, I said that the Palestinians happened to be in Lebanon, not because they wanted to be there but because they were driven there. They did not go there of their own choice. They were expelled at bayonet point, as a result of a criminally conceived campaign of terror. I was referring to the criminal acts committed in 1947 and 1948 by the so-called Jewish armed gangs, and I recalled in particular the crime committed at Deir Yassin, which was carried out by none other than the present Prime Minister of Israel, who was ironically - and shamefully, I would say - decorated as a Peace Prize winner.

In pursuing its acts of terrorism Israel, a Member of the United Nations, committed a crime of murder last Saturday, when its agents gunned down a member of the Palestine Liberation Organization diplomatically accredited to a mission in Cyprus. With him, a visiting colleague was also gunned down. Yesterday there was a rally in Beirut at the burial of the victims of that crime against diplomatically accredited representatives. Chairman Arafat made a statement at that rally and, among other things, he said:

"What is currently happening in south Lebanon is not just a demand for the withdrawal of the forces of the Palestinian revolution and the Lebanese national movement. Rather it is a demand to implement the Zionist plan, which covers not only Palestine but south Lebanon and north Lebanon as well."

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

I wish to remind representatives that in March 1978 I presented to this Council a map showing the Zionist plan to acquire parts of Lebanon, not secretly but openly, made in 1919 at the Peace Conference in Versailles. Chairman Arafat yesterday, in his statement at the burial of his comrades in arms, went on to say:

"Our combat on this narrow path does not mean that we want Lebanon as an alternative homeland. It is those who fight the Palestinian revolution and those who are with Camp David - it is those who want to settle the Palestinians in Lebanon."

I wish to assure the Council that we Palestinians have no intention whatsoever of replacing our Palestine with the beautiful country of Lebanon. All we are looking forward to is to be permitted to return to our own country, establish our own State and live in peace, so that peace will prevail in the area.

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

It is incumbent upon this Council to come up with something concrete so that our people's trust in this Council will be strengthened and there will be no room for despair.

We are approaching Christmas. At this point I would recall the Christian Maronites of two villages in North Palestine that were occupied in 1948. I am referring to Kafr Birim and Ikreet. The people of those two villages have since 1948 been Israeli citizens. Yet, until now, and it is almost 1980, they have been denied the right to return to their little villages and settle there. They were on one occasion denied the right to restore the church bell and to celebrate Christmas in their villages. And yet here we hear someone talking about Christians, or something like that. Those villagers have become Israeli citizens, and yet they are denied the right to celebrate Christmas Eve in their own chapels, in their own villages. They are Maronite Palestinians.

I wish to extend to the representative of Bolivia our felicitations and congratulations on perhaps doing something much more effective and feeling happier. I know how he felt when this Council elected him a member of the Commission to go and investigate Israeli atrocities in the occupied territories, and he was denied permission by none other than one who said he was a good friend of his. He was denied permission to go and investigate. It is very difficult to have such hypocritical friends, or friends who are really more enemies than friends.

Finally, I sincerely hope that UNIFIL will fulfil its mission and that it will confirm that Israel has fully withdrawn from Lebanese territory and that the Lebanese Government is in full authority and exercising sovereignty in its territory up to its borders with Palestine, borders that have been internationally recognized.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): I thank the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization for the friendly sentiments he expressed towards my country.

I would inform the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic in which he asks to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote,

(The President)

in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. EL-Choufi (Syrian Arab Republic) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): I invite the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. EL-CHOUFI (Syrian Arab Republic): Mr. President, since this is the first time I have spoken before the Council this month, allow me at the outset to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. The friendly relations that have always existed between the peoples and Governments of China and Syria are excellent examples of the unselfish relationship upon which a new international order can be built.

I should also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Bolivia, for the able manner in which he guided the deliberations of the Council during November.

While thanking you, Sir, and the members of the Council for allowing me to participate in the discussion, I should like to explain that I had no intention of speaking. I am doing so only to reply to what we have heard from the representative of Israel.

The Council has just taken a decision concerning UNIFIL's mandate in southern Lebanon. As the Secretary-General mentions in his report,

"UNIFIL was envisaged as a two-stage operation. In the first stage, the Force was to confirm the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory to the international border." (S/13691, para. 19)

This was stated on 19 March 1978, and it is repeated in the present report of the Secretary-General. But, as we can see from the present report of the Secretary-General, UNIFIL cannot yet carry out even the first stage of its mandate, which is to ensure Israeli withdrawal from Lebanese territories. Had Israel abided by the Security Council resolutions on southern Lebanon, UNIFIL could indeed have discharged its responsibilities, the Council would have been saved further debate and the Middle East would have been spared more trouble.

(Mr. El-Choufi, Syrian Arab  
Republic)

Nowhere in the report of the Secretary-General is my country mentioned. The Council's deliberations are limited to the situation in southern Lebanon and to UNIFIL's mandate. As has clearly emerged from the statements of the representatives to which we have listened, the world community is genuinely concerned to ensure the fulfilment of UNIFIL's mandate and to help the Lebanese Government to exercise authority over its own territory. Any attempt to change the focus of attention, to distort facts, to bombard the Security Council with fabrications and lies is an offence not only against Lebanon but against the world community as well.

Apparently the representative of Israel feels no shame in undertaking this shameful course. He tried arrogantly to stupify us all. Allow me to give only one example, The Secretary-General has rightly stated in his report:

"As I mentioned in my previous report, an essential factor in UNIFIL's success in the implementation of its mandate is the position of the Israeli Government, inasmuch as the de facto forces are supported by Israel."

(ibid., para. 58)

The representative of Israel did not choose to address himself to that fact. To cover up the crimes of his Government he has chosen to resort to deceit, lies, fabrications and the pretension of omnipotence. He speaks like a god. And why not? His rotten Zionist ideology dictates that he belongs to the "chosen people". He thinks that being "chosen" gives him the right to enslave others, to occupy the lands of others, to interfere in the internal affairs of others and to be a holy arbiter.

Contrary to what we have heard from the representative of the neo-Nazi Government, the Ambassador of Israel, Syria is not occupying Lebanon. I have on several occasions stated before this august body, and I state again, that Syria entered Lebanon in response to a clear invitation from the legal Lebanese authorities. Syria has always been, and still is, ready to withdraw from Lebanon whenever the legal Lebanese authorities so demand. Syria will never remain for a single day in Lebanon against the will of the legal Lebanese authorities.

(Mr. El-Choufi, Syrian Arab Republic)

The presence of Syrian forces in Lebanon has been decided by the League of Arab States and they are under the direct command of the President of Lebanon.

In conclusion, I should like to appeal to this body to use the legal authority invested in it in the Charter of the United Nations once and for all to put a stop to the nonsensical Israeli statements that the Council has so unjustly allowed itself to listen to and order the aggressor to halt his aggression. I should like to appeal to the Council to rise to its responsibilities and put an end once and for all to Israel's contempt of others, of us all, of the United Nations and of a civilized international order.

I realize, though, that, its arrogance notwithstanding, Israel is but a tool, a puppet. I know that the real culprit is the United States of America. Without the economic, military, political and all kinds of support the United States Government accords Israel, Israel could not be that arrogant, that privileged outlaw. Without the United States, Israel could never enjoy its honeymoon of criminality.

Therefore, by all rational logic this Council must, in our view, condemn not only the stooge but also the master. The United States is, in our opinion, as responsible - or, rather, as irresponsible - as the Israelis.

We would have preferred to see the Council condemning Israel's persistent defiance of Security Council decisions. Also, we would have preferred operative paragraph 8 of resolution 459 (1979), which the Council has just adopted, to be more explicit. The Security Council should have urged the United States Government to discourage Israel from further undermining the authority of this Council and of the United Nations as a whole.

Our respect for the American people is limitless. We believe that the United States Government owes it to its own history to take a stand at least once for justice in the Middle East. I hope that the United States will discourage Israel from choosing a policy that can only be disastrous not only for us the victims of its continual aggression but also for the peace and security of the world at large.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): I thank the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic for the kind words he addressed to me.

I now call on those representatives who wish to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): I assure the Council that I shall be brief and, again, that I shall not intervene again on any question relating to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) this year, in 1979. God knows what may happen later.

I have asked to speak now because the representative of Israel, Ambassador Blum, gave me a Christmas present when he expressed his sentiments to me. And, in accordance with the basic norms of courtesy, when one is given a Christmas present, he has to do the following: either to acknowledge the present or give one in return. Unfortunately, I do not have a present to give, but I have an acknowledgement, which I shall make.

He spoke derisively and sarcastically about my quoting Shakespeare, Dante and sometimes the Koran and sometimes the Bible, on which I am less learned. Perhaps I can leave him a legacy now, for the Christmas present he gave me, a legacy which is not from the Bible, not from Shakespeare, not from Chaucer but from the basic fundamental proverbs of Kuwait.

I am fascinated by our expressions in Kuwait. These days we are known because of our oil. But we are not products of oil, we are products of destitution from the years before the oil, years when we challenged the waves, invaded shores and smuggled gold into various countries. Through that destitution, we came by our sayings, one of which is: If you get something you do not deserve, please go and kiss the palm of your hand.

I think that Israel has gotten - as the Americans say - or has obtained a resolution which it does not deserve. Israel should have been condemned; it should have been not only condemned but exposed. However, politics are sometimes more powerful than logic and, because of that, that simple Kuwaiti proverb becomes more incisive, more powerful and more truthful in the present circumstances.

I have another Kuwaiti proverb, which is also a legacy for Christmas. We say in Kuwait - and here I have tried to juggle with the words in order to make it truthful: If you reach the stage at which you believe that you can make red, blue; black, white; and purple, pink; then, please, you must consult your mother, because, basically, there must be something inherently wrong with you. Proceeding from this Kuwaiti proverb, I think that there is a political

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

dislocation and intellectual deprivation in this exercise of UNIFIL.

Perhaps the Israelis with their logic should consult a political psychiatrist.

I shall not go on with those unflattering words, because I do not like them.

But, on a serious note - and this has nothing to do with Shakespeare or even the proverbs of the Kuwaitis of the past, and they have different proverbs these days - perhaps the best present, and a genuine one, would be an acknowledgement from the Israeli Government that it will cease its support for Haddad. That is the key; the rest are ramifications, consequences and results. The effect, the cause and the *raison d'être* of the whole problem is that bizarre Israeli-Haddad relationship. And in diplomatic relations, it is a bizarre relationship, unprecedented since the dark ages. I hope that we are not now in the dark ages. We claim that we are not, but, in practice, we sometimes swim through the dark waves of the valley of darkness.

The best thing that Ambassador Blum could tell us here, instead of talking about me tongue in cheek, would be that his Government is ceasing its assistance to Haddad - and that would be the key for the success of UNIFIL. And there should be no problem; all he needs do is consult the report of the Secretary-General, which substantiates this theory. There is no need for discursive, stodgy, inexplicable statements. The need here is for clarity, and clarity is the enemy of evasiveness. Those who have a weak point resort to evasiveness; they avoid clarity; they shun it; because clarity is the detrimental enemy of confusion and in confusion they survive.

In south Lebanon, the whole theatre is the result of confusion, of this unholy alliance between Israel and Haddad.

That is what I wanted to say at this juncture, and, again, I wish to assure the Council that I shall not speak again on UNIFIL in 1979; but perhaps I shall do so next year.



Mr. DE ZAVALA URRIOLAGOITIA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish):

I shall say only a few words to express my gratitude, on behalf of Ambassador Palacios de Vizzio, who was President of the Security Council during the month of November, for the cordial words of congratulation addressed to him by the representatives of Israel and Syria.

As for the reference made by my friend from the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), I must remind him that the trip which I made to the Middle East under a mandate from this Council in accordance with its resolution 446 (1979) was carried out as a special mission of the Council, and not as a friend of the representative of Israel, whose personal friendship I appreciate highly, as I do my friendship with Mr. Terzi, the representative of the PLO.

Mr. LUNGU (Zambia): My delegation would like to respond very briefly to a statement made by the Ambassador of Israel in which reference was made to some part of a statement made in the Council by my delegation in August 1979.

My delegation wishes to state that it reserves the right to comment in detail on the matter at an appropriate time, should the need arise.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): The representative of Israel has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I now invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. BLUM (Israel): I gratefully acknowledge the present offered to me by Ambassador Bishara, the representative of my geographical region. I accept it in the same spirit in which it was given to me. Frankly, I should have preferred another small gift, namely an announcement by Ambassador Bishara that his Government had finally decided to accept Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which it has so far rejected.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

Just to refresh the memory of the representative of Zambia, let me quote from the statement made by another representative of Zambia on 30 August 1979 in this Council. He said:

"The so-called armed elements, who are abetted by Israel, also had the audacity and sagacity to seize and abduct some United Nations soldiers as hostages. What could be more terroristic than such actions?" (S/PV.2165, p. 21)

I quite agree. What could be more terroristic than such actions? At least and at long last we know who those armed elements are. That has been disclosed to us in the most recent report of the Secretary-General.

One might have expected the Soviet Union, which never supported the creation of UNIFIL and which does not pay one penny towards its budget, to be more circumspect in expressing its views on the matter before us. In reality, the Soviet Union has no interest in peace-keeping in Lebanon or anywhere else in the Middle East. For almost three decades it has been fueling the flames of conflict in the region. It has pumped arms into the area and continues to do so. It trains, supplies and supports the PLO terrorists who operate from Lebanon into Israel. Now the Soviet Union is making every effort to torpedo the peace process and to prevent the establishment of international peace and security in the Middle East. It is scarcely qualified to express a view in this debate.

I see little point in engaging in polemics for the umpteenth time with the representative of Syria, that self-professed champion of the civilized international order. He presents himself here as overflowing with brotherly love towards Lebanon, full of chivalry and honour. All of us know only too well the real nature of Syrian intentions regarding Lebanon and the abominable record of his country in fanning and fueling the civil war in Lebanon for its own purposes, with merciless disregard for the lives and property of the various factions in that country, as it suits Syria's aims at any given time. I shall also refrain from responding to his anti-Semitic outbursts reminiscent as they are of a dark and ignoble era in the history of mankind.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

In my statement I commented that various Arab States see in the Lebanese crisis a means of advancing their own partisan aims within the web of inter-Arab rivalries. In fact, my comment was far from original. It was based not only on what we all know but also on observations made by a well-known Arab diplomat only two months ago to a Kuwaiti newspaper. On 21 October 1979, Al-Anba of Kuwait quoted that Arab diplomat quite specifically as having said that there are Arab States which are interested in maintaining a state of war in Lebanon. Incidentally, the diplomat quoted in that report was none other than Ambassador Tueni, our Lebanese colleague here.

I should also like to draw the attention of the Council to remarks made only a few days ago by the Prime Minister of Lebanon with regard to the PLO terrorist presence in the south of his country. In an interview in the Lebanese paper Monday Morning of 10 December 1979 Mr. al-Huss said that the terrorist presence in UNIFIL's area of operations violated Security Council resolutions. He continued that his country would try to bring about the thinning down or the total withdrawal of the terrorists in that area.

Mr. TUENI (Lebanon): There is always an air of unreality in a debate that takes place after a vote, which in United Nations procedure is called explanations of vote. I could hardly find any explanation of vote in the various remarks made by the representative of Israel. Once we had disposed of the business before this Council he tried to open up new avenues of bickering instead of answering the one simple question which has been put to him over and over again here in this Council ever since 17 March 1978. It so happens that it was the representative of Kuwait who asked the question: is his country or is it not prepared to withdraw from Lebanon and to stop intervening in Lebanese affairs?

(Mr. Tueni, Lebanon)

Therefore I shall not be drawn, nor shall I imp your patience by answering what has been said. I merely want to once more that the business before this Council was a resolution concerning peace in south Lebanon. That resolution has been adopted and we refuse to be drawn into any debate which is alien to the matter on the agenda of this meeting.

The meeting rose at 7.40 p.m.