



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-THIRD YEAR

2086th MEETING: 19 SEPTEMBER 1978

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2086)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/12845)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

2086th MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 19 September 1978, at 11.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Ilja HULINSKÝ (Czechoslovakia).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Bolivia, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Kuwait, Mauritius, Nigeria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2086)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the Middle East:
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/12845)

The meeting was called to order at 12.15 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/12845)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representatives of Lebanon, Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic have addressed letters to the President of the Council in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the question. I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

2. I have also received a letter from the representative of Kuwait, dated 18 September [S/12851], which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request that, in accordance with past practice, the Security Council should extend an invitation to the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the present deliberations of the Council on the Secretary-General's report on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon."¹

The proposal is not made pursuant to rule 37 or 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, but, if approved by the

Council, the invitation to participate in the debate will confer on the Palestine Liberation Organization the same rights of participation as those conferred on a Member State when it is invited to participate under rule 37.

3. Does any member wish to speak on this proposal?

4. Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): The United States delegation has consistently taken the position that representatives of the Palestine Liberation Organization could be granted a hearing under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, but not, as is proposed, with the same rights of participation as Member States. We are, of course, aware that this procedure has been used in the past. However, we believe that the procedure used in the past and proposed today is not appropriate.

5. Members of the Council are familiar with the reasons for our taking that position in the past, and I do not want to repeat them, but I request that you should put to the vote the question of the invitation to the Palestine Liberation Organization in accordance with the procedure you have outlined.

6. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): If no other member wishes to speak, I shall take it that the Council is ready to vote on the request for participation now before it.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Bolivia, China, Czechoslovakia, Gabon, India, Kuwait, Mauritius, Nigeria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The proposal was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon) and Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took places at the Council table and Mr. Blum (Israel) and Mr. El-Choufi (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

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

¹ Quoted in English by the speaker.

8. Mr. BLUM (Israel): At the outset, I should like to join with previous speakers by paying my respects to you, Sir, on your assumption of the duties of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I should also like to thank you for according me the right to take part in the deliberations of the Council for the first time since my accreditation to the United Nations.

9. Israel did not intend originally to participate in this discussion. However, certain statements made in this chamber yesterday contained such deliberate distortions of the situation in Southern Lebanon that they now call for a response so as to set the record straight. Israel views with great concern the present situation in Lebanon. That concern, which goes well beyond the duration of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), stems both from our own vital security considerations and from the very real threat which a large segment of the Lebanese population faces to its very existence.

10. As the Secretary-General has noted in his report, "the situation in Southern Lebanon is very closely linked to the formidable problems of Lebanon as a whole" [*S/12845, para. 59*]. In recognition of that fact, the Security Council six months ago entrusted UNIFIL with a broad three-part mandate designed to restore "the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries" [*resolution 425 (1978)*]. That mandate was not intended merely to paper over the wounds that might open up again as soon as UNIFIL withdrew. Rather, it was to help heal the wounds and to create conditions that would preserve both peace and Lebanese independence long after the mandate expired. To that end, UNIFIL was charged with, first, "confirming the withdrawal of Israeli forces", secondly, "restoring international peace and security" and, thirdly, "assisting the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area" [*ibid.*].

11. In co-operation with the Israel Defence Forces, UNIFIL has successfully carried out the first part of its mandate. The completion of Israel's withdrawal was confirmed by the UNIFIL Commander on 13 June 1978 and recorded in the progress report of the Secretary-General of the same date [*S/12620/Add.5*]. As the Secretary-General's spokesman stated on that day:

"The fourth and last phase of the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from Southern Lebanon took place today, 13 June 1978. The withdrawal process was verified by United Nations military observers. By 1700 hours GMT, all Israeli positions were evacuated and the Commander of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, Major-General G. A. Erskine, confirmed to the Secretary-General that the Israeli forces had completely withdrawn from Southern Lebanon as called for by Security Council resolution 425 (1978) . . . With the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from all Lebanese territory and its confirmation by the Force Commander, the first part of the mandate entrusted to UNIFIL by the Security Council has been fulfilled."

12. As the representative of Israel stated in this chamber last March [*2071st and 2074th meetings*], Israel's action in

Southern Lebanon was aimed only against PLO terrorists who, having usurped Lebanese sovereignty in that region, had turned it into a staging ground for barbaric attacks against Israeli civilians. Our own desire was identical to that of the Government of Lebanon itself, that is, to see the establishment of full Lebanese authority and sovereignty in Southern Lebanon. In witness of those intentions, Israel has fulfilled its part in the implementation of resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978). None the less, as the Secretary-General himself states in his report:

" . . . very much remains to be done before the task entrusted to UNIFIL by the Security Council is fulfilled . . . Above all, the task of bringing about the restoration of Lebanese sovereignty and authority in Southern Lebanon has only begun, and even in the large area under the full control of UNIFIL progress has been slow." [*S/12845, para. 57.*]

13. The Government of Israel shares that assessment and earnestly views the fulfilment of that task as vital, not only to the people of Lebanon but to our own citizens as well. For over 30 years, our northern borders have been used to launch armed attacks against Israel and its population. When the PLO was permitted entry into Southern Lebanon some 10 years ago, a reign of terror began for Israeli and Lebanese villagers alike. In the last four years alone, there have been 1,662 individual acts of aggression arising from artillery, Katyusha, mortar and other terrorist attacks mounted against Israel from Lebanon and resulting in hundreds of Israeli casualties. That situation must not be allowed to return.

14. This meeting takes place immediately following the successful conclusion of the truly historic summit meeting held at Camp David on the personal initiative and under the aegis of the President of the United States. Now that we are well along the arduous road towards a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, it is imperative to defuse tensions throughout the area and to ensure that the momentum to peace which has just been given new impetus will be maintained.

15. It is therefore with particular sorrow that we view the current actions of certain armed elements abusing the territory of Lebanon as deliberate attempts to sabotage the peace process in the Middle East. It almost appears that, the more successful the peace efforts are, the more implacable and disruptive and intransigent become the elements within the Arab world and beyond that are so violently opposed to those efforts. The situation in Lebanon is only one manifestation of their subversive activities, and it is surely incumbent on the Security Council to avoid adopting any position or expressing any opinion which might give encouragement, however remote, to those elements so at odds with the peace-making process. The precarious situation in Lebanon—which is by no means confined to Southern Lebanon—is all too amenable to exploitation with the aim of diverting us all from the road to peace. The Council, with its duty to advance international peace and security, can have no part, either in word or deed, in the attempts which no doubt will be made to take advantage of the situation in Lebanon with a view to disrupting the peace-making process in the Middle East.

16. But there is no need to refer to those intransigent elements so indirectly, for they themselves make no attempt to hide their sinister intentions. Indeed, the real obstacle to full implementation of UNIFIL's mandate was outlined by Abu Iyad, Arafat's second-in-command and architect of the murderous attack on the Israeli bus on the Tel Aviv-Haifa highway in March of this year, in an interview with the Swiss newspaper *Tages Anzeiger* published shortly after UNIFIL was established:

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

Such declarations, confirmed by clashes with UNIFIL troops, the killings by the PLO of soldiers of UNIFIL and continued PLO infiltration behind UNIFIL lines, cast some doubt on the somewhat angelic impression of the PLO conveyed by certain quarters and also to the Council.

17. Much has been said here about obstacles to the deployment of the Lebanese Army in Southern Lebanon. The salient fact in this connexion is that PLO armed elements were able to infiltrate back or were allowed to exercise control over certain areas in Southern Lebanon which continue to be barred to the Lebanese Army. It is a well-known fact that units of the Lebanese Army would not even dare to advance through the coastal sector of Tyre or through PLO-dominated areas in the central sector of UNIFIL's area of operation.

18. I speak here not only of Southern Lebanon, which is experiencing relative quiet compared to the bloodletting in the north. The Secretary-General's report correctly states that "the situation in Southern Lebanon is very closely linked to the formidable problems of Lebanon as a whole" [*ibid.*, para. 59]. Thus any discussion of Lebanon must aim at creating a permanent peace and restoring full Lebanese sovereignty, not only in the South, but throughout the country, including at Beirut itself.

19. Israel's position on the resolution adopted last night by the Council is based on three major considerations.

20. First, as confirmed by the UNIFIL Commander, Israel has fulfilled its obligations under the first part of the UNIFIL mandate by having completely withdrawn its forces from Lebanese territory. In the process, and I regret that there was no space to mention this in the Secretary-General's report, Israel provided significant assistance and tangible aid to UNIFIL, facilitating its entry into Southern Lebanon, installing facilities and assisting with communications, supplies and logistics.

21. Secondly, despite Israel's complete withdrawal, foreign forces still remain on Lebanese soil, thus impeding the implementation of the second and third parts of the UNIFIL mandate. It is painfully clear to all observers that the problems of the Lebanese Government in reasserting its authority over its territory are not confined to certain marginal areas of Southern Lebanon. Effective control by the Lebanese Government is impeded as long as that Government functions in the gunshots of foreign artillery

and tanks. As to the PLO, it still constitutes a virtual state within a State in Lebanon, and the continued presence of its armed terrorists constitutes a serious threat both to the authority of the Lebanese Government and to the prospects for peace through the region. If UNIFIL becomes the thin end of the wedge whereby the PLO may re-enter Southern Lebanon, the United Nations Force will have failed in its task.

22. Thirdly—and this is perhaps the most urgent consideration—the villagers of Southern Lebanon have genuine reason to fear for their lives. In view of their own previous experiences, and in the light of what is at present taking place in the north, these villagers know that their own Government does not at present possess the means to guarantee their security. It is their fear that foreign forces will enter the South when the United Nations leaves that has prompted the villagers there to depend on themselves. For the present, the local Lebanese forces defending the Christian and Shiah areas in the South represent their only protection and those areas constitute, incidentally, the only ones in all of Lebanon where Lebanese authority has been maintained. No credible alternative to those local forces has yet been presented.

23. Given the dimensions of those problems and the determined conspiracy by some parties to sabotage the current peace efforts, the task of UNIFIL, with its geographically limited mandate and its politically defined scope, remains awesome indeed. Under the most trying conditions it has made progress, as witnessed by the relative calm in the South and by the return of refugees, many, unfortunately, fleeing the renewed terror in the north. In these circumstances, my Government wishes to pay tribute to the courage and performance of the officers and men of the United Nations Force, and to express our deepest appreciation to the Members of the Organization which have contributed contingents to it. Soldiers from Asia, Africa, Europe, Canada and the Pacific have fulfilled and are continuing to fulfil their duties with integrity under conditions of great hardship. Indeed, several of their number have made the supreme sacrifice. The people of Israel honour their memory and pray for the speedy recovery of the wounded. If UNIFIL succeeds in fulfilling its mandate, their sacrifice will not have been in vain and they will have made a lasting contribution to the search for peace in our troubled region.

24. No one could be surprised at the remarks of the Soviet representative last night, since his country's role has been overtly designed to torpedo the current peace efforts and to destabilize the region as a whole. In consonance with its policy of destabilizing the Middle East, the Soviet Union refused to support the creation of UNIFIL in March, preferring no doubt to see the agony of Lebanon continue at the hands of its terrorist protégés. I use that phrase advisedly, for it is no longer a secret that the PLO terrorists are supplied and even trained by the Soviet Union, both directly and by proxy. Ever since Soviet vessels were discovered unloading weapons and missiles for the PLO at Sidon in January, Soviet assistance to the PLO has reached Lebanon via Syria. Elaborate terrorist "training institutes" exist today in the Soviet Union.

25. The larger Soviet design is even more ominous, as represented by the massive build-up of arms supplies to the States of the "rejectionist front" since President Sadat's visit to Jerusalem last November. According to figures released by the International Institute of Strategic Studies in London and the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, Syria, Libya and Iraq are augmenting their already vast arsenals with huge quantities of the most sophisticated Soviet weapons, including thousands of T-62 and T-72 tanks and hundreds of MIG-23 fighter aircraft, as well as Sukhoy fighters, Scud surface-to-surface missile launchers and Komar and Osa missile boats. Indeed, the artillery rockets and tanks at present pounding Christian neighbourhoods in Beirut are of Soviet manufacture.

26. In fact the Soviet Union has played a key role in every outbreak of violence in the Middle East in the past 25 years. As Egyptian President Nasser indicated in his resignation speech of 9 June 1967, it was Soviet intrigue that had led Egypt into the 1967 war. The recent intensive Soviet-Syrian diplomatic and military interchanges are reminiscent of Soviet attempts to increase tensions on Israel's northern border after the 1975 Disengagement Agreement between Israel and Egypt. Determined to destroy the peace process, the Soviet Union has aimed at destabilizing the Middle East, including Lebanon, as it has attempted in recent years to destabilize other regions of the world. Only in what it regards as its own sphere of influence does the Soviet Union employ even more direct means. In this respect also the Soviet Union appears to have taught its Syrian allies a lesson in regional expansionism. Following the Soviet pattern, the Syrians have used the mask of regional peace-keeping to advance their sinister aims. The sad record of the Soviet Union in the use or threat of force in international relations disqualifies it from making pronouncements on the subject of national sovereignty and territorial integrity in this forum.

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

28. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): It is very fashionable nowadays to quote from the Bible, and I wish to start my brief address this morning by a quotation from the prophet Isaiah:

"Is it not yet a very little while, and Lebanon shall be turned into a fruitful field, and the fruitful field shall be esteemed as a forest?

"And in that day shall the deaf hear the words of the book, and the eyes of the blind shall see out of obscurity, and out of darkness.

". . .

"For the terrible one is brought to nought, and the scorner is consumed, and all that watch for iniquity are cut off:

"That make a man an offender for a word."²

² Isaiah, 29: 17-21.

29. Mr. President, I too had not intended to speak in this debate. The generosity with which you personally conducted yesterday's superb hearings and, as I understand, the consultations, and the very swift vote that took place yesterday on the draft resolution had given total satisfaction to my country and my delegation. We also had felt that the Secretary-General's report had said everything that there was to be said. However, I find myself compelled, since the debate has been opened to non-members, to make a few remarks, and I want to initiate them by thanking you for this opportunity, which stems from your personal generosity as well as from the very intimate ties that have always existed between your country and mine and the understanding that you can have of the problems we are suffering.

30. My delegation, as I said, would have had little to add to the report of the Secretary-General, which has been implicitly endorsed in substance, particularly its conclusions, by the majority, if not the totality, of the members of the Council. I wish, however, to be permitted the following remarks.

31. First and foremost, we wish to be associated with the Council in expressing our deep appreciation for the tremendous performance of UNIFIL. The soldiers of peace, under the very wise and courageous guidance of the Secretary-General and the superb command of their officers, particularly Major-General Erskine, have given a new historical dimension and a new meaning to the solidarity between peace-loving nations and the rule of international law and order. Never will the people of Lebanon forget the message of hope, carried by men who have chosen to imperil their lives, far from their homelands, for the cause of peace.

32. My second remark flows directly from this tribute to the peace-keeping force. When resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) were adopted in this chamber, I said, in concluding the debate [*2075th meeting*], that my Government considered the response of the international community as a challenge—that we all considered it as a challenge—a challenge to the United Nations and a challenge to the Government of Lebanon. I also expressed our hope that our people would be able to prove that independence was for Lebanon more than an empty word.

33. Since then, much has happened in Lebanon, and we feel that we owe it to the Council to admit, with candour and honesty, that the challenge has not been fully met. Yet, we are anxious that the Council should be assured that we do not look upon UNIFIL as a permanent engagement, nor does Lebanon intend, in any way, to become forever a "problem country", a burden unto itself and the world.

34. My third remark is precisely about this: if Lebanon is still today a "problem country", it is through no fault of its own. Our ancient land—where the scars left by so many conquerors are still bleeding, generation after generation, and year after year—has always been known for its patience, its resistance, its heroism and a certain ability always to resurrect and survive.

35. But let us not be blinded by rhetoric. Today what Mr. Waldheim so rightly calls "the tragedy of Lebanon" is

far too complex for any one nation to overcome alone. If I may borrow here the very words of paragraph 59 of the Secretary-General's report, I would submit that indeed "the situation in Southern Lebanon is very closely linked to the formidable problems of Lebanon as a whole", which, in turn, are "inextricably linked with the problem of the Middle East".

36. I submit, however, that this should not be read as an excuse for carelessness or an alibi for failure. Quite to the contrary, this, in historical perspective, is in reality the most factual statement in support of what was said here to this very Council six months ago and later to the General Assembly—that Lebanon had been made to pay, through no fault of its own, for being so deeply committed to the ideals of peace.

37. Is it not strange indeed that the one and only country in the Middle East which has refused to wage war should have suffered, both in terms of casualties and destruction, so much more than the sum total of the losses of all the parties to three or four Middle East wars? Is it not also strange, and paradoxical as well, that this haven of liberty and democracy should have been transformed not into a "no man's land" of peace but into an "every man's land" of war, an arena of everyone's war against everyone and everyone's revolution as well? A greater paradox is that some have taken this tragic reality as a licence to perpetuate what is now called "the Lebanon war" or, at best, "the question of Lebanon".

38. Let it here be said, and clearly understood, that Lebanon is not negotiable; nor do we consider it a dispensable entity. So strong is our will to survive in freedom and in peace, that we refuse to be constantly made to choose only between two fatal options, both suicidal: explosion or invasion.

39. Yesterday many of us saw and listened to the President of the United States address both Houses of Congress. I have the honour here to quote what the President said as a testimony to this attitude:

"We must also join in an effort to bring an end to the conflict and terrible suffering in Lebanon . . . [We must] try to move toward a solution of the problem in Lebanon which is so vital to us and to the poor people in Lebanon who have suffered so much."

40. This leads me to my fourth remark, which is an appeal to the Security Council—a body which we have always respected—that Lebanon should not be made the object of debates and quarrels that go much further beyond the Lebanese question. On the contrary, Lebanon should be protected, and the problem of peace and the fate of peace in Lebanon should be resolved in both a more practical and stable and much wiser manner than some statements here have indicated.

41. I have no intention of going into rhetoric nor of answering any of the speakers. But I want to assert here before the Council, on behalf of my Government, that we have no intention of maintaining the United Nations Interim Force permanently on our borders or inside our

land, and we think that the time has probably come for us all to seek a legal and pragmatic expression of international security on and within our internationally recognized boundaries comparable at least to, if not more secure than, what had been found admissible on more belligerent frontiers.

42. Such arrangements already have their legal framework laid over the years, since the first Middle East war and in the signature of the documents creating the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission (ILMAC) in 1949. In this connexion we wish to remind the Council that, in the report of the Secretary-General to the Council [*S/12611*] which the Council approved by its resolution 426 (1978), it is stated very clearly that UNIFIL's efforts should ultimately lead to the revival of the Armistice Agreement and of ILMAC. Furthermore, in the Secretary-General's latest progress report [*S/12620/Add.5*], it was reiterated that UNIFIL should ultimately lead to a reactivated ILMAC. Such an arrangement would avoid much rhetoric in the Council—useless rhetoric, if I may say—about who has withdrawn from Lebanon, what is withdrawal from Lebanon and how it is possible still to be in Lebanon while having withdrawn.

43. In concluding these remarks, I should also like to say that this agreement should be made easier to reach by the fact that Lebanon has never expressed the desire to become what is called a "confrontation State", nor has it ever indicated an interest in so becoming. And I do earnestly hope that those words will be taken in the spirit in which they are being said.

44. That brings me to my fifth and final remark. We appreciate the Secretary-General's reasons for saying:

"It is difficult to envisage a full and satisfactory over-all solution of the problems of Lebanon except in the framework of a general settlement of the Middle East problem or, at the very least, of a significant degree of movement towards such a settlement." [*S/12845, para. 59.*]

Yet, we submit also that this should be read as complemented by further statements speaking—at random, *inter alia*, and sometimes by signals and symbols—of the "disastrous" consequences of UNIFIL's withdrawal, on the one hand, and on the other hand of the "complexities" of the problems in Lebanon, the "psychological climate", the need "to bring about a change" in the way people "view not only each other but also the outside world" and "the degree of suspicion, fear, violence and even fatalism which prevails"—let alone the importance of stressing the task of protecting "the rights and security of all the inhabitants".

45. We feel sure that no injustice is being done here to Mr. Waldheim's political wisdom and acumen by reading into his remarks a more explicit warning—I repeat, a more explicit warning—than he probably wanted to deliver. This warning, we submit, should be addressed to each and every one of us, individually as well as collectively. For if conditions in Lebanon no longer appear, as they did six months ago, to constitute a real "danger and threat to international peace and security", yet they still constitute a

"major obstacle to a just settlement of the Middle East crisis", which in turn keeps the world on the brink of war. It is again probably paradoxical yet none the less true that, while there cannot be peace in Lebanon without a settlement of the Middle East crisis, there also cannot and, indeed, will not be peace in the Middle East without or even before peace is attained in Lebanon. For peace in Lebanon cannot, should not and, indeed, will not, I hope, wait for a comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East, much as we all want that peace.

46. Six months ago, Lebanon cried in agony to the Security Council and to the world: "let my people live". We then thought that the world had already responded, as this Council had. But since then, some of my people have been dying every day, more and more every day, every day of every week of every month.

47. Many, indeed, may have thought it convenient that Lebanon should die, and some may even have thought it possible. We are meeting here to prove that it shall not be so. Indeed, the Council's new resolution should be read as such, as an act of faith and a new lease of life.

48. Lebanon has had more than its share of death and desolation, of human suffering and bloodshed, and of the destruction not only of life and of cities but also of the very fabric of its society and polity. Let us therefore recreate Lebanon, not by quarrelling over rights and responsibilities and all the Pharisaic interpretations of life and death, but by allowing the Lebanese to unite again, to rediscover their national identity, to regain their total sovereignty and independence, and freely and fully to implement themselves what the international Organization has been calling for.

49. We all here know the hazards and the glories of peace-keeping—all forms of peace-keeping, past, present and future.

50. Returning once more to the Secretary-General's observations and the facts brought to the Council's attention, we feel justified in saying that bringing peace to Lebanon, in particular to Southern Lebanon, is more a "political" matter than a military one, whence our earlier assertion that the settlement of Lebanon's crisis must be political as well. The mission, so unique in character, of the "soldiers for peace" should thus be conducive to a more comprehensive peace-keeping effort. Such an effort is probably what the Secretary-General has hinted at in his report on the work of the Organization for the year 1978, where he clearly states:

"The strength of a peace-keeping force lies not in its arms but in its peaceful and disciplined approach and in the political consensus which lies behind it. To resort to force is the last and least desirable course for a peace-keeping force. Negotiation and persuasion must be the primary method for achieving its objective. However, if such methods prove unavailing, the Security Council may well have to consider what other approaches are open to it under the Charter."³

³ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Supplement No. 1*, sect. IV, p. 5.

51. In my Government's letter to the President of the Council dated 5 September [*S/12835*] there was an invitation to seek to redefine the mandate of UNIFIL so as to ensure the full implementation of the objectives set forth in resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978). Our request was no more than what the Secretary-General has himself said. I do not wish to enter into a futile debate on the facts stated in my letter as well as in the report of the Secretary-General or in explanations presented to the Council. However, I should like to say the following. The Council was well inspired in setting a specific date, midway through the period of the second mandate of UNIFIL, for an assessment of the situation and to examine what further steps should be taken.

52. Not much can be achieved in two months, or even in four, but a lot can certainly be undertaken that might encourage us all either to pursue UNIFIL or to deploy further political efforts, or a combination of both, let alone the possibility of seeking new avenues of thought and action.

53. While expressing my Government's appreciation to the Council for its resolution, allow me to say that we find in its positive presentation greater encouragement than in the condemnation that we would have been justified in seeking. Israel's responsibility in preventing the total implementation of the previous resolutions is so clear, so patent, that it hardly needs further emphasis.

54. Let us therefore hope that the course chosen by the Council will be an inducement to confidence: confidence in international law and order, confidence in the United Nations, confidence in the effectiveness of United Nations forces in providing peace and security for all and their ability to protect—and alone to protect—the right of people to live and to determine their own future.

55. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I thank the representative of Lebanon for the kind words which he addressed to my country in connexion with the traditional links of friendship and co-operation that have always existed between Lebanon and Czechoslovakia. I thank him also for the very kind words that he addressed to me personally.

56. The next speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

57. Mr. EI JHC UFI (Syrian Arab Republic): Mr. President, allow me first of all to extend to you and to the friendly people of Czechoslovakia our warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. We are confident that in this capacity you will guide the deliberations of this important international body to meaningful conclusions in the cause of peace and security the world over.

58. We all know, as does the world at large, who it is that has created obstacles that have prevented UNIFIL from carrying out its mandate in accordance with the resolution of the Security Council. Not even the Council can hide, by carefully selected wording, the fact that Israel merely

pretended to accept resolution 425 (1978), and did not hesitate to sabotage its full implementation, for, while the resolution called for complete and unconditional withdrawal of its forces from Lebanon, Israel instead handed over some of the positions under its control to irregular and illegal militia that had already been denounced by the Lebanese Government.

59. Israel thus exacerbated a situation already fraught with tension and danger and, as a result of such intransigence, many lives, including the lives of UNIFIL personnel, were lost or seriously endangered. This behaviour on the part of Israel is not exceptional in the posture it has adopted ever since it came into existence as a Zionist entity in the Middle East. Its aggressive conduct and consistent record of trampling upon other people's rights merely flow from its Zionist character. We share with the international community the hope that one day the Israelis will recognize the danger of Zionism, an ideology that poisons not the Arab area alone but the morality of the Israelis in Palestine as well. Zionism has transformed part of world Jewry into neo-Nazis. The promised land of the preachings of the Bible and other holy books is a dream, a concept relevant to all human beings, especially the oppressed; but Nazi Zionism transformed that dream into an instrument of hatred; it made of this dream a myth for the perpetuation of chauvinism and Nazi supremacy, a concept relevant only to oppressors.

60. Listening to the representative of Israel, we all witnessed an excellent act of flagrant distortion, when that expansionist himself, whose Government still occupies part of my country, called Syria expansionist. It is still more ironic that the Israeli representative is complaining about Syria's acquiring enough armaments to defend itself against the permanent Israeli aggression. When the Israeli representative wants to cite the armaments of others he must respect this international body and remember that his Zionist State has become a true storehouse of lethal armaments, probably including nuclear armaments.

61. As regards the Syrian mission in Lebanon, we are there at the request of the legal Lebanese Government. We are striving to do all that we can to carry out our national and humanitarian mission in the shortest possible time. It is indeed ironic and blatant hypocrisy for the Zionist racist entity of Israel to claim humanistic intentions in Lebanon. We are all aware of how the Palestinian people and other Arabs have been treated—or, rather, mistreated—by the Zionists in Palestine. We believe that the problem in Southern Lebanon can be resolved, notwithstanding the over-all conflict in the Middle East. It is a problem that can be solved because, for the first time, the Security Council has intervened and stated in clear terminology that Israel, the aggressor, must withdraw from the territory of a sovereign, independent Member State.

62. We reiterate, therefore, that the Council must discharge its responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security to ensure that the Lebanese Government will be enabled to exercise its full legal authority over its own sovereign territory.

63. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, upon whom I now call.

64. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Comrade President, I am really honoured to speak when you are occupying the presidential chair of the Security Council and it is considering a vital matter that affects not only the status and the lives of people in Lebanon but the entire situation in the Middle East.

65. We are not in Lebanon because we want to be in Lebanon: we are in Lebanon because we have been driven from our own homes at bayonet point. Our ambition is to go back to our homes. We fully support the banners that were carried around in some streets: "Palestinians, go home". This is exactly what we want, and this is exactly what we are fighting for.

66. I shall confine my statement at the moment to the report of the Secretary-General, and I wish to state at the outset that the Secretary-General and his staff had the courage and the guts, if I may say so, to dot the i's and cross the t's. The Secretary-General and his staff have clearly said:

"The fact that the Israel Defence Forces"—ironically they call themselves defence forces when they are invading Lebanon—"handed over control of the border area to *de facto* armed groups"—and here I would much rather have seen the term "unauthorized armed personnel" instead of "*de facto* armed groups"—"rather than to UNIFIL has continued to make impossible the full deployment of UNIFIL and the restoration of the authority of the Lebanese Government in the whole area of operation." [S/12845, para. 61.]

67. Now, this in itself should have been sufficient for the Council to think of taking more action than just renewing for four months or three months or six months the deployment of UNIFIL, action that is guaranteed in the Charter. What should the Council do with so-called States that owe their presence to the United Nations? The remedy is there in the Charter: there is something called sanctions. We cannot permit those racists to invade neighbouring countries and go scot free.

68. Let me be frank. The United States drafted the first resolution, but I wish to tell the representative of the United States, through you, Sir, that its duty does not end with the presentation of a paper, its duty is to see to it that the contents of that paper have been implemented.

69. But what have we seen? The United States continues to supply Israel with lethal weapons—cluster bombs, billions of dollars' worth of armaments—to kill more and more people. In the interim, and during the presence of UNIFIL in the area of operation, the racist forces attacked Lebanon, and we have sent a letter to the Secretary-General concerning another raid by Israeli planes. They were American planes piloted by Israelis; maybe there were Americans as well; how do I know? But those planes maintain and continue their mission of destruction and genocide.

70. Of course, we are not surprised. Not only are the Zionist racists criminally-minded, but at the head of that group is the most notorious criminal, Begin, someone who took pride, and still takes pride, in his book, *The Revolt*, about the massacre of Deir Yassin. But, naturally, the world seems to forget. At the White House the other night they gave a wonderful show, the Menachem Begin Show, producer Jimmy Carter, and there were other participants. This will not erase that image of the criminal who massacred our children and women 30 years ago.

71. In the Secretary-General's report we do not see a reference to a human aspect: the return of those who inhabited Southern Lebanon before the invasion. We have been told that they have not yet been enabled to return to their homes. This is not surprising. The Security Council, in June 1967, in its resolution 237 (1967), which was one of the consequences of the June 1967 aggression against the Arabs by the racist Zionists, called upon the Government of Israel

“to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations have taken place and to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who have fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities”.

As the Council knows very well, since 1967 those inhabitants have not been enabled to return.

72. What is more tragic is that we note in a document that appeared yesterday, a document which is called “A Framework for Peace in the Middle East Agreed at Camp David”, how they view the return of those Palestinians and others who were thrown out of their homes. They state that a committee made up of Egypt, Israel, Jordan and the so-called self-governing authority which is to be established under the bayonets of the forces of occupation, will decide on the modalities of the admission of persons displaced from the West Bank and Gaza in 1967. But there is something more dangerous there. That is subject to measures which are to be taken to prevent disruption and disorder. Now what does that mean? That is a violation and a complete disregard of resolution 237 (1967). We do sincerely hope that our brothers, both Palestinians and Lebanese, who have lived in the area of operation will be permitted immediately to return to their homes.

73. Another matter that has been brought up here is the financial aspect. The Secretary-General is concerned about this and he is justified. There are financial aspects. Now why should the international community bear that brunt? It is the criminal who has been convicted of his crime that should pay for his crime. And if not only the criminal—if the criminal is such a poor fellow—then the accessory before the fact, during the fact and after the fact should also be responsible for bearing those expenses. Let me make myself clear. It is the Government of the United States that should bear the expense and not the international community.

74. I am content that my colleague, the representative of Lebanon, is satisfied that the duration of UNIFIL has been extended four months. I agree with him that we should not

think of renewing UNIFIL perpetually without achieving an aim. The aim should be the confirmed and effective withdrawal of Israel from Lebanese territory—and not its remaining there by proxy—so that the Lebanese may exercise their authority and sovereignty over their own territory.

75. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I call on the representative of the Soviet Union, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

76. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I had not intended to speak, but since one of the previous speakers has gone somewhat beyond the context of the question we are discussing, I am obliged to make a few brief comments.

77. Unfortunately, the new representative of Israel has repeated the old worn-out gross distortions of the aims of Soviet foreign policy in that part of the world. If Israel were to pursue a policy such as or at least closely along the lines of the policy pursued by the Soviet Union, I am profoundly convinced that there would have been peace in the Middle East long ago. Furthermore, it would have been a durable peace and a peace serving the interests of all peoples in that part of the world.

78. The representative of Israel could be asked many questions, but I shall simply confine myself to the following. Who occupied the Arab territories and who is still in those territories even today—in the territory of Sinai, the Golan Heights and in other places? Who expelled the Palestinians from their homes and turned them into a homeless people—these talented and hard-working people who for many years have been suffering as a result of Israel's actions? Who invaded Lebanon and inflicted new sufferings and privations on that country and its people?

79. Here the representative of Israel expressed regret and spoke about humanitarian purposes. But that is something like the tears which are shed by a crocodile when he is devouring his victim.

80. We can think of other questions to ask as well, but we could hardly expect the representative of Israel actually to reply satisfactorily to such questions.

81. The Soviet Union, as everybody knows, including the representative of Israel, is not seeking any spheres of influence or any possessions. It is not seeking anything of that sort either in the Middle East or in any of the other parts of the world which were referred to by the representative of Israel. Members of the Council also know the proposal that we made for a comprehensive settlement of the problem of the Middle East, including ways and means of ensuring the security of Israel itself. One cannot get away from that. Israel is trying to complicate the comprehensive settlement. Its aim is quite clear. It is trying to poison the atmosphere in the Middle East and prevent a comprehensive settlement. However, I am deeply convinced that such a policy will not succeed. Sooner or later a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East, responding to

the interests of a durable peace and the vital interests of the peoples of that area, will in fact be found. As regards the assistance of the Soviet Union to the national liberation movement, its purpose is also well known. It has one purpose and one purpose only, namely, to help those peoples to achieve independence, freedom and peace. That is a noble purpose and nobody will be able to distort the real facts by false rhetoric, not even the new representative of Israel.

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

83. Mr. BLUM (Israel): As might have been expected, the opponents of peace in the Middle East have done everything possible in this chamber today to escalate verbal tensions with a view to bringing about the disruption of the spirit of peace-making. Israel will not assist these opponents of peace and we therefore refrain from being drawn into futile exchanges with them.

84. The representative of the Soviet Union is understandably unhappy with the exposure of the hypocritical attitude of his country. He must surely know by now that no amount of bullying and invective in this chamber can succeed in intimidating the people of Israel.

85. As for Syria, its intentions are clear enough, and from official statements they appear to be rather broader in scope than those of the PLO. Anyone who does not ignore the facts knows that the challenge to the independence and sovereignty of Lebanon is not something which began just a few months ago, and he knows that it does not come from the Lebanese of the South. The threat to the independence and sovereignty of Lebanon has come time and again from the same direction. In the words of the Syrian Minister for Information, Ahmad Iskandar, "Lebanon will not escape from the destined unity of Syria and Lebanon". The President of Syria himself told the newspaper *Al-Anwar* that "Syria and Lebanon are one single country".

86. Under the transparent guise of an inter-Arab deterrent force, the 30,000 Syrian troops who entered Lebanon during the Lebanese civil war are gradually implementing the old Syrian design for Al Surriya Al-Kubra—Greater Syria. In pursuit of that plan, which would ultimately also embrace Israel and Jordan, Syria is determined to destroy the peace process initiated last November and has openly vowed to do so. If in President Assad's own words "Syria and Jordan are one nation, one homeland, one army", and "Palestine is southern Syria", then Syria clearly has no interest in a genuine peace settlement in the Middle East. Until the present Syrian leadership is disabused of such outdated expansionist notions, and until it agrees to participate in negotiations towards a just and lasting peace in the Middle East based upon secure and recognized boundaries for all parties including Israel and Lebanon, we have no choice but to view Syrian activities in Lebanon with the greatest suspicion and as a grave threat to our own security.

87. There can be no one here who has not been appalled and outraged by Syrian excesses in Beirut and northern Lebanon, in whatever language they have read of them and whatever sources they have at their disposal.

88. Recently, *Newsweek* magazine reported that a full-scale Syrian assault on Christian neighbourhoods in Beirut left hundreds dead, mostly civilians, and resulted in the worst fighting since the civil war ended two years ago:

"On Wednesday night," reported *Newsweek* correspondent Raymond Carroll, "the Syrians pumped an estimated 1,200 shells into the Christian zone, and next morning I risked a trip to one of them—Ashrafiyya. It was quite apparent that the shelling had been indiscriminate. Apartment buildings had huge holes pumped through their sides by direct rocket hits. Hospital corridors were lined with beds bearing wounded people, most of them old men, women and children. Few looked able-bodied enough to be militia men."

The International Committee of the Red Cross, an organ usually most reticent about issuing protests, nevertheless stated that it had "vigorously protested against the use in a densely populated town of weapons causing considerable loss of life among the civilian population". And the Lebanese American League, representing 2.5 million Lebanese in 75 organizations throughout the United States, recently wrote to President Carter in the following words:

"We protest vehemently the savage killing of the innocent and unarmed Lebanese civilian population by the Syrian Army. The mass murder of young men in the Bekaa's Valley this past week, and now the unprovoked and indiscriminate shelling of the densely populated residential areas of Beirut, are again clear proof that the Syrian Army can no longer be considered a peace-keeping force in Lebanon. Whatever may have been President Assad's original intention, he is now engaging in systematic destruction of the Lebanese Christian community in the worst traditions of barbarism. We believe that the integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon will be restored if all Syrian so-called peace-keeping forces and armed Palestinians are put out of Lebanon. Meanwhile an enlarged peace-keeping role should be entrusted to the United Nations forces until a new Lebanese army is formed."

89. Surely the Council cannot turn a blind eye to what it knows, what it must know, are Syria's actions and intentions in Lebanon.

90. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

91. Mr. EL-CHOUFI (Syrian Arab Republic): I really did not want to take any more of your precious time, Mr. President, or the time of this important international body, but the remarks we have heard from the representative of Israel oblige me to make a few remarks.

92. It is strange that the representative of Israel should show such interest in preventing more bloodshed in Lebanon. He could have shown this same interest in other instances, when his armed forces, following invasion, occupied Lebanon, and when his armed forces occupied—as they still do—other Arab territories in Syria, in Jordan and in Egypt.

93. We are all looking for a comprehensive peaceful settlement in the Middle East. We have not changed our position. All the Israeli accusations and distortions cannot

make Syria change its position concerning its willingness for there to be a peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

94. Lebanon has gone through a tragedy, a great tragedy, and it is the responsibility of the world community to help Lebanon to solve this problem. Syria is doing its part. We do hope we are doing it in the best interests of the Lebanese people and the cause of peace in general.

The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.