



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FOURTH YEAR

2148th MEETING: 14 JUNE 1979

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2148)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 30 May 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13356); Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/13384)	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.

2148th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 14 June 1979, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Oleg A. TROYANOVSKY
(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Bangladesh, Bolivia, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Gabon, Jamaica, Kuwait, Nigeria, Norway, Portugal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2148)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 30 May 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13356);

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/13384)

The meeting was called to order at 11.20 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 30 May 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13356);

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/13384)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): In accordance with the decisions taken by the Council at the 2146th and 2147th meetings, I invite the representative of Lebanon to take a place at the Council table and I invite the representatives of Israel, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Syrian Arab Republic to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber. In accordance with a decision taken at the 2146th meeting, I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to take a place at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon) took a place at the Council table, Mr. Blum (Israel), Mr. Kikhia (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) and Mr. El-Choufi (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber and Mr. Abdel Rahman (Palestine Liberation Organization) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Egypt, Iran, Ireland, Jordan and the Netherlands containing requests that they be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with established practice and with the consent of the Council, I propose to invite them to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Elaraby (Egypt), Mr. Shemirani (Iran), Mr. Keating (Ireland), Mr. Shamma (Jordan) and Mr. Scheltema (Netherlands) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

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

4. Mr. ELARABY (Egypt): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to express my delegation's pleasure at seeing you presiding over the deliberations of the Security Council during the month of June. As a permanent member of the Council, the Soviet Union is entrusted with a special responsibility in the maintenance of international peace and security and in ensuring the sovereignty, the political independence and the territorial integrity of every Member State. All Member States look to the Council to uphold legitimate causes such as the quest to be free from foreign occupation and outside intervention, and in general to support just causes. I trust that with your well-known talents and wide diplomatic experience, the Council, under your wise leadership, will be able to take the required action and to carry out its responsibilities as the guardian of a just peace.

5. I wish also to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Vasco Futscher Pereira of Portugal, who very ably guided the work of the Council during the month of May.

6. The Council is once again called upon to deal with a grave situation. In a letter dated 30 May 1979 [S/13356], Mr. Tuéni, the Permanent Representative of Lebanon, requested the convening of an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the rapidly deteriorating situation in Southern Lebanon resulting from Israeli escalation of its attacks and the consequent adverse effect this has on the implementation of Council resolution 425 (1978).

7. When resolution 425 (1978) was deliberately disregarded by Israel, the Council in clear terms de-

plored in resolution 444 (1979) the lack of co-operation on Israel's part. However, the magnitude and continued escalation of the recent Israeli attacks require prompt and effective action by the Council, particularly in the light of the assistance extended by Israel to the illegal forces of Major Haddad to enable him to defy the authority of the Lebanese Government and undermine the mandate and functioning of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL).

8. It is indeed deplorable that Israel opted to ignore the resolutions of the Security Council regarding Lebanon. The intensified Israeli air raids and naval bombardments, as well as the repeated military incursions into Lebanon, have resulted in the killing or maiming of many innocent civilians, including Lebanese and Palestinian women and children. The Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon have been subjected to unwarranted and deliberate bombardment by the Israeli armed forces.

9. Israel attempts to justify its actions in Southern Lebanon on the grounds of safeguarding its security. What we oppose—in fact deplore—is that any country should invoke that argument to justify intensive military action outside its international borders and its interference in the internal affairs of sovereign countries. The self-defence pretexts advanced by the Israeli Government to justify those attacks have no validity whatsoever. The scope of self-defence, in international law, certainly could in no circumstances be stretched and abused to cover the Israeli aggressive acts against Lebanon or to give Israel a free hand to kill innocent civilians.

10. The provisions of Article 51 of the Charter clearly stipulate that a State may have recourse to the inherent right of self-defence only when an armed attack occurs. In point of fact, under the general principles of international law—and this was true well before the Charter ushered in a new international legal order—States are required to observe certain limitations which affect the measure and degree of the use of force. The notion and scope of self-defence were admirably defined and articulated by Daniel Webster, an eminent United States Secretary of State. He coined, in a concise and lucid manner over 150 years ago, what became the widely acknowledged definition of the doctrine of self-defence. Self-defence, according to the former United States Secretary of State, could be invoked only—I repeat: only—when an armed attack was “instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation”.

11. Furthermore, the 1949 Geneva Conventions,¹ as well as the 1977 Additional Protocols² to those Conventions, clearly prohibit attacks on civilian centres like the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon. It is also relevant to recall that article 1, common to the four Geneva Conventions—to which I believe all the members of the Security Council are parties—contains a clear obligation on the parties not only to respect but also to ensure that all other parties shall scrupulously respect their provisions. Thus, the Israeli actions are beyond any legality and clearly violate the basic norms of international law.

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

² A/32/144, annexes I and II.

12. The deteriorating conditions in Southern Lebanon are a source of utmost concern to my Government which has consistently warned against any interference in the internal affairs of Lebanon and called for strict respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Lebanon. Egypt has, moreover, strongly condemned all actions aimed at infringing upon the sovereignty of Lebanon or undermining the full and effective authority and control of the Lebanese Government over all the territory of Lebanon.

13. It is imperative in our view that concrete steps be taken in order to fully implement resolutions 425 (1978) and 444 (1979). The Council should consolidate and strengthen the provisions of those two resolutions and condemn any attempt to obstruct the deployment of UNIFIL over the entire area of operation as envisaged by the United Nations and the Lebanese Government.

14. I should like to seize this opportunity to pay a special tribute to the soldiers, officers and commanders of all United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East. I should like also to emphasize that the Egyptian Government firmly believes that the United Nations is performing a central and indispensable role in the area through its peace-keeping operations. Such a commendable role should indeed be developed and supported by all peace-loving nations. In his report on UNIFIL, the Secretary-General rightly points out that he wishes:

“to emphasize once again the indispensable function which UNIFIL is actually performing in bringing calm to a sorely affected area and in reducing the active threat to international peace and security” [S/13384, para. 4].

15. The Secretary-General recommends in his report the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months. Lebanon, the host country, consents to that extension and my delegation therefore joins in urging the Council to endorse the Secretary-General's recommendation. Notwithstanding obstacles deliberately placed in its way, UNIFIL is admirably discharging its delicate and difficult mandate. The Council should, in the view of my delegation, state in the clearest possible terms that any restriction on the deployment of the Force will not be tolerated. UNIFIL is certainly a tangible manifestation of the United Nations' dedication to the maintenance of peace and security. It should be fully supported in order to enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations in maintaining world peace and to assist countries like Lebanon to safeguard their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

16. The Government of Egypt has condemned the Israeli actions against Lebanon and against the Palestinian refugees in Lebanon and stated that such actions contradict and undermine the efforts to achieve a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East. Indeed, the Egyptian Government has made it abundantly clear that such actions seriously violate international law as well as the spirit of the just and comprehensive peace to which Egypt is committed and which it is earnestly striving to achieve.

17. Egypt firmly believes that if we are to get out of the vicious circle of violence and bloodshed that has plagued our region for over three decades, it is imperative to resolve the Palestinian problem. Sincere endeavours in good faith, particularly on the part of Israel, should be doubled, extended and widened, in order to realize a settlement of the Palestinian problem that will enable the Palestinian people to exercise all their legitimate rights, including their inherent right to self-determination. That is the only valid prescription for attaining a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

18. Mr. LUSAKA (Zambia): Mr. President, it is gratifying for me to be able to congratulate you on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council for this month. We have in you a seasoned diplomat who represents a country with which my own has very friendly relations based on mutual interests and a similar outlook on issues of liberation the world over. We wish you well in the weeks ahead, in view of what promises to be a very crowded schedule during the month of June.

19. Once again the Security Council has to deal with the problem of Lebanon in its many aspects. Zambia is aware that the situation in Southern Lebanon is closely linked with the situation in the rest of Lebanon. In turn, the problem of Lebanon is intrinsically intertwined with the over-all problem of the Middle East. Above all, the whole question of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon is a consequence of the situation to which I have just referred.

20. Lebanon continues to bleed from the fratricidal strife, with no immediate solution in sight. The situation on the ground in that country is very serious. Complexities underlie this condition. Thus simplistic rhetorical solutions cannot be a panacea for the problems.

21. The Security Council, which is the highest organ of the United Nations vested with responsibility for maintaining world peace and security, has a duty to devise solutions to global problems. As it does so, Council members, both individually and collectively, have to endeavour to maintain objective stances in approaching such problems. We all have to rise above parochial interests in the service of peace.

22. In an analysis of the situation, it is vital to maintain a sense of the problem. Not all parties are responsible for the predicament of Lebanon, or for the strife in the south in particular. While some groups are contributing to the solution, others persist in fuelling and brewing problems for the area, which renders any resolution difficult.

23. Until the problem of Lebanon is resolved meaningfully, there is no choice but to retain UNIFIL as an interim force. At this point let me state unequivocally that UNIFIL is indispensable to Lebanon at the present time. This point has been underscored also by the Secretary-General in his report.

24. Successive reports of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL have emphasized its important role. Unfortunately, to date UNIFIL has not been able to implement its mandate in full. UNIFIL is being prevented from

fulfilling its mandate primarily because of the activities of the Israeli authorities. Israel continues to exploit the situation and fish in troubled waters. This policy is part of the activities of the Tel Aviv group to destabilize Lebanon in pursuit of its expansionist designs.

25. It is evident that the so-called *de facto* Lebanese forces under Haddad could not persist in their activities without the active support of Israel. The situation has been worsened by continued Israeli armed invasions of Southern Lebanon, for which there can be no justification whatsoever. Any act of aggression by any country against another constitutes a flagrant violation of international law and the norms of amity among peoples and nations.

26. The members of the Security Council should work tirelessly to ensure that Israel desists from its war of attrition in Lebanon.

27. In conclusion I wish, on behalf of Zambia, to commend the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, for his latest report on UNIFIL, which is, as usual, lucid, objective and comprehensive. We also wish to pay a tribute to the Commander of UNIFIL, Major-General Emmanuel A. Erskine of Ghana, of whom the United Nations as a whole and Africa are proud. Our homage goes also to the men who constitute UNIFIL. Theirs is a difficult task under very trying circumstances. This is exemplified, *inter alia*, by the casualties: four killed and 23 injured as a result of firing incidents between 13 January and 8 June 1979, in addition to the six who were killed and the 15 who were wounded as a result of accidents. The members of the United Nations peace-keeping forces are soldiers of peace with a noble mission on behalf of mankind's existence. The contributing countries also are to be commended highly, and we hope they will continue to honour their pledges.

28. Zambia strongly recommends that the mandate of UNIFIL be renewed for another six months without equivocation. Let this Council send a clear message to all the parties: that it intends to have UNIFIL fulfil its mandate. Any ambivalence on the part of the Council would undermine the vital and necessary role of the United Nations in that troubled region of the Middle East.

29. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): Sir, may I start by congratulating you on your assumption of your position as President of the Security Council for the month of June. It promises to be a busy month, and I suspect that you will be a busy President. May I also say how grateful we were to your predecessor, Ambassador Futscher Pereira of Portugal, for his considerable efforts made last month.

30. The Secretary-General's report makes sombre reading. Although there have been one or two welcome developments, including the dispatch of the Lebanese army battalion to the UNIFIL area of operation and an increase in the numbers of Lebanese civilian administrative personnel in the area, the report generally paints a picture of escalating violence over the period under review. Such activity is scarcely calculated to increase the confidence of the beleaguered citizens of Southern Lebanon, who

have surely suffered enough. It is clear that such stability and normality as they do enjoy is due primarily to the unstinting efforts of the officers and men of UNIFIL. It is for this reason that my Government unhesitatingly accepts the Secretary-General's recommendation that the Force mandate should be renewed for a further six months. I cannot, however, let this occasion pass without some comment on the more disturbing aspects of the Secretary-General's report.

31. As in previous reports, our attention is drawn to a perplexing lack of co-operation from both the *de facto* forces and the Israeli Government with the United Nations Force in its attempt to implement its mandate. Our attention is drawn also to the increased number of incidents involving Palestinian and Lebanese armed elements—armed elements for whose co-operation in the past the Secretary-General has been able to express appreciation.

32. In previous statements on this subject we have warned that such co-operation from the armed elements was clearly fragile and that, unless the *de facto* forces and the Government of Israel adopted a more constructive approach, this co-operation could well be jeopardized. Certain parts of the current report sadly underline how well founded those warnings were.

33. We welcome, of course, the information that the PLO has reaffirmed its commitment not to initiate any action from inside the UNIFIL area of operation and its undertaking not to shell targets of the Israel Defence Forces or the *de facto* targets unless first attacked. Nevertheless, we strongly deplore such incidents as have taken place, and most particularly that which resulted in the tragic death of two soldiers of Fiji in February and was indirectly responsible for the accident in which four of the Norwegian personnel lost their lives.

34. I must also repeat again that my Government strongly deplores terrorist action across the border into Israel. Nothing can justify the violent acts which have resulted in the loss of so much innocent life. And this argument applies with equal force to the retaliatory actions undertaken by the Government of Israel. We particularly deplore the air raids which inevitably lead to the loss of civilian life.

35. I must also record the British Government's dismay at the incursion by elements of the Israel Defence Forces into the Irish sector of the area controlled by UNIFIL early in the month of May. Such action in territory controlled by the United Nations is, I believe, unprecedented. The Force has quite enough problems without such unjustified and unacceptable provocation.

36. Given these views, it follows that my Government is alarmed by the reported Israeli determination to continue its policy of undertaking pre-emptive strikes at what are described as PLO strongholds on Lebanese territory. We cannot see how such action will help to bring about the peace in the area which it is the duty of us all to work towards.

37. We have expressed before in this chamber our belief that the Government of Israel has considerable influence

over the *de facto* forces. We have also said that we believe the Government of Israel should cease supplies to those forces of the military equipment which is currently enabling them to frustrate efforts by UNIFIL fully to implement its mandate. Of the various incidents reported by the Secretary-General involving the *de facto* forces, there are two aspects which provoke particular alarm and, indeed, indignation. First, we are told that there were deliberate attacks against UNIFIL headquarters on two occasions, together with regular harassment of the Force throughout the mandate period. Secondly, we are told that, on various pretexts, villages in the UNIFIL area have come under heavy shelling and serious threat of destruction.

38. This policy has resulted in large numbers of villagers feeling compelled to abandon their homes and property and flee the area. In our view, there can be no possible excuse either for this type of activity or for the failure to co-operate with the peace-keeping force of the United Nations. As the Secretary-General so aptly warned at our last meeting, the continued presence of UNIFIL is not inevitable. We expect the Israel representative's statement at the same meeting of his Government's intention to co-operate with UNIFIL to be translated now into action on the ground.

39. In thanking the Secretary-General for his report I must state our admiration for his determined and devoted efforts, and those of his staff, in the pursuit of the extremely difficult goal which the Security Council has set them. For General Erskine and his officers and men, the task facing them remains one of enormous complexity and physical hardship, coupled with a danger greater than any to have confronted a United Nations force since the Congo operation. Their performance under the most difficult conditions, at times under fire, deserves our highest praise and gratitude. The cost continues to be high, however, and I should here like to pay a tribute to the memory of those members of the Force who have given their lives in the cause of peace in Southern Lebanon.

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

41. Mr. SCHELTEMA (Netherlands): Mr. President, first of all I should like to pay 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 express our appreciation to your predecessor, the representative of Portugal, for the able way in which he conducted the work of the Council last month. I should also like to thank you and the other members of the Council for granting my delegation's request to take part in this debate. This request was prompted by our awareness of the special responsibility my Government carries, since the Netherlands is one of the countries that contribute troops to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, a contribution it is prepared to continue if the Council decides to extend its mandate.

42. My Government has been deeply concerned over the military and political obstacles that have been put and

still are being put in the way of the implementation of the UNIFIL mandate. This has been clearly outlined in successive reports of the Secretary-General, most recently in the report now before the Council.

43. When the Lebanese Government, in full conformity with the aims of the mandate and with the decisions of the Security Council, decided to deploy troops in the southern part of its own territory, the *de facto* forces of Major Haddad reacted violently and actually attacked UNIFIL headquarters. Numerous incidents followed, such as the abduction of three UNIFIL soldiers and the Israeli incursion into the village of Shagra. More recently shellings into the UNIFIL area have seriously endangered the lives of the local population and of UNIFIL personnel. Instead of being allowed to deploy fully in its area, UNIFIL at this moment is under pressure as a result of efforts by the *de facto* forces to expand their area of control.

44. Attacks on and harassment of United Nations peace-keeping forces constitute a challenge to the authority of the Security Council and to that of the United Nations as a whole. The parties concerned, therefore, bear a heavy responsibility. My Government hopes that they will live up to that responsibility and appeals to the Government of Israel to bring its influence to bear upon the *de facto* forces.

45. My Government fully understands Israel's need for security. It deplores and indeed rejects terrorist activities committed in that country. At the same time, we believe that Israel's security will best be served if UNIFIL is allowed to operate fully and unhampered. In this respect, my Government welcomes recent commitments made by the Palestine Liberation Organization such as that for the withdrawal of its armed units from towns and villages in the area. We look forward to the carrying out of those commitments and we trust that they will contribute to greater security in Southern Lebanon.

46. In our view, UNIFIL has so far done everything in its power to prevent the recurrence of fighting and to ensure that its area of operation is not used for hostile activities of any kind. We believe that the Force has so far been successful in carrying out that part of its mandate under sometimes trying circumstances. Indeed, the casualties suffered by the Force sadly bear witness to the dedication of its members. Their restraint, in the face of what often seems to be harassment or provocation, has, in our view, been exemplary.

47. Acts of aggressiveness must now come to an end in order to enable the Force to carry out its task of ensuring peace and security in fulfilment of its mandate. My Government therefore fully shares the view expressed by the Secretary-General in his latest report that UNIFIL cannot continue to function without certain essential conditions being fulfilled.

48. My Government has responded on various occasions to the urgent call for all Member States to bring their influence to bear on those concerned. As a Member of the United Nations, and particularly as a troop-contributing country, the Netherlands seizes this opportunity to renew its earnest appeal to all parties concerned

and particularly to the *de facto* forces, to Israel and to the PLO, to fulfil without delay the conditions set out in paragraph 42 of the Secretary-General's report, thus ensuring the security of UNIFIL, and the implementation of its mandate and of the relevant United Nations resolutions. Only in this way can peace and security in the area be ensured and the suffering of the people of Lebanon alleviated.

49. In conclusion, I should like to thank the Secretary-General and his staff for their untiring efforts. I should also like to pay a tribute to the UNIFIL Commander, his staff and troops for their courage and self-restraint in this most difficult situation. They have our warm sympathy and they deserve our unanimous support.

50. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (*interpretation from French*): It is with special satisfaction, Mr. President, that the French delegation welcomes your accession to the presidency of the Security Council. The quality of the relations and links between our two countries was recently revealed by the visit which the President of the French Republic made to your capital. I wish to assure you of the total co-operation of the French delegation. Your eminent qualities as a diplomat and negotiator will surely lead to the success of our work during the month of June.

51. I should also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, the representative of Portugal, who, with talent, imagination and effectiveness made constant efforts on behalf of peace during the month of May.

52. We are bound to observe that on balance the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon has not so far fulfilled our hopes. It is not the Force itself which bears responsibility for this, as is clear from the report of the Secretary-General. The Force has striven with praiseworthy perseverance and courage to discharge its mission. Nor is the Government of Lebanon to blame. It has for its part undertaken to set up the phased programme of activities suggested to it by the Council, and we are grateful to it. Essentially, the fact that little progress has been made is due to constant defiance of UNIFIL not only by the *de facto* armed forces, which, as we all know, enjoy support from Israel, but also by Israeli forces themselves.

53. The incidents which have thus increased in the course of the past months and already led to our meeting officially on two occasions are particularly serious. They are serious first and above all because once again they have unfortunately led to the loss of human lives, mainly among the civilian population. But also they are serious because, as everyone is aware, in several instances they have taken a form that gives them a political significance warranting grave concern. Indeed, one cannot but wonder about the true nature of the objectives pursued by the various sides, when Christian militiamen deliberately attack the headquarters of the Force at Naqoura, as they did on 29 March and 18 April, or when they carry out acts of intimidation against the population of the area where UNIFIL and the first units of the Lebanese regular army are stationed, or, finally, when there are Israeli attacks against numerous places in Southern Lebanon. On 9 May last, regular Israeli units even crossed the international border and then sought to enter the zone controlled by

the Force. The reasons then given for this incursion cannot justify it. The authorities of France have already indicated several times in the past that, while unambiguously condemning blind violence, they refuse to consider as unavoidable the consequent spiralling repression. They accept it even less in this latest case because these so-called reprisals at one time took on the appearance of a deliberate defiance by a Member State of the authority of the United Nations. We hope that in the near future the Government of Israel will adopt an attitude more in accord with the decisions of the Council and the properly understood interests of peace in the region. For at present everything must be done to enable UNIFIL to pursue its mission and, first and foremost, it is essential that its security be better guaranteed, whether at headquarters, among operational units or logistic components. In this respect my delegation welcomes the measures adopted recently to that effect by the PLO.

54. The alarming nature of this record, which is reflected in the report of the Secretary-General, can escape no one. In the meantime, the Council by meeting on several occasions during the past months has demonstrated that it is aware of the considerable difficulties encountered by UNIFIL and the urgency of improving the situation.

55. It was in order to enhance this awareness that on two occasions in the past we advocated a reduction in the length of the envisaged extension of the mandate of the Force. The authorities of France have not considered it necessary to make such a request again. However, they wish to recall that the life of the Force was conceived of as of limited duration and that it is essential to continue the necessary efforts to restore fully the authority of Lebanon in the region concerned.

56. Having in mind this fundamental objective, my delegation will vote in favour of the proposal of the Secretary-General to renew the mandate of UNIFIL for six months.

57. Before concluding, I wish on behalf of the authorities of France and on my own behalf to pay a tribute to the 10 soldiers who sacrificed their lives in the course of the past five months and to their comrades-in-arms who were wounded. If proof were necessary, this heavy loss would show the devotion of the men of the Force, under the leadership of their officers and their Commander, General Erskine. To all of them as well as to the Secretary-General and his assistants, we express our gratitude.

58. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I thank the representative of France for the kind words he addressed to me. For my part too I should like to speak with satisfaction of the friendly relations existing between my own country and France.

59. Mr. MATHIAS (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, permit me first of all to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency for this month. Your knowledge, skill and experience and your great professional qualities, which are recognized by all, are the best earnest of the effectiveness with which you will surely conduct our proceedings.

60. Although I am sure that Ambassador Vasco Futscher Pereira will have an opportunity to do so personally, I should also like to thank all the previous speakers who have been so generous as to address to my country and to Ambassador Futscher Pereira himself kind words with regard to the way in which Portugal acquitted its duties as President of the Council for May.

61. The Portuguese delegation would like to associate itself with those who have paid a tribute here to the civilian personnel and the soldiers who, under the command of General Erskine, are serving in UNIFIL. The high level of morale and dedication with which they are performing an often difficult task compel both our respect and our admiration. The sacrifice of those who fell for the cause of peace should inspire us to continue our efforts for the same end, namely, that of restoring peace in the region, particularly in the zone of operation of the Force. My delegation pays a tribute to the memory of those who have given their lives and wishes to convey its condolences to their families and their countries. We should also like to pay a tribute to the Governments which have contributed contingents to UNIFIL for the encouraging proof they give of the importance they attach to peace-keeping operations.

62. As members are aware, my delegation, on a Council mission, albeit in another context, recently had occasion to visit several Middle East countries, including Lebanon. This shows how mindful we are of the gravity and difficulties of the situation in which UNIFIL is called upon to carry out its functions, how aware we are of the human dimension of the tragedy which has befallen the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples, so sorely tried by the violence and insecurity of which they are victims, and finally, how strongly we feel that the exile of the Palestinian refugees, whose lives are marked by mourning and deprivation, is intolerable.

63. We shall not hesitate to vote in favour of prolonging the mandate of UNIFIL, in accordance with the wishes of the Government of Lebanon. Also, we share the view of the Secretary-General that, in spite of all difficulties, the presence of UNIFIL is indispensable if we want to avoid the deterioration of a situation which is already so fraught with tension.

64. But we cannot refrain from deploring most vigorously the attitude, which in our eyes nothing can justify, of those who are creating obstacles to the accomplishment of the mandate of the Force. The necessary conditions must be created to permit it to conclude its task successfully, in accordance with resolutions 425 (1978) and 444 (1979), particularly with regard to the restoration of the effective authority of the Lebanese Government in the region, in respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Lebanon.

65. We share the view that the Council can and must also be an instrument for constant but discreet diplomatic action. The efforts that have been undertaken to that end seem to us to deserve our encouragement and should be continued, inasmuch as they represent one way of seeking peace. We do not exclude the possibility, in this context, that it is often not at all easy to narrow differ-

ences, to reduce the drama of the debates and better to highlight shared interests.

66. The objective of peace in the south of Lebanon and the will to achieve it should cause us to spare no effort. We are in favour of all positive initiatives which, without preconceived ideas, could lead to that outcome, because it is our hope in that way to contribute to safeguarding the unity and independence of Lebanon. That country is the victim of a conflict whose dimensions transcend its own frontiers, but the solution of that conflict, while it must necessarily be global, could be furthered by the sectoral reduction of tensions.

67. It is with that in mind that we welcomed the intention recently announced by the PLO and mentioned by the Secretary-General in paragraph 38 of his report—a report which, once again, gives us a very clear and distinct picture of the situation. We believe that the reaffirmation of that position by the PLO is a positive element which we welcome most warmly.

68. Permit me, in conclusion, to repeat to the Secretary-General and his assistants the thanks of my Government for their work towards the full accomplishment of the UNIFIL mandate.

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

70. Mr. SHAMMA (Jordan): Allow me to extend to you, Sir, and to your great nation my delegation's sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I need not dwell on the cordial and friendly relations between Jordan and the Soviet Union, but I am certainly confident that, under your able and wise guidance, the conclusion of the work at hand will be most fruitful and productive.

71. I wish also to express my delegation's esteem and respect to Ambassador Futscher Pereira of Portugal, your predecessor, for his excellent work in so ably conducting the Council's work last month.

72. I must also address the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, and extend to him our heart-felt appreciation and admiration for his selfless and tireless efforts in the service of peace. These efforts are clearly shown in his report on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. One can see in the report the sincerity, courage and dedication of the Secretary-General and all those involved in UNIFIL in trying to serve the cause of establishing peace in Southern Lebanon. But one can also see the forces of evil, namely, those of Israel and its *de facto* forces, working against the cause of establishing peace in that area.

73. Israel and its Zionist values are a phenomenon of evil, cruelty and hatred. In the past 30 years, the forces of Zionism have brought four destructive and miserable wars to our area; they have deprived a whole people, the Palestinian people, of their homeland; and now those same evil Zionist forces are working on the Lebanese

people to deprive them of their livelihood and of the peace that Lebanon once enjoyed and had enjoyed for centuries.

74. To our understanding, UNIFIL was created to combat those evil Zionist forces and restore peace to Lebanon. It is not much to ask, as the report does in paragraph 42, that "certain essential conditions [be] fulfilled" if UNIFIL is to continue its mission of restoring peace to Southern Lebanon. One of those conditions is "a cessation of the harassment of the civilian population and of UNIFIL by the *de facto* forces" and another is "a change in the position of the Israeli authorities". The prerequisites for restoring peace to Lebanon are so simple and so explicit. Will the Israelis heed the Secretary-General's simple conditions for peace? Of course not.

75. Mr. Waldheim sounded extremely pessimistic when he expressed regret that the stalemate had persisted and that UNIFIL continued to encounter difficulties in fulfilling the task assigned to it by the Security Council in resolution 425 (1978). In other words, Israel and its evil Zionist values have led UNIFIL to the end of its third mandate without permitting it to fulfil its assigned mission of restoring peace to Lebanon. My Government shares the concern of the Lebanese Government at this situation which Ambassador Ghassan Tuéni has described as deteriorating rather than improving.

76. It is common knowledge that the occupation by *de facto* forces of portions of Lebanese territory is only a mask for an Israeli presence in Lebanon. That presence is designed to control the headwaters of the Jordan River and portions of the Litani River to ensure that Israel has an ample water supply for its development and progress, not to mention the purpose Ambassador Tuéni spoke of before the Council on 8 December 1978, when he said:

"Israel has in fact achieved one of two things, or probably both: pushed its real border further north into our country [Lebanon] and established through occupation by proxy a shadow client mini-State" [2106th meeting, para. 124].

77. How can we believe the Israeli representative when he says before this Council that all along the State of Israel has been pursuing peace and stability in the area, when we know that that State has expanded by wars into the territories of Jordan, Syria, Egypt and now Lebanon? What kind of peace is the Israeli representative talking about? Is it the peace that we all value as an instrument of respect for other peoples' right to live? Or is it the peace that the Zionists value as an instrument for living by depriving other peoples of their right to live?

78. I happened to listen to the testimony of 22 witnesses from the West Bank of Jordan who appeared before the Security Council Commission established under resolution 446 (1979) which a month ago travelled to my country to investigate the Israeli establishment of settlements in the occupied Arab territories. I am sure that the Commission was moved by the testimonies of those 22 witnesses for they contained factual information about Zionist treatment of West Bank Palestinians. That information was enough to turn anybody's stomach 22 times. The methods used by the Zionists to deprive the Palestinian people in the West Bank of their livelihood exceed

by far the brutality of the methods used by the Nazis against the Jews. I shall not cite those methods, lest I be labelled, as usual, "anti-Semite". I shall leave it to the Commission's report³ to expose the crimes committed by the Zionists against the helpless Palestinians in their homeland. I am sure that it will be a sobering report, a reminder for the Zionist leaders to resort to reason, to behave like other civilized people and, at least, to be human as other people are.

79. However, we know from experience that the Zionist mentality is neither civilized nor human, and that the only way of reaching such a mentality is by an act of the Security Council, by taking firm and effective measures in accordance with the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter, including those of Chapter VII.

80. Israel should be made to realize that peace, security and stability in the Middle East cannot be achieved by aggression, invasion, occupation, the deprivation of people and usurpation of their land and resources. Rather, peace can prevail and security can be maintained only through Israeli respect for other peoples' right to live on their own land in their own homes. The representative of Israel claims to be a professor of international law, which should make him qualified and put him in a good position to advise his Zionist cohorts in Israel that international law provides for the respect for the sovereignty of other States and for their territorial integrity and political independence. I should like to remind the professor that his own concept of international law providing for the occupation of other peoples' land is invalid in civilized international law. Lebanon is recognized by all nations as a sovereign State, and all States Members of this Organization respect its territorial integrity, political independence and national unity. Israel should be brought to do likewise—specifically, to cease its acts of aggression against Lebanon and to cease support and assistance to the *de facto* armed forces so that UNIFIL can fulfil its mandate in bringing peace and tranquillity to the Lebanese people.

81. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Iran. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

82. Mr. SHEMIRANI (Iran): Mr. President, as the Security Council continues its deliberations on sensitive issues relating to the Middle East conflict, it is a source of great comfort and confidence for my delegation to see you with your abundant diplomatic skills and talents presiding over this month's proceedings of the Council. Certainly, your predecessor, the representative of Portugal, by his own skills and abilities greatly facilitated the difficult task of the Council during the month of May, and we are certain that that trend will continue during your term as President of the Council.

83. Given the profound interest of the Islamic Republic of Iran in a just solution of the Middle East problem and the stake it has in such a solution, my delegation has been following with the deepest concern and alarm the recent

events in Southern Lebanon. We therefore appreciate the opportunity once again to address the Security Council on yet another matter dealing directly with the explosive and dangerous situation in the Middle East.

84. Only three months ago, during the Council's debate on the situation in the occupied Arab territories, my delegation, in its first statement before the United Nations [2124th meeting], referred to the over-all Middle East situation and the imperative need for its just solution as a major consideration in the foreign policy of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Therefore, we have seized upon this opportunity with great readiness to express our views and convictions on a matter—namely, the situation in Southern Lebanon—the resolution of which carries great substantive and symbolic value for a comprehensive and just solution of the Middle East problem.

85. The interim report of 19 April 1979 [S/13258] of the Secretary-General concerning the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and his report of 8 June 1979 [S/13384] candidly and objectively capture the facts along with the intricacies of the situation in Lebanon as it exists. If there is one outstanding and indisputable conclusion that emerges from those reports it is that the alarming nature of the situation and the inability of UNIFIL to perform its task free of harassment, intimidation and danger are intertwined. That being the case, a composite assessment of the causes of this potentially volatile situation, based on world-wide press accounts and governmental as well as United Nations reports, invariably reveals the sinister and self-serving role that Israel has chosen to play in this situation. But that revelation should not come as a surprise to anyone, for Israeli intrigue, incursion into and general involvement in the domestic affairs of Lebanon and its violation of its sovereignty have on numerous occasions been the subject of reports and resolutions emanating from the Council.

86. The reports of the Secretary-General concerning UNIFIL to which I referred earlier again document in an updated context such heedless Israeli behaviour. Paragraph 19 of the report of 19 April and paragraphs 32 and 42 of the report of 8 June in particular combine to illustrate clearly the crucial and pivotal role that Israel exercises in regard to the growing tensions both along the Israel-Lebanon border and inside sovereign Lebanese territory. The Security Council for its part, in resolution 444 (1979), has restated its belief that Israeli non-cooperation with UNIFIL efforts fully to implement its mandate, as well as Israeli assistance to irregular armed forces in Southern Lebanon, is deplorable and constitutes a formidable obstacle in the path of international efforts aimed at the reduction of tensions in the area. Such Israeli behaviour has quite accurately and frequently been described by the Council as a form of blatant defiance of its resolutions and in violation of the Charter of the United Nations.

87. Recent events, marked by Israeli invasion of Lebanese territory and the subsequent loss of innocent civilian life and destruction of property caused by those vicious attacks, have served once again to "drive the point home" regarding Israel's expansionist, belligerent and

³ Circulated on 12 July 1979 as document S/13450 and Corr.1.

self-serving motives. The bankruptcy of Israeli attempts at justification and pretexts for such unacceptable infringement on the territorial sovereignty, unity and political independence of a Member State has again been exposed by the facts as they appear.

88. The issue at stake here is a rather basic and fundamental one: whether we, the community of nations, are going to allow the flagrant and continual violation of the national and territorial sovereignty of a fellow Member State. No fabricated or imaginary excuse, pretext, or smoke-screen, whether in the form of "punishment raids" or "peace accords", should distract our attention from that very basic fact. Our failure to deal with this issue resolutely, firmly and in unison will set a dangerous precedent for the conduct of international relations. The risks of such failure are particularly high in a region where conflict, injustice and aggression have for too long been a part of the political landscape.

89. The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has on several occasions and in various forums addressed itself to this point, having strongly condemned Israeli violence and aggression against defenceless and innocent civilians in Southern Lebanon. That being the case, we believe that the Council must by its decisions make it clear that acts of violence and destruction cannot be tolerated in the region, and that such inhumane actions emanating from Zionist expansionism and deliberate Israeli provocations aimed at the destruction of any chance of a just peace or of guaranteeing the rights of the Palestinian People, on which the just resolution of the Middle East conflict ultimately depends, remain intolerable.

90. My delegation wishes to restate its view that any peace not guaranteeing the rights of the Palestinian people, including the right of return, the right to self-determination and the establishment of an independent State in its homeland, is at best tenuous and at worst contains the makings of a broader international conflict. Therefore we believe that any decision regarding issues related to the Middle East question as a whole, such as the one we are discussing here today, must keep constant cognizance of this fact.

91. It is in this understanding, then, that we support efforts by the Council to strengthen and renew the mandate of UNIFIL and to further the general implementation of the phased programme of activities with the aim of securing full implementation of the Council's relevant resolutions on this issue. Such decisions should ultimately lead to the full return of the Lebanese Government's effective authority over all its territory, based on strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. The alternative to this is the further aggravation and complication of an already delicate and dangerous situation and, in the final and over-all analysis, the denial of two universally cherished concepts that form the underpinnings of the Charter—namely, global peace and security and world-wide human dignity based on freedom, equality and justice.

92. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): 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 a statement.

93. Mr. EL-CHOUFI (Syrian Arab Republic): Mr. President, first of all I feel that I owe you, as the representative of the Soviet Union, special and untraditional congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. The selfless friendship between the Soviet Union and my country already forms part of our national pride. We in Syria appreciate the role the Soviet Union has played in helping us to defeat the aggressor, to strengthen our independence and to regain our occupied territories. It is not incidental that the Soviet Union takes the side of the oppressed against the oppressor. After all, your country was the site of the great October Revolution, the first revolution ever in human history to place State authority in the hands of the working people. Allow me to convey, through you, our utmost appreciation to the great people of the Soviet Union.

94. I should also like to express my appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Futscher Pereira of Portugal, for his able handling of the Council's deliberations last month.

95. The question facing the Council has been a source of much dismay and distress for all of us, and rightly so. The sufferings and misery that have been borne by the Lebanese people under continued Israeli intrusions and violations of Lebanese sovereignty cannot escape anyone's humanitarian and peace-loving concern. It was in this spirit that the Council mandated the formation of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon in order to assist the Lebanese Government in restoring peace, tranquillity and normality in its besieged country. Along those same lines, resolution 444 (1979) called for the drawing up of the phased programme of activities to promote the restoration of Lebanese authority in Southern Lebanon.

96. At the last meeting of the Council in May, the President said:

"I should like, before I relinquish my presidency, to address an appeal to all parties, which I hope will be heeded, to respect the cease-fire in accordance, *inter alia*, with the Armistice Agreement, to refrain from all acts of violence to help UNIFIL to carry out the mission entrusted to it by the Security Council in resolution 425 (1978)" [2146th meeting, para. 74].

97. After that solemn appeal, what exactly has transpired to make the convening of the present meetings of the Security Council imperative? Did the Zionist entity of Israel desist from or mitigate its acts of aggression against Lebanon? Have the Israeli aggressors shown any indication so far that they will ever respect the authority of this august body?

98. For its part, the Palestine Liberation Organization has declared its willingness to help UNIFIL to carry out its mandate, as the Secretary-General has recognized in his report in which he states that:

"The PLO leadership have recently reaffirmed their commitment not to initiate any action from inside the

UNIFIL area of operation and have stated that they will not shell IDF or *de facto* forces targets from Lebanese territory unless they are attacked first. It is also relevant to mention a recent joint communiqué issued by the PLO and the allied Lebanese parties within the context of discussions on the situation in Southern Lebanon according to which 'all armed forces will be evacuated from villages and towns' and 'the PLO will remove all of its offices from the city of Tyre.'" [S/13384, para. 38.]

99. I think that all the members of the Council have carefully read the report, which has provided us with an even-handed and realistic description of the situation. In all fairness, one cannot but conclude that the expansionist authorities of Zionist Israel are still persisting in their arrogant defiance of the authority of the Council and in perpetuating their expansionist schemes against Lebanon. To give just one example, I should like to remind Council members of the moving appeal made by the representatives of Lebanon before this august body on 31 May. He said:

"One war in the South, if allowed to develop, will inevitably lead to another, and Lebanon will then become again the arena it has been for almost five years now, unable to rebuild its national institutions and recover the unique position it occupied in the Arab world, and the world at large, in politics, and beyond in the broad realm of human achievements." [2146th meeting, para. 31.]

He concluded his statement by saying:

"So let us see to it together that the Council's debate shall lead to a resolution that will express both our concern for peace-keeping and the confidence and faith of the soldiers of peace who chose to imperil their lives waging peace, not war." [Ibid., para. 35.]

100. At the very same meeting, the representative of expansionist Israel had merely this to say:

"the Government of Israel has the right and, indeed, the duty to take all the measures necessary to protect the lives and safety of its citizens" [Ibid., para. 50].

And he went on to describe this as the "right" of the Israelis to strike wherever they wish and to kill whomever they wish under the pretext of "security".

101. The Israeli authorities, from the terrorist Begin down, do not hesitate to defend State terrorism. This is indeed reminiscent of the Nazist ideology, under which Hitler gave himself the right to expand, to terrorize others in order to satisfy his imperialist schemes. Like Hitler, the Israelis advocate the ideology of the "chosen people", which is another version of Hitler's ideology of "German supremacy"—and both of these served as pretexts for colonial expansion even at the cost of annihilating another people.

102. I realize that we are here to deal with practical and not ideological questions and, reserving further comments on the rotten ideology of zionism, I shall try to confine my remarks to the very practical side of the problem facing us today.

103. A year ago, the Secretary-General, in his interim report of 13 June 1978, [S/12620/Add.5]—like all his other subsequent reports, as well as several statements made by his subordinates—pointed out that the PLO has always been co-operative with UNIFIL and has been honest in helping UNIFIL to discharge its mandate.

104. It goes without saying that the Lebanese Government has also done everything within its power to the same end. At the same time, we cannot fail to note that Israeli occupation by proxy continues up till this very moment. We cannot fail to observe that the Israelis' defiance of the Security Council is still as strong as ever. In fact, the Secretary-General, in his latest report, states that:

"UNIFIL has recorded a total of 291 such border violations during the period under review. The most serious border violation occurred on 9 May when a sizeable unit of the Israeli Defence Forces (IDF) entered into the UNIFIL area of operation manned by the Irish battalion in the vicinity of Shaqra." [S/13384, para.28.]

105. I cannot but endorse the important conclusion of the Secretary-General in the same report that a change in the position of the Israeli authorities is yet another prerequisite for significant progress. But, of course, I for one believe that unless the Security Council rises up to its responsibility and resorts to other actions which it is empowered to take in accordance with the Charter and in the interest of international peace and order, there will never be any change in the position of the present Israeli leadership.

106. We fear that if there were a change in the Israeli position, it would indeed be for the worse. Encouraged by its separate peace treaty with Egypt, Israel would indeed increase its aggressiveness and arrogance and its defiance of the authority of the Council. Israel in fact has not failed to reveal its particular concept of what its leaders shamelessly call a "peace settlement": at the same time that they claim their adherence to the principle of peaceful settlement, they intensify their acts of provocation in the West Bank, the Golan Heights, Southern Lebanon and elsewhere.

107. It is relevant to quote the following excerpt from an article in *The New York Times* of this morning reporting on a debate in the Knesset over the latest settlement near Nablus:

"Mr. Sharon"—the Israeli Minister of Agriculture— "defended the establishment of Elon Moreh on a hill near Nablus and the confiscation of privately owned Arab land nearby as moves that would guarantee the security of the West Bank's main north-south road.

"... he said the site had actually been designated for Jewish settlement in November 1967, several months after the war, by the ministerial security committee of a Government led by the Labour Party."

"He said that years before the 1967 war"—I repeat: "years before the 1967 war"—"the Israeli military had

planned to seize the area because of its strategic importance.

"Mr. Sharon said critics who said settlements in the occupied areas were endangering peace did not understand that the issue was part of the struggle against the establishment of a Palestinian State.

" 'Accordingly', he said, 'Israel will go ahead with its settlement programme. No fifth column will prevent it, and no band of hypocrites will succeed in undermining true Zionism.' "

108. Apparently the Zionists' understanding of peace is unique: they want to annihilate the Palestinian Arab people, subjugate all the Arab lands to their colonialist schemes and deceive the world at large by still claiming their "adherence" to peace. It is clear that, to be achievable, peace in the Middle East must be just and comprehensive.

109. I cannot but reiterate that we in the Middle East and the Member States of the United Nations at large, and especially this august body, cannot depend on the "good intentions" of the Zionists. I further believe that deep in our hearts we are aware that the aggressor will never voluntarily withdraw from its aims and intentions; it will have to be compelled to do so.

110. History bears out that truth. That is why we wish to make an earnest appeal to the Security Council to deal with this arrogant aggressor—Israel—as it deserves. We know that because of the steady position taken so far by one permanent member of the Council—the United States—the Council will be barred from taking the appropriate measures against expansionist Israel under Chapter VII of the Charter. But we think that there are two feasible actions that must be adopted, and we hope that the United States will not go on using the same damaging tactic which it always has used—that is, blindly supporting the aggressor—because the stakes in Southern Lebanon are too high to be compromised. I am tempted to say that the failure by the Council to help in putting an end to the tragedy going on in Southern Lebanon would result in a still bigger tragedy that might go beyond Lebanon and the Middle East.

111. I subscribe to the contention of the Secretary-General and other fair-minded authorities that the situation in Southern Lebanon is internally linked to the over-all Middle East problem and that, therefore, the final solution in Lebanon truly lies in the solution of the core of the Middle East problem, that is, in a just and lasting settlement of the Palestinian question, a settlement which would fulfil their right to self-determination in their own homeland and the thoroughgoing rectification of the historical injustice committed against the Palestinian people. However, I believe that it is the duty of the Council to spare Lebanon more suffering and more bloodshed and to spare us all more abuse and arrogance from the Zionists. That is to say, that the Council, in our view, is indeed in a position to deal with the situation in Southern Lebanon independently and separately from its efforts to reach a comprehensive, just and durable peace in the Middle East. In that context, my Government believes that the Council can and, if you allow me to say

so, must resort to the following two feasible actions. First, it is imperative that the mandate of UNIFIL be redefined in order to enable the Force to carry out that mandate. Being a United Nations peace-keeping force, UNIFIL must have adequate military credibility to enable it to carry out its mandate. In many of its resolutions the Council has referred to the possibility of resorting to "other measures". I think that it is high time that the Council told the world what those "other measures" may be. That is why we think that UNIFIL should be empowered at least to defend itself when it is attacked either by the Israeli army and/or their henchmen, the so-called irregular forces of Major Saad Haddad. Secondly, we completely agree with the Lebanese proposal that it is necessary to reactivate the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission. We believe that there must be neutral, credible and reliable observers to inform the Council who, between Lebanon and Israel, really is violating the cease-fire agreement and who between them is violating whose borders.

112. In conclusion I should like to remind the Israelis that *The Christian Science Monitor* stated in an editorial on 5 June that the Israelis have some serious thinking to do on their Government's illegal settlements in the West Bank, Gaza, the Golan Heights and elsewhere. But they have more serious thinking to do concerning their very existence in the Middle East. Policies advocated by the terrorist Mr. Begin and his like cannot secure their future. Their Government's arrogance in Southern Lebanon and elsewhere can never pave the way to a peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

113. We in Syria and in the Arab world earnestly hope that conscious awareness of the real interests of the great majority in Israel will triumph over policies of expansionism, terrorism and anachronistic imperialist ambitions. We are confident that truth and justice will triumph over the terrorist Begin and his like.

114. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I thank the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic for his kind words about my country and me personally. For my part, I too would like to express my satisfaction regarding the friendly relations existing between Syria and the Soviet Union.

115. The representative of Israel has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

116. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The Jordanian representative came here today to exploit this debate and professed to express concern about the situation in Lebanon. How quickly memories fade! When the terrorist PLO threatened to do to his country what it is now doing to Lebanon, Jordan had no hesitation in removing that threat in the most brutal way possible. Has the Jordanian representative forgotten the so-called Black September of 1970 when Jordanian tanks and artillery massacred thousands of Palestinian Arabs and expelled the PLO from Jordanian territory? Has he forgotten Yasser Arafat's statement to journalists at Beirut on 24 October 1970 that the fighting between his followers and Jordanian troops "claimed about 20,000 victims, dead or wounded"? Has the Jordanian representative forgotten that PLO

members fled to Israel in 1970 to escape his Government's repression? Now he comes to the Security Council to shed crocodile tears over Lebanon's fate because that unfortunate country has been less successful than his own in destroying the terrorists. Let me also refer the Jordanian representative to the statement by his monarch to the senior editor of *Newsweek*, Arnaud de Borchgrave, at the height of the Lebanese civil war in 1976. King Hussein told *Newsweek* that, as a result of its activities in Lebanon,

"the PLO has weakened, perhaps irreparably, its argument that Jews, Moslems and Christians could live in harmony, side by side, in a future greater Palestine".

117. Syria, with its army of occupation still on Lebanese soil, is hardly more qualified to comment on Lebanon's sovereignty and independence. The memory of the Syrian representative appears to be shorter still than that of his Jordanian colleague. When his country's armed forces illegally intervened in the Lebanese war, they ruthlessly killed thousands of Palestinian Arabs, prompting PLO terror attacks against targets in the heart of Syria. After PLO terrorists, who had attacked the Semiramis Hotel at Damascus, were publicly hanged in a Damascus square in September 1976, Syrian President Hafez Al-Assad stated:

"The only thing these PLO leaders wanted was to attack Syria... We condemn this act of terror committed by a gang of traitors and criminals."

His Defence Minister, General Mustafa Tlass accused the PLO of planning "the massacre of Lebanon". Writing in the official Syrian army newspaper *Tishrin* on 10 September 1976, General Tlass remarked that the PLO "arouse nothing but disgust among all honest Arab citizens".

118. But if Syria's own actions against the PLO are not sufficient reason for it to stay out of this debate, then its

own barbarities against the Lebanese population certainly are. Less than a year ago the world was appalled and outraged as Syrian forces indiscriminately shelled and populated civilian areas of Beirut itself. Syrian artillery relentlessly shelled the city, killing hundreds of innocent men, women and children and turning half a million more into refugees. With that record, the Syrian representative should have the good grace to abstain from further comment on the Lebanese situation while his own country's occupying forces remain on Lebanese soil.

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

120. Mr. EL-CHOUFI (Syrian Arab Republic): We are all already used to the diversionary tactics of the representative of Israel who always tries to shift the discussion from the subject under consideration to other matters. As concerns the Syrian presence in Lebanon I should like, just for the record, to state that the fact of the matter is that the Syrian force is part of the Arab deterrent force and is under the direct command of the Lebanese Government. Because of Syria's long and close historical ties with Lebanon, it responded to the latter's call for assistance in bolstering its presence and authority in the south where it has been and continues to be besieged by continual Israeli aggression.

121. The Syrian force is more than ready to leave Lebanon the moment the Lebanese Government indicates its desire to terminate the mission of the Arab deterrent force. If Israel stops its aggression against Lebanese territory and stops instigating armed provocations in the south by ending its criminal support of the renegade Major Haddad, then there will be no cause for the Arab deterrent force to remain there.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在世界各地书店和经销处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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