



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FOURTH YEAR

2164th MEETING: 29 AUGUST 1979

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2164)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letters dated 24 August 1979 and 28 August 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13516 and S/13520)	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.

2164th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 29 August 1979, at 11.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Andrew YOUNG (United States of America).

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/2164)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the Middle East:
Letters dated 24 August 1979 and 28 August 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13516 and S/13520)

The meeting was called to order at 11.50 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

Letters dated 24 August 1979 and 28 August 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13516 and S/13520)

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

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

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 29 August 1979 from the representative of Kuwait [S/13521], which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request that the Security Council extend an invitation to the representative of the Pales-

tine Liberation Organization to participate in the Security Council's consideration of the item 'The situation in the Middle East', in accordance with the Council's past practice."

3. This practice of the Council has been followed since December 1975. It is understood that the proposal by the representative of Kuwait is not made pursuant to rule 37 or rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, but, if approved by the Council, the invitation to participate in the debate would confer on the Palestine Liberation Organization the same rights of participation as those conferred on a Member State when it was invited to participate under rule 37.

4. Does any member of the Council wish to speak on this proposal? Since no other member of the Council wishes to speak, I shall speak in my capacity as representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

5. The United States does not agree with the special procedure by which the Security Council hears the representatives of the Palestine Liberation Organization. As we see it, the issue is not whether or not to hear the Palestine Liberation Organization but the manner in which the invitation is formulated in terms of the rules of procedure. We request that this matter be put to a vote.

6. I now resume my functions as PRESIDENT of the Council.

7. If no other members of the Council wish to speak, I shall take it that the Council is ready to vote on the proposal of Kuwait.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

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

Against: United States of America

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

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

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Abdel Rahman (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the side of the Council chamber.

8. The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw attention to the following documents, which contain letters received from the representative of Lebanon and the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Lebanon: a letter dated 6 August 1979 [S/13486]; a letter dated 24 August [S/13516]; a letter addressed to the Secretary-General dated 28 August 1979 [S/13519]; and a letter dated 28 August 1979 [S/13520].

9. At the outset I should like to convey to members the information I have received from the Secretariat on the situation in Southern Lebanon. It will be recalled that at the close of our last meeting, on 24 August, I made the following statement as President of the Security Council:

"Before adjourning the meeting I wish to draw the attention of the Council to the many reports we have received of intense military activity over recent days in Southern Lebanon. I am informed that the Commander of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) has been instructed to make every effort to arrange an immediate cease-fire in the area.

"The members of the Council will recall the Secretary-General's own recent appeal for restraint on the part of all the parties. In my capacity as President of the Council, I appeal for restraint on the part of all concerned so that these hostilities may be brought to an end." [2163rd meeting, paras. 188 and 189.]

10. Early on Saturday morning, the Commander of UNIFIL requested the parties to agree to a cease-fire, to be effective not later than 1200 hours (local time). The parties refused to give their formal agreement to a cease-fire, but all of them undertook to desist from firing unless they were fired upon. Thus a *de facto* cease-fire was established, and by 0930 hours (local time) all firing ceased in Southern Lebanon. However, the lull lasted for only seven hours, and at approximately 1600 hours (local time) the firing broke out again. It continued until the early hours of Sunday morning.

11. The Commander of UNIFIL called for a new cease-fire, to be effective at 0400 hours (local time) on Sunday. The Palestine Liberation Organization agreed to that request; the Israel Defence Forces took the position that they were not involved in the cease-fire, but they undertook not to initiate firing unless they were fired upon. The *de facto* forces did not respond to the Force Commander's request, but by 2030 hours (local time) they had stopped firing. Since that time the situation has been generally quiet except for some minor outbreaks of firing.

12. The representative of Zambia has inquired about the casualties suffered by UNIFIL during the recent events. The following information is based on reports received from UNIFIL. On 14 August, a Nigerian patrol was ambushed by armed elements, after a Nigerian unit had stopped and turned back infiltrators. Five Nigerians were wounded. On 21 August, during a heavy exchange of fire between armed elements in the Château de Beaufort area and the *de facto* forces in the Marjayoun area, a shell from the armed element side fell and exploded near a Nepalese battalion position, probably by accident. Three Nepalese soldiers were

wounded. On 22 August, following fire by armed elements at a Fijian battalion position, which had been reinforced by Dutch troops, three Dutch soldiers and one Fijian soldier were wounded. In a later incident involving armed elements and the Fijian position, a Fijian soldier fired in self-defence and wounded a member of the armed elements believed to be from the National Movement. It was reported that this man later died at the hospital. On 24 August, two Fijian patrol vehicles were ambushed by armed elements. Three Fijian soldiers were killed and two wounded. UNIFIL is at present carrying out an investigation to establish the identity of the armed elements involved. The PLO for its part has disclaimed all responsibility for this incident and informed UNIFIL that it has established a committee to inquire into the incident.

13. That concludes our report from the Secretariat. If there are no questions about the report, I shall call on the first speaker inscribed on my list, the representative of Lebanon.

14. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): Mr. President, there undoubtedly is an element of providence in your return to the presidency of the Security Council after the meeting of Friday, 24 August.

15. In this chamber, where history has been made more often than is commonly believed, sensed or admitted, rarely if ever had a man brought the cold realities of international politics so near to the heart, forcing his simple words deep into the conscience of the nations of the world. Suddenly, the attitude of one person in one short moment of human anguish became—almost biblically, if I may so put it—so much more dramatic and poignant than the issue of war and peace which had been debated for endless hours.

16. But the epilogue had yet to come. For what else but the fate of the innocent of this world could bring you back? Strange indeed are the ways of Providence. Less than two years ago you were pleading in this very chamber for peace in my country. Resolution 425 (1978) will forever be remembered as the Andrew Young resolution, and great were our hopes the day it was adopted. Now we turn to you again—almost in an anticlimax—in what may well be a last desperate effort to salvage not only peace but also the peacemakers.

17. People are still dying in my country every day of every month since March 1978—civilians, young and old, men and women, children and even babies, whose only crime is that they were born there with nowhere else to go and nothing else to live with and for but their sacred mother earth, their land, their homes, their love and their destiny. With us are dying also soldiers of peace, the men of goodwill who have come from far-away countries motivated, as never before, not by hatred but by love and the belief you yourself, Mr. President, have preached: faith in the international rule of law and order.

18. Hence this your new rendezvous with history, this strange encounter between you and your other self—the diplomat and his creation, a romantic representative of a super-Power and an army which he prompted us to create as a projection of our common idealism. And what does this army confront today? A cynical, almost insane logic of

crime and terror best exemplified by Prime Minister Begin, who as recently as yesterday was expressing his "deep grief and sorrow" at the loss of innocent Lebanese lives but also adding that this was the inevitable consequence of his pre-emptive strategy against the Palestinians which "saved the lives of many Israeli citizens". In other, more simple words, the Lebanese are doomed to be killed because Mr. Begin wants to go on killing Palestinians before they in turn kill every Israeli citizen.

19. And we are to be content with Mr. Begin's expressions of "deep grief and sorrow". We are expected to die in silence, almost in peace, to see our churches and convents destroyed, our schools, cities and villages ravaged and the whole fabric of our society totally disrupted simply because we have been chosen by others as the arena of their wars and their revolutions as well.

20. We now have a cease-fire. We have heard your report, Mr. President, and we are content. For five days we have been counting our victims, burying the dead and trying to reverse the exodus of those driven away by fear from nowhere to nowhere else.

21. So I am here today not to accuse and judge but to defend. I am here to defend the right of a people to live, the sanctity of a land and the validity of international peace keeping. Ten UNIFIL soldiers have been killed in 10 days; over 100 Lebanese civilians are dead in less than a week; there are 270,000 homeless Lebanese—10 per cent of our population—wandering about in the desolate ruins of their own homeland; a peace-keeping force that might become no more than a thin demarcation line between the war and the "anti-war"—all this is more than we can take and more than the world should tolerate. To allow this situation to continue would mean that there is indeed a grand conspiracy designed to destroy the one country in the Middle East that has refused to share in the destruction of others.

22. I should like now to make some very simple practical points. The first imperative before this Council and before the whole world is a cessation of hostilities, that Southern Lebanon should, as we have repeatedly asked, be a zone of peace. To achieve this we must fully and unconditionally implement, in the face of each and all, resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978), 427 (1978), 434 (1978), 444 (1979) and 450 (1979), not to mention all the statements on the subject made by presidents of the Council.

23. Not being keen on collecting resolutions, we are not at this stage asking for another. If we were asking for one, the only possible and logical resolution would be one which, by resorting to Chapter VII of the Charter, would force Israel to cease its defiance of the world community represented in the Council.

24. At this stage we would be content with a serious and profound reconsideration of the peace-keeping operation, where so much is at stake.

25. In my memorandum to the Secretary-General [S/13519], I have raised a number of points that I should like to take up briefly here before the Council. What are the objectives that we are seeking? We should like UNIFIL to

enjoy the prerogatives that are concurrent with its responsibility. We want, first, to see the safety and integrity of UNIFIL, of its headquarters and of its freedom to operate ensured. Secondly, we want to see UNIFIL provided with the necessary instruments to enable it to perform its operation and to fulfil its mandate. Thirdly, we should like to see UNIFIL supported with the necessary infrastructural means, not excluding additional personnel. Fourthly, we should like to see the area of operation of UNIFIL and its methods of deployment and movement redefined in the light of developments on the terrain since resolution 426 (1978) was adopted, and the number of observers increased so that the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization could report, with unimpeachable impartiality, when and where violations took place with regard to the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Lebanon.¹ We have asked for this in a private letter to the Secretary-General of 15 June, and we should like this matter to be taken up with the utmost celerity. Finally, we should like to see the reactivation of the Israeli-Lebanese Mixed Armistice Commission, in accordance with resolution 450 (1979), by invitation of the Secretary-General or of his military representatives; this Commission should be enabled to determine how it will establish a mechanism for peace in Southern Lebanon.

26. It is difficult, of course, to predict what the situation in Southern Lebanon may bear for the future. However, I should like to say the following. We think, as the Secretary-General has stated in more than one instance in his reports, that the situation in Southern Lebanon is indeed directly and organically linked to the situation in the rest of Lebanon, and in this context we should like to repeat what we have often said here.

27. First, we believe that, once a determined and militarily more credible UNIFIL is established in Southern Lebanon, more articulate and constructive efforts can be undertaken by the Government of Lebanon, in conjunction with UNIFIL, to make the area of operation, and thereby all of Southern Lebanon, a zone of peace, restoring international security and establishing a climate conducive to national reconstruction.

28. The Lebanese authorities here solemnly pledge that they are prepared fully to share military as well as civilian responsibilities under the operational command of UNIFIL or in conjunction with it in Southern Lebanon. Lebanon hopes to be able then to resume its role as a factor for stability and peace in the area instead of being a source of anxiety to all and a danger to itself and to international peace and security.

29. Secondly, we know that whatever happens in the area of operation of UNIFIL will have a direct bearing on the whole of Southern Lebanon. This in turn will complement and confirm efforts engaged in elsewhere all over the country. It will give my Government added leverage and credibility in implementing, through strict Lebanese imperatives, such security schemes as have been blocked by the continued deterioration of the situation in the south. The restoration of Lebanese social and national unity is and will be the only road and best chance for reintegrating those who

¹ *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 4.*

have for too long been lured into seeking security outside the fabric of Lebanon's historic body politic.

30. Thirdly, such objectives, both the immediate and the ultimate, obviously cannot be obtained without the confirmed total withdrawal of Israel as stipulated in resolution 425 (1978). Whereas such withdrawal had been declared by Israel on 13 June 1978, successive reports of the Secretary-General have on the contrary proved that Israeli military personnel were still active inside Lebanon and that they exercised a determining influence in the border area. The Security Council has more than once described this fact as constituting defiance of its resolutions and a violation of the Charter of the United Nations.

31. I should like to conclude by expressing, through this Council, an appeal to each and all. For too long now, my country, Lebanon, has been a martyred country, a casualty both of war and of peace. This should now be brought to an end, and only forceful action by the Council can achieve this. The Speaker of the House said yesterday that the United Nations in Lebanon was, in the beginning, a dream: it has now become a mirage. I should like to say that we never wanted the United Nations to be either in Lebanon. We do not want it to be a dream and we do not think it should be allowed to become a mirage. We want it to be a living and forceful reality. Let us all work to make it so.

32. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (*interpretation from French*): The events of recent weeks in Southern Lebanon, in particular in the area of operation of UNIFIL, are such as to arouse the deepest concern. Not only have members of the Force been killed or wounded—and here I should like to pay a particular tribute to the three Fijian soldiers who died last Friday and to express our sorrowful condolences to the Government of Fiji—but, what is more, civilian populations in increasing numbers are constantly threatened, driven to forced exile in their own country, or have become the victims of mindless bombings. The resumption of these acts of violence leads us to wonder about the purposes pursued by their authors. Is this a way to respond to the many gestures of goodwill made by our Organization to enable the inhabitants of Southern Lebanon to live in peace and stability?

33. It cannot be admitted that these intemperate acts perpetrated by the armed elements as well as by the *de facto* armed elements and the Israeli armed forces should continue indefinitely. Certainly, there has been a cease-fire, but at what a cost, and we know how fragile it remains.

34. Given this situation, as the French Council of Ministers in Paris emphasized today, my country "firmly condemns all acts of violence committed against Lebanon, its citizens and institutions, as well as against populations to which this country has granted asylum". It "reaffirms its support for the negotiations and actions within the framework of the United Nations, and, in particular, by UNIFIL", whose conduct is exemplary. It "reaffirms its devotion to the unity, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon, which knows that it can count on its support, co-operation and friendship".

35. Our Organization can no longer tolerate the questioning of the credibility of UNIFIL without seeing undermined

the authority of the Security Council, which, in its resolutions 425 (1978), 434 (1978), 444 (1979) and 450 (1979), gave a clearly defined mandate to UNIFIL.

36. Accordingly, my delegation attaches the greatest interest to the suggestions presented, within the framework of this mandate, by the representative of Lebanon, so as to strengthen the effectiveness of the Force. We believe, in particular, that it is necessary that the security of UNIFIL and its headquarters be better assured. Likewise, we deem it indispensable that the freedom of action and movement of the United Nations troops be guaranteed. We are also in favour of a study on means of improving their defensive equipment and logistical capability.

37. The delegation of France further considers that an increase in the number of United Nations observer posts along the southern border of Lebanon, as well as the reactivation of the Israeli-Lebanese Mixed Armistice Commission, would have significant advantages in the present situation.

38. The time has come for us to return to reason. In this spirit, my Government renews the appeal that appears in resolution 450 (1979) for Israel to cease its incursions into Lebanon and the assistance it continues to lend to irresponsible armed groups, and appeals to all parties concerned to refrain from activities inconsistent with the objectives of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. Calm must return to Southern Lebanon, where the authority of the Beirut Government must be restored.

39. France, for its part, will support all efforts made towards the restoration of peace. Given the gravity of the situation created on the spot, we deem it justifiable that the Security Council continue to be seized of this matter and to follow it with special attention.

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

41. Mr. BLUM (Israel): On behalf of the Government and people of Israel, I should like to express at the outset our deep sympathy to the families of the three Fijian soldiers members of UNIFIL who lost their lives and the two others who were wounded in the Tyre area on 24 August. Again, the terrorist PLO was responsible for these casualties among those acting in the service of international peace and security. The Government of Israel finds it incomprehensible that in the statement made in the name of the Secretary-General on 25 August with regard to this tragic incident, no mention was made of the identity of those responsible for this crime. The sad fact is that, of the 30 fatalities of UNIFIL to date, the great majority have been killed directly or indirectly by PLO terrorists.

42. The Security Council has been summoned today for the tenth time since the establishment of UNIFIL in March of last year, ostensibly to discuss the problems of Lebanon. However, the true object of the exercise lies elsewhere. It is to find a scapegoat for Lebanon's fundamental problems and a way to avoid facing up to them directly.

43. This, sadly, has been Lebanon's approach for the last decade and more. For example, as early as December 1968, Mr. Fouad Boutros, Foreign Minister of Lebanon, claimed in this Council that "Lebanon shelters no commando organizations" [1461st meeting, para. 161]. This was a bare-faced lie, and when the President of Lebanon, Mr. Hélou, was pressed about it, he later admitted to Lebanese parliamentarians that the claim was made in this Council "in order to secure Israel's condemnation". This was reported in the Beirut newspaper *Al-Hayat* of 1 July 1969.

44. This mendacious approach, and the psychological problems it reflects, continue to find expression in Lebanon's recent calls for the reactivation of the Israeli-Lebanese Mixed Armistice Commission, when it was Lebanon, at the time of the Six Day War of 1967, which by its declarations and actions made it clear that it considered that the General Armistice Agreement¹ had come to an end. The essence of the Armistice Agreement was a commitment to put an end to all hostilities and acts of aggression between Israel and Lebanon. This is summed up in article III which, *inter alia*, prohibited terrorists from operating on or from the territories of both parties.

45. Had Lebanon been prepared to face its problems honestly and had it fulfilled its international commitments, Lebanon may not have come to the sorry pass it has reached today. One could go further and suggest that the need for UNIFIL could have been avoided and all the debates we have had in recent months obviated.

46. What then is the reality in Lebanon today? Permit me to demonstrate this reality with the map of Lebanon to which I invite your attention. Lebanon is an occupied country. It is occupied by two foreign elements. The first is Syria, marked in red on this map, which has deployed 30,000 troops throughout the bulk of that country, as is clearly evidenced on the map. The second is the terrorist PLO, which has some 10,000 to 15,000 armed criminals in Lebanon, and the zone of influence of the PLO is marked in brown. The area in dark green is controlled by Lebanese Christians.

47. As is clear from the map, Syria dominates Lebanon and controls its Government, whose writ scarcely runs beyond Beirut, if that. This stark truth is known to the whole world and cannot be hidden any longer. In the name of "peace", Syria fuelled a civil war that led to the destruction of Beirut, to 60,000 Lebanese dead and almost 1 million refugees. Now, by comparison, I draw your attention to the fact of how small are the southern areas about which we are talking. The area in light green is the area controlled by the Christian Lebanese villagers in the south. The area marked in blue is the area of operation of UNIFIL, and here again, in brown, is another area controlled by the terrorist PLO in the south, an area reaching south of the Litani river into the Tyre pocket to a distance of a mere eight miles from the border of Israel.

48. The PLO, for its part, has, since the end of the 1960s, taken over a large area in the south of the country, the brown area, which it maintains as the most concentrated zone of terrorist operations in the world. About 2,000 of those terrorists are located south of the Litani river. About

1,500 of them are stationed in the Tyre pocket, which reaches—as I have said before—to within eight miles of Israel's northern border. The rest, about 500 or so, are entrenched in the area of operation of UNIFIL.

49. In this situation, one may well ask what has happened to the unity, territorial integrity and national sovereignty of Lebanon. I shall refrain from describing in detail how this situation was reached, for members of the Council are well aware of its background.

50. Let me only point out that the PLO area of control is dependent on the Syrian area of occupation, as is clearly obvious from this map, and in fact it is part of the wider Syrian design; for, rather than permit PLO attacks on Israel from Syrian territory, Syria prefers them to be launched from Lebanon, and for Lebanon, crippled and battle-weary as it already is, to bear the consequences of this aggression.

51. Resolution 425 (1978) took account of the fundamental problems facing Lebanon and provided UNIFIL with a threefold mandate, calling for strict respect for the "territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence"—and I stress "political independence"—"of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries".

52. UNIFIL was entrusted with an appropriate mandate. It was established not only for the purpose of confirming the withdrawal of the Israeli Defense Forces, which it did in June of last year, but also for "restoring international peace and security and assisting the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area".

53. However, the area of operation of UNIFIL was confined to the south of Lebanon, so that there was no possibility whatsoever of its being able effectively to fulfil its mandate. Anybody glancing at the map in front of you will readily appreciate how marginal and irrelevant UNIFIL was and is to the real problems of occupied Lebanon.

54. In 1970, the terrorist PLO was ruthlessly hounded out of Jordan, and many of its operatives came fleeing across the Jordan River to Judaea and Samaria—under Israeli control—to save their lives. Syria has steadfastly refused to let the PLO operate from its territory. Rebuffed by other Arab countries, the PLO subverted Lebanon's sovereignty, and it now enjoys complete freedom in Lebanon. Its headquarters are located there. Its bases for launching indiscriminate acts of terror against innocent civilians in Israel are located there. Whenever an atrocity is perpetrated in Israel, responsibility is taken by the PLO in Lebanon.

55. Israel is thus faced with a tragic dilemma: we can either wait for our own civilians to be murdered, or move in order to prevent terrorist outrages. Israel has in fact no choice at all.

56. Members of the Council scarcely need to be reminded that, under international law, if a State is unable or unwilling to prevent groups from using its territory to attack another State, the latter is entitled to take all necessary measures in its own defence.

57. The PLO, in its cowardly way, deliberately locates its bases in refugee camps, civilian towns and villages. I do not

wish to repeat here the relevant passage of the statement to the General Assembly of 14 October 1976² by Ambassador Ghorra, the former Permanent Representative of Lebanon, in which he vividly described these criminal methods employed by the PLO. As a result of that policy, civilians on the Lebanese side inevitably are affected, and no country more than Israel feels their pain when their lives are lost, callously sacrificed by the terrorist PLO.

58. It has always been the case that the PLO was an instrument in the hands of certain Arab Governments. However, since the signing of the Camp David accords in September of last year, and, more particularly, since the signing of the Israel-Egypt peace treaty on 26 March 1979, it has become patently clear that the PLO is operating on behalf of the rejectionist Arab States—that is, the opponents of the peace process in the Arab world, and their supporters beyond the Arab world. In particular, behind it stand Syria and Iraq, which are using the PLO as an extension of the so-called eastern front in an effort to sabotage the ongoing peace process in the Middle East. Illustrative of this was the appointment earlier this month of a Syrian former major-general as director of the so-called Military Department of the terrorist PLO.

59. There have been repeated reports of increased supplies of arms, Soviet and other, to the PLO in recent weeks. As of today, the terrorists have approximately 100 cannons deployed in Lebanon, mainly in the region between the Zaharani and Litani rivers—the brown area—consisting of Soviet-made 130-mm and 155-mm Howitzers, and now also a sizable quantity of 105-mm cannon of other manufacture. They also have extensive supplies of Soviet Katyusha rockets, which are mobile and are brought up to the border for an attack. As a result, the terrorist PLO constitutes a threat not only to Israel, particularly its civilians in the north, but also a considerable threat to Lebanese villagers in the south and to UNIFIL itself.

60. Speaking of these Lebanese villages in the south, let me remind the Council that these are Christian, Shiite and Druze farmers, who have been the victims of the disaster inflicted on them over the years by the terrorist PLO. They have found themselves abandoned and have resolved to take up arms to defend themselves.

61. At the same time, Israel's policy of self-defence is proving effective. Since the atrocity at Nahariya on 22 April 1979, when four Israeli civilians—including two little sisters, aged 4 and 2—lost their lives as the result of a sea-borne terrorist raid launched from Lebanon, there has been a significant decrease in the terrorist activities in Israel. Moreover, we have solid information that as many as four murderous attacks were prevented in the last week by the operations of the Israeli Defense Forces.

62. Israel's position vis-à-vis Lebanon is clear. Israel supports the unity, national sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries.

63. Detaching the question of Southern Lebanon from the situation in Lebanon as a whole will not enhance the

cause of peace. Peace cannot be restored in Lebanon while a Syrian occupation army trains its gunsights on the civilian population of Beirut and while armed PLO terrorists are allowed free reign on Lebanese soil.

64. This is not the view of the Government of Israel alone. It is also held by leading Lebanese figures. Only yesterday the former President of Lebanon, Camille Chamoun, was reported on a Lebanese radio station as stating that the reason for what has been called the "Israeli attacks" is the PLO presence in Lebanon, and that the escalation about which there have been official protests in recent days follows from the fact that the PLO have received heavy weaponry and set up new bases in Arkoub and other places. Let me quote former President Chamoun:

"It does not matter if we go to the United Nations or we request an Arab summit. The question is whether the Government of Lebanon has sufficient courage to deal with the question of security in the south in all its aspects. The Syrian forces which should have deterred the Palestinians are encouraging them and giving them cover to extend the areas under their control."

Likewise, Pierre Jumayyel yesterday observed that, every time there has been an increase in hostilities in the south, the Lebanese authorities have rushed to have international pressure brought to bear on Israel but have never exerted pressure to prevent the attacks on Israel.

65. Until the nettle of the fundamental problem plaguing Lebanon is grasped, nothing will be achieved. The PLO must be evicted from Lebanon, and the Syrian occupation of that country must be ended. Until these basic requirements are met, the Security Council will achieve little. This is a sad conclusion, but it is a realistic one which the Council is in duty bound to address squarely.

66. The PRESIDENT: Since no other members of the Council have asked to speak at this time, I shall now speak as representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

67. I welcome the opportunity afforded by this meeting of the Council to address a problem which has long been a matter of grave concern to my Government.

68. In recent weeks and months, the sorry spectacle of the slaughter of innocent people through random violence, principally in Lebanon but also in Israel, has been an affront to the conscience of mankind. We are meeting now at the request of the Government of Lebanon, in response to the recent upsurge of violence in Southern Lebanon. In recent days alone, thousands of Lebanese and Palestinian civilians have been forced to flee from their homes, and many have been killed and maimed by often indiscriminate shelling. This situation is intolerable. The people of Southern Lebanon, Lebanese and Palestinian alike, and the people of Israel as well, deserve relief from the almost daily violence and fear of attack with which they have been forced to live for far too long. They look to us to point the way to a solution that will allow the people in Lebanon to return to their homes and allow them and Israeli citizens to carry on their lives in freedom from the fear of attack. We must not fail them.

² Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Plenary Meetings, 32nd meeting.

69. The United States Government's policy on Lebanon is well known. We support that country's sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity. We have special ties of sympathy with the people of Lebanon, and we have supported the Government of President Sarkis in its efforts to restore its authority throughout the country, including throughout Southern Lebanon. We will continue to do so.

70. Let me make absolutely clear the position of the United States with regard to the events in Southern Lebanon. In doing so, I speak with the full authority of the United States Government. First, we condemn those who boast of the murder of an Israeli mother and her child, the attack on a bus filled with Israeli civilians, and the explosion of rockets and bombs in Israeli towns and cities. No political objective can ever justify such barbarism. Secondly, and just as strongly, we condemn the policy of artillery shelling and pre-emptive attacks on Lebanese towns, villages and refugee camps which Israel and armed Lebanese groups which Israel supports have followed in recent months. Let there be no doubt or ambiguity about this. We cannot and do not agree with Israel's military policies in Lebanon as manifested in the past few months. They are wrong and unacceptable to my Government. They are painfully at variance with the values which Israel has traditionally espoused.

71. Let me turn to what the United States Government believes must be done to break the deadlock of terror and counter-terror in which both sides seem to be caught.

72. First, both sides should co-operate fully with UNIFIL in enabling it to carry out its mandate. It is disgraceful that the men of the Force in Lebanon have been subjected to attack and harrassment from both Palestinian elements and groups supported by Israel because they seek to carry out a mission entrusted to them by this Council. A lasting end to the violence in the area can be brought about only through scrupulous observance of resolution 425 (1978). UNIFIL should thus be allowed to fulfil its mandate by functioning in an unimpeded fashion throughout all of Southern Lebanon. The objective remains to restore the authority and control of the Government of Lebanon throughout the country.

73. Secondly, Israel should end its policy of pre-emptive strikes on Lebanese soil. It should cease its artillery attacks in support of Lebanese militia groups and effectively use its influence over these groups so that random and indiscriminate violence can be stopped, especially against the men of UNIFIL.

74. Thirdly, the Palestinian leadership should help heal the wounds of Lebanon. It should stop attacks on the Lebanese militia groups in Southern Lebanon and on Israel. It should renounce the use of Lebanese territory for this purpose. It should carry out its pledge of 5 June to withdraw its fighters from Southern Lebanese villages and towns and remove all its armed groups from the area of operation of UNIFIL. This step should be taken without pre-condition and without delay. There is no conceivable justification for the continued presence of Palestinian armed groups in Southern Lebanon if the Palestinian leadership is prepared to co-operate with the Council and UNIFIL in carrying out resolution 425 (1978).

75. Fourthly, all parties to the fighting should carry out and strictly enforce a complete, immediate and lasting halt to all shelling, terrorism and other acts of violence.

76. Members of this Council, less than a week ago, met to consider another aspect of the Middle East situation, the critical issue of the rights of the Palestinian people. If there is a strengthened understanding in my country of the importance of ensuring that the legitimate rights of the Palestinians are included in a comprehensive settlement—and I believe that there is—then it is time for the Palestinian leadership to recognize that their objectives cannot be achieved through violence and terrorism. Indeed, it is time—past time—for wiser counsels to prevail on both sides of the border between Lebanon and Israel.

77. Finally, I want to pay a tribute to General Erskine and the brave men of UNIFIL he commands. Their task has been thankless, frustrating and dangerous. Subjected to attack in the performance of their duties, they have suffered heavy casualties. Tragically, three members of the contingent from the small nation of Fiji were killed in a recent clash with terrorists. In difficult terrain, and in a country where arms are widely available among the population, the men of UNIFIL have been subjected to a severe test of their steadfastness. They have risen to challenges with exemplary determination and courage. We all owe them a debt of thanks which words cannot repay. They can be proud of their continued contribution to the cause of peace.

78. I now resume my functions as PRESIDENT. The next speaker is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

79. Mr. ABDEL RAHMAN (Palestine Liberation Organization): It was not my intention to speak here today, but I must because of the barrage of lies and distortions to which this august body has been subjected by the representative of the Government of Israel, the Government of Menachem Begin.

80. I think that we of the Palestine Liberation Organization are on record with regard to our position vis-à-vis Lebanon. We whole-heartedly support the territorial integrity, national independence and unity of Lebanon, and I think that our Lebanese brothers know this. Our position vis-à-vis UNIFIL is also clear. It has been stated in the reports of the Secretary-General and reports from the field by UNIFIL commanders that the PLO does everything possible to co-operate with the forces of UNIFIL. We made a pledge after the adoption of resolution 425 (1978), and we are still abiding by that pledge.

81. I should like here today to clarify just a few points. First, with regard to requesting the Palestine Liberation Organization to carry out its commitment to the declaration made on 5 June, the PLO has implemented that declaration. However, a few hours after the withdrawal of the Palestinian military from towns and villages in the south, the area was subjected to barbaric shelling and bombardment of our refugee camps and of civilians of Lebanese villages.

82. Nobody in his right mind who wants to be objective can ask the Palestinians or the Lebanese not to resist a genocide that has been and is still being directed against them. Just to give an example, on 27 August, Ramsey Clark, former United States Attorney-General, David Dellinger, editor of *Seven Days*, Max Holland, researcher at the Centre for International Studies, Fred Jameson, professor at Yale and author, and Don Luce, Co-ordinator of the Asian Centre, had just returned from the Middle East. They issued a press release in which they testified that:

“The group surveyed the daily military destruction of Lebanese villages and Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon, especially in the southern part of the country. In the south, the group observed artillery shelling and passed a point on the coastal highway north of Tyre two hours before a ship-based Israeli commando raid killed eight people. They found massive, indiscriminate destruction throughout Southern Lebanon, including villages and cities extensively damaged and almost completely destroyed.

“According to members of the group, the civilian population of Southern Lebanon has been the major victim of the daily air raids and shelling. Casings and shrapnel pieces of cluster bombs with United States markings were shown to the visitors, with the angry protest that the bombs had been dropped on defenceless villages by Israeli-flown and United States-made airplanes.

“They also agreed that the increased Israeli military activity has not been in response to Palestinian attacks on Israel. This was confirmed by the Israeli Army Chief of Staff, Lieutenant-General Raphael Eitan on 15 August 1979.”

Therefore, the Israeli shelling and attacks on Southern Lebanon are not in response to Palestinian violence. It is a war of genocide that is being carried out by the criminal-minded Menachem Begin and his clique to destroy the political and physical existence of the Palestinian people.

83. We heard the Israeli representative speak of “no choice”. I think that there is a choice. The choice is that Israel should withdraw from the occupied territories and allow the Palestinian people to exercise its right to self-determination and national independence. There is a choice; everybody knows that we did not choose to be in Lebanon, that we were forced to be in Lebanon, and that we as Palestinians did not establish bases for resistance against Israel and then establish around them refugee camps, that it is just obvious that the Palestinian people, as a people struggling for its right to return to its homes and properties in Palestine, should resist and carry out its struggle by all means—political and diplomatic, and also, in accordance with the Charter and the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, by armed struggle.

84. We are in Lebanon because we are not in Palestine. If we were in Palestine, we would not be in Lebanon. That is a very logical formula. And we are in Lebanon because the representative of Menachem Begin as well as 80 per cent of the population of Israel are settler-colonials in our country. I cannot be at my house because an Israeli who came from either England or Brooklyn is living there.

85. All we ask is to be allowed, like any other people in this world, to exercise our minimum human and political rights—the right to be in our homes and the right to self-determination and national independence.

86. This morning I received this satchel. It belonged to Ahmad Hayel, a nine-year-old boy in Al Rashidia refugee camp. His school was shelled; he was killed; and here is the piece of shrapnel that destroyed his books as well as his life. This is what the Israelis and people like the representative of Menachem Begin call self-defence: killing hundreds of Palestinian and Lebanese children in their schools and refugee camps; continuing to occupy our land by force of arms; committing daily atrocities against our people in their villages, towns, shops, schools; and limiting the freedom of those people. It goes further, confiscating their lands and establishing settlements in an attempt to create a Palestinian ghetto similar to the bantustans that South Africa created for our black brothers in South Africa.

87. We wish to state here in this Council that it is clear that we are not fighting for the sake of fighting. We are a normal people like any other. We want our children to learn to play with toys rather than with guns. We want our children to learn how to cultivate the land rather than to train. But, after what has been inflicted on us, what choice do we have? And I ask everyone of the representatives here: should we disappear as a nation? I can assure them that we will not; we will continue to exist.

88. We still believe in peace. We have struggled for peace and we want peace, but a peace that would secure for us our basic human rights, our political life, our right to self-determination, our right to live in dignity as a people, our right to exist as a nation. This can be achieved only if Israel withdraws from all the territories occupied since 1967 and recognizes the right of the Palestinian people who were expelled from their homes and properties in Palestine to return or be compensated for their property as well as their right to self-determination and national independence in accordance with the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly.

89. Those conditions have been approved by the United Nations. If they are implemented, I can assure the Council that peace will be established immediately. Therefore, the choice is not whether to push the Palestinians into the Mediterranean or to continue a war of genocide against them. The choice is for those who are interested in peace to implement the conditions for peace.

90. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Lebanon has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of his right of reply, and I now call on him.

91. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): The representative of Israel has once more engaged in his usual rhetoric of trying to divert the debate from the point at issue to various other points that he has often raised here. I think he should renew his stock of quotations. In fact, he is becoming repetitious. I shall not deal with this.

92. I was very much interested by this painting, which shows the drama in my country. I am very candid. I have

said that I belong to a country that has become a martyred country, a country torn by the wars of others, but a country that a year ago asked this Council: let my people live. I repeat: let my people live.

93. I shall not discuss the various accusations. I have come to this Council today, and before, repeatedly asking for the implementation of peace and of the Armistice Agreement, and we were confronted with debates on international law that we never sought. Let me, however, read to this Council, for the first time, a letter from Mr. Moshe Dayan, Foreign Minister of Israel, addressed to this body and dated 3 August 1978:

“Please be advised that the Government of Israel is considering agreeing to reinstate the Lebanese/Israel General Armistice Agreement of 1949 in order to enable Israel to consider the matter positively. We request a reaffirmation from the Government of Lebanon that it will abide by all the provisions of the Agreement, including article III, . . .”.

This is an official letter given to the Secretary-General to which we have replied saying that we were prepared to abide by the terms of the Armistice Agreement. Not only have we replied in the positive; there was an exchange, and this Council has reaffirmed the Armistice Agreement over and over again. What are we asking for? I have not come here to ask for war. I have come here to propose that Lebanon become a zone of peace, that all hostilities stop in Southern Lebanon, that the international conspiracy that has made Lebanon a martyred country be brought to an end.

94. Peace in Lebanon cannot wait for a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem. It is immoral that my country should continue to suffer pending the achievement of a comprehensive peace settlement. It is immoral that the representative of Israel should come here and accord himself the right of tutelage over sovereignty in my country. We want Lebanon reunited and in peace; and we are capable of maintaining that peace. We have committed ourselves to the maintenance of peace and the cessation of hostilities, and we are prepared to stand by our word. Is the representative of Israel prepared to commit his Government to abide by the United Nations resolutions?

95. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

96. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I should just like to remind the representative of Lebanon and the Council of the invitation

extended by Prime Minister Begin on 7 May 1979 from the rostrum of the Knesset to President Sarkis to meet and negotiate peace between Israel and Lebanon. Prime Minister Begin stated on that occasion that Israel had no territorial ambitions whatsoever vis-à-vis Lebanon. We support the unity, territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. We still await Lebanon's reply to that invitation. As of now, no such reply has been forthcoming.

97. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Lebanon.

98. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): We are still free in our country to make at least one decision, which is how to govern our country, and we think we are doing quite well given the five years of war. No other nation in the world that had been subjected to what we have been subjected to could have survived as we have survived.

99. As for the invitation of peace, we have replied by saying that the Armistice Agreement is sufficient. It is, if read properly—and we have written numerous notes on this to the Security Council—a guarantee for security and for the return of peace to Lebanon.

100. We want all hostilities in Lebanon to stop. We want the PLO to stop its hostilities in Lebanon. We want it because we want it, and not because Israel is inviting us to do it. And if the Israelis are sincere in their claim for peace, let us immediately have the Armistice Agreement implemented under the auspices of this Council.

101. The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of the Netherlands in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representative of the Netherlands 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. Feith (Netherlands) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

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

如何购取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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