

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FOURTH YEAR

2113th

MEETING: 19 JANUARY 1979 UN LIBRARY

NEW YORK

MAR 23 1982

UN/SA COLLECTION

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2113)	1
Expression of welcome to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Norway	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/13026 and Corr.1)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

2113th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 19 January 1979, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Donald O. MILLS (Jamaica).

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/2113)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the Middle East:
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/13026 and Corr.1)

The meeting was called to order at 4.30 p.m.

Expression of welcome to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Norway

1. The PRESIDENT: At the outset of the meeting I should like to acknowledge the presence at the Council table of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Norway, Mr. Knut Frydenlund. Norway has always taken a very strong and responsible interest in the affairs of the United Nations and has demonstrated this particularly and in a very practical way in reference to the situation in Lebanon. On behalf of the members of the Council, therefore, I extend a warm welcome to His Excellency.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/13026 and Corr.1)

2. The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Lebanon in which he requests that he should be allowed to participate in the discussion. I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representative of Lebanon to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in conformity with the 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.

3. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the

United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) for the period 14 September 1978 to 12 January 1979, contained in document S/13026 and Corr.1, and a draft resolution contained in document S/13042.

4. I take it that members of the Council are ready to vote on the draft resolution. There being no objection, I shall now put it to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

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

Against: None

Abstaining: Czechoslovakia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

The draft resolution was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.¹

One member (China) did not participate in the voting.

5. The PRESIDENT: I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Security Council:

"The Security Council, after considering the report of the Secretary-General in document S/13026 and Corr.1, paid special attention, at its meeting on 19 January 1979, to the question of restoration of the authority of the Lebanese Government over the entire territory of Southern Lebanon.

"The Council takes note of the recent efforts made by the Lebanese Government to establish a presence in the southern part of the country and expresses the hope that the continuation and expansion of such activities will be encouraged.

"The Council accordingly suggests that the Lebanese Government, in consultation with the Secretary-General, should draw up a phased programme of activities to be carried out over the next three months to promote the restoration of its authority.

"The Council requests the Secretary-General to report to it by 19 April 1979 on the implementation of this programme."

¹ See resolution 444 (1979).

6. The Secretary-General wishes to make a statement, and I now call on him.
7. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I have taken note of the resolution just adopted by the Council and also of the President's statement. I wish to assure the Council that I and my colleagues here at Headquarters, as well as General Erskine and the members of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, will continue our efforts to achieve the objectives set for us by the decisions of the Council.
8. I have stated my views on the situation regarding UNIFIL at some length in my report to the Council and I do not wish to repeat them. I should like to say again, however, that the co-operation of the parties concerned is an essential element in the effectiveness of UNIFIL. If this co-operation is lacking, we shall inevitably continue to experience the same difficulties which we are now experiencing.
9. I therefore appeal to the members of the Council who are in a position to do so to bring their influence to bear on those concerned in support of the efforts which we shall continue to make to implement the Council's resolutions. I also appeal to the parties concerned to modify their attitude in such a way as to afford UNIFIL the degree of co-operation necessary for the successful achievement of its objectives. I do this in the firm belief that the success of the Force will benefit all parties and be a major contribution to peace in the area.
10. In my report and in the consultations of the Council I have made no secret of my view that the present situation is a serious one in which the credibility of UNIFIL is at stake. It is essential that all concerned should make every possible effort during the forthcoming mandate to remedy this situation and to make real progress towards the objectives outlined in resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978).
11. To this end we shall especially concentrate our efforts on the restoration of Lebanese authority and sovereignty in the south. For this purpose we shall intensify our contacts with the Lebanese Government with the aim, among others, of working out of a phased programme for the restoration of its authority in the area. I feel obliged to say once again, however, that experience shows that the best of plans and programmes will not achieve their ends without the necessary degree of co-operation from all the parties concerned. I sincerely hope that this co-operation will be forthcoming.
12. I shall not fail to keep the Council informed of further developments.
13. Questions have been put to me by some members of the Council concerning the reported Israeli military operation in Southern Lebanon in the early hours of this morning.
14. I wish to make clear that that incident took place north of the UNIFIL area on the other side of the Litani River. However, I have received the following information from UNIFIL.

15. At 1823 hours GMT, on 18 January, there was a heavy exchange of artillery, mortar, machine-gun and tank fire between the armed elements to the north of the Litani River and the *de facto* forces and Israeli forces in the south. Just after midnight on 19 January, Israeli fighter aircraft flew over the UNIFIL area and attacked three villages to the north of the Litani River. At 0125 hours, an unidentified helicopter flew over Marjayoun and to the north of the Litani and then returned to the south. Similar helicopter flights took place at 0200 and 0325 hours.
16. There was a movement of unidentified armoured vehicles from El Khiam to Marjayoun at about 0325 hours and 23 Israeli armoured personnel carriers fully manned by Israeli troops and four other armoured vehicles crossed from Israel into the Lebanese Christian enclave at 0300 hours today. At about 0500 hours, those vehicles were reported moving south from Marjayoun to Metulla, in Israel. There was no movement by those armoured vehicles in the UNIFIL area of control.
17. Since 0640 hours today, no further action has been reported. At no time has UNIFIL been involved in any of the action or suffered casualties.
18. Since UNIFIL is not deployed either north of the Litani or in the Christian enclave and has no freedom of movement there, it cannot confirm more concrete details of the reported Israeli operation, which did not take place in any areas controlled by UNIFIL. However, the number of troops and vehicle movements observed indicates some form of ground attack by helicopter-borne troops, with artillery support from the Christian enclaves.
19. That is the report I have to make to the Council in regard to the incident this morning.
20. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those delegations which have indicated their desire to be allowed to speak after the vote.
21. Mr. FRYDENLUND (Norway): Mr. President, first of all, I should like to thank you for the kind words of welcome you extended to me. It is an honour for me to participate in today's deliberations of the Council under your able leadership. I promise, however, that I shall not be permanently present at your meetings.
22. Allow me, as a point of departure, to refer to the report which the Secretary-General has submitted to the Council on the activities and functioning of UNIFIL over the past four months. It is a frank and strong document which goes to the heart of the matter. The Secretary-General presents us with a rather depressing but realistic picture of the situation. Yesterday's dramatic events referred to just now by him clearly indicate and underline the seriousness of the situation, and the information provided in the report corresponds largely to our own assessment. The Norwegian Government shares the concern expressed by the Secretary-General and supports his observations and conclusions.
23. The Force has now been operational for almost one year. The Force, which was to be of an interim nature, was charged with a double mandate: to confirm the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon and to assist the Lebanese Government in ensuring the restoration of its effective authority in the southern part of its country.

24. Much to our regret, it has not been possible for UNIFIL, through no fault of its own, to accomplish this task. As is the case with all peace-keeping operations, such a delicate task cannot be discharged successfully without the full co-operation of the parties concerned.

25. Less than two weeks ago, another effort was made, to no avail, by the United Nations to elicit a positive response to suggestions aimed at securing the effective functioning of UNIFIL in the remainder of its area of operation. The Norwegian Government deplores the fact that it has not been possible to ensure deployment of UNIFIL in accordance with the provisions of its mandate and would urge all parties concerned to co-operate fully with the Force in order to facilitate such deployment.

26. UNIFIL has clearly demonstrated its ability to control its area of operation. My Government is convinced that the full deployment of UNIFIL will contribute positively to strengthening the security of all States in the region and thus promote peace and stability. A continuation of the present situation is unacceptable to the Council and the international community.

27. Another problem which is highlighted by the Secretary-General—and about which my Government fully shares his concern—is the harassment to which UNIFIL, to an increasing degree, is being subjected by the *de facto* forces. If continued, this might negatively affect the morale and effectiveness of the Force. This situation—which goes beyond a mere lack of co-operation with UNIFIL—is totally unacceptable and must be brought to an end. If this is not done, serious consequences might ensue. This places a grave responsibility upon those who obstruct or refuse to co-operate with UNIFIL in its efforts to complete the task assigned to it by the Council.

28. The second part of the UNIFIL mandate—the return of effective Lebanese Government authority in Southern Lebanon—has so far largely been left unimplemented. In this connexion, the Norwegian Government welcomes the recent initiatives taken by the Lebanese Government in strengthening its presence in the area. What has been done so far can, however, be considered only a modest first step. We hope that we are now witnessing the beginning of a process which will progressively lead to the complete restoration of the Lebanese Government's authority.

29. I have so far concentrated in my statement on the problems and negative aspects of the present situation in Southern Lebanon. That said, the Norwegian Government fully recognizes that UNIFIL has contributed decisively towards the maintenance of peace and stability in Southern Lebanon and in the region as a whole. We feel that, in the present situation, it is necessary to retain UNIFIL in Southern Lebanon. If UNIFIL should be withdrawn today, this would not only have undesirable repercussions in the region: it would also raise doubts as to the future capacity of the United Nations to deal effectively with issues relating to international peace and security.

30. For this reason, the Norwegian Government has, by casting a positive vote today, supported the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of five months. The Norwegian Government will, furthermore, seek to maintain its present level of participation in UNIFIL.

31. The situation in Southern Lebanon and in the country as a whole must be viewed in the context of the situation in the Middle East. The Norwegian Government hopes that the leaders in the region will now take the decisions required to bring a just and lasting peace to the area.

32. In conclusion, I wish to pay a tribute to Major-General Erskine, his staff and the officers and men of the various contingents of UNIFIL for their dedication and courage. Serving under extremely difficult conditions, they have been able to maintain high morale and act impartially. I take this opportunity to assure the Secretary-General of our continued support in his efforts to implement the decisions taken by the Council in relation to the situation in Southern Lebanon.

33. The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Israel in which he requests that he should be invited to participate in the discussion. I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representative of Israel to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in conformity with the provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the request of the President, Mr. Blum (Israel) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

34. Mr. CHOU Nan (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): On behalf of my delegation, I should like first of all to extend the warmest welcome to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Norway, His Excellency Mr. Knut Frydenlund, who is participating personally in this meeting of the Security Council.

35. The report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon has fully demonstrated the gravity of the situation in Lebanon. In our statement on 8 December last [*2106th meeting*], during the Council's consideration of the situation in Lebanon, the Chinese delegation strongly condemned the Israeli Zionists for their obstruction of the exercise of sovereignty by the Lebanese Government in Southern Lebanon and for the serious incidents of Israel's repeated armed attacks on Lebanon. What arouses indignation, however, is that since then the Israeli authorities have not shown the slightest intention to shun evil and mend their ways but have continued obdurately to resort to all means to obstruct the Lebanese Government from exercising its sovereignty over Southern Lebanon. In recent weeks, the Israeli aggressors have sent out planes on many occasions to carry out indiscriminate bombing raids on Lebanon and to slaughter innocent people there. In the past few days, Israel again flagrantly launched armed attacks on Lebanese territory. The wanton provocations by the Israeli Zionists have aroused great indignation and stern condemnation by the peoples of Lebanon, Palestine, other Arab countries and the rest of the world.

36. The Chinese Government and people hold that the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon must be strictly respected, and we have always given firm support to the peoples of Lebanon, Palestine and other Arab countries in their just struggle against Zionism and hegemonism and for the recovery of their lost territories and the regaining of their national rights. We strongly condemn Israel for its series of crimes of aggression against Lebanon. In our view, any resolution adopted by the

Security Council now should naturally condemn the aforesaid Israeli acts of aggression. Furthermore, the Council should take even more effective measures to stop Israel's aggression against Lebanon.

37. The Chinese delegation has studied the draft resolution contained in document S/13042. We approve of the relevant paragraphs in the draft condemning Israel's obstruction of the exercise of sovereignty by the Lebanese Government in Southern Lebanon. However, in view of the fact that the draft resolution mainly concerns the question of the United Nations Force, on which the Chinese delegation has always held a different position in principle, we did not participate in the vote on the draft resolution. In spite of this, we consider that the content of the President's statement is good, and we fully support it.

38. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): Mr. President, I should like at the outset to pay you a well-deserved tribute for the skill and dedication which have characterized your handling of this problem during the last three long and arduous days.

39. I should also like to welcome the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Norway. His presence underscores the importance which his Government attaches to peace-keeping operations in general and UNIFIL in particular.

40. The delegation of Kuwait would like at the outset to put on record its appreciation to the Secretary-General, his staff and the officers and soldiers of UNIFIL, commanded by our friend Major-General Erskine, for their unflagging efforts for the implementation of resolution 425 (1978). UNIFIL must be one of the most frustrating experiences in peace-keeping operations. It is so frustrating because the nature of the operation is different from the familiar pattern of separating two warring parties or two communities engaged in bloodshed. Here we have an operation initiated to assist a Government in its own efforts to restore its authority in one section of its territory over which it has lost control. UNIFIL therefore has to perform duties of a domestic nature. According to its mandate, UNIFIL has to confirm the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon, to assist the Government of Lebanon in restoring peace and order in the south and to maintain international peace and security by forestalling threats that might jeopardize the fragile truce of the region. Two-thirds of its mandate, I would say, have been met, but what is left unfulfilled is dangerous enough to give rise to serious concern. The Force was sent to protect Lebanon from Israel. It was sent to assist Lebanon to safeguard its territorial integrity and sovereignty in the south. Unfortunately, what was once Southern Lebanon has now become a buffer zone for the protection of Israel. The area which is now under Israeli occupation—directly or by proxy—falls within the mandate of UNIFIL, and it is therefore logical to expect its deployment therein. Southern Lebanon is now in the hands of the stooges of Israel, who are assisted, trained, supplied and controlled by it. The unquestionable fact is that Israel refuses to let UNIFIL fulfil its mandate. The Secretary-General's report states unequivocally the facts about Israel's attitude. Nowhere else in the history of United Nations peace-keeping operations have United Nations forces failed to carry out their mandate. Instead of protecting Lebanon, UNIFIL is held hostage by an insignificant bunch of rebels who sheepishly obey the orders of Israel. The representative of Israel, with unusual temerity, stated in his letter of 14 January to the

President of the Security Council [S/13028] that UNIFIL's task of restoring international peace and security remained unfulfilled. It is true that it remains unfulfilled, but who is responsible? Is it UNIFIL? Is it the Government of Lebanon, which has tried hard to send in its troops but has seen its determination blunted? Or is it Israel, which has defiantly blocked the deployment of UNIFIL on the internationally recognized borders of Lebanon?

41. The Council debated this issue extensively about five weeks ago [2106th meeting]. At that time I had the opportunity to stress the dangerous nature of the "Metulla connexion", as I then named it. The problem with the renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL is that the Council finds itself a party to the failure of its own decisions. The automatic renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL, in disregard of its imperfections and the advantages it offers to Israel, amounts to acquiescence in an anomalous situation.

42. The Council is in no position to take drastic measures against Israel, which knows this fact and acts in the full knowledge that it can get away with what it wants. After all, one should not forget that 12 years of occupation of Arab territories, with no commensurate action against it by its benefactors or by the United Nations, have convinced Israel that it can do whatever it likes with exceptional impunity—so much so that even South Africa looks at it with a jaundiced eye.

43. My delegation is not necessarily happy to see the Council renew the mandate of a force that is the victim of the taunting trickery of Israel. In this welter of trickery and deceit, the options are unfortunately limited. The Secretary-General cautioned us against submission to despair when he stated that "these difficulties should not be allowed to obscure UNIFIL's valuable contribution to peace in the area" [S/13026 and Corr.1, para. 38].

44. Notwithstanding the difficulties, frustrations and imperfections of the situation, UNIFIL's presence in Southern Lebanon is essential. Otherwise Israel will invent an excuse to invade Southern Lebanon and to squat on Lebanese soil indefinitely. My Government supports the request for the renewal of the mandate solely on that basis. My delegation is gratified at the remark of the Secretary-General that he is "fully aware of the potential dangers of assuming an automatic renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL" [*ibid.*, para. 40]. Lebanon must assume its responsibility for its territory. That is true. And in this connexion my delegation is happy to endorse the statement of the President inviting Lebanon to assume its own responsibility. In paragraph 39 of his report the Secretary-General refers to the arrangements being worked out between UNIFIL and the Government of Lebanon with a view to strengthening the latter's presence and authority in the area. We welcome and encourage this trend.

45. Aware of the limitations of the Council on this issue, my delegation believes that the key to success for UNIFIL is the co-operation of the Government of Israel. Israel is obstructing UNIFIL's deployment in the south. This is a fact no one can deny. It is controlling the rebels in Southern Lebanon. It is challenging the authority of the Council. The question, then, is who will prevail on the Government of Israel to be more co-operative with UNIFIL? In this respect, first and foremost, the United States bears the responsibility for exerting utmost pressure to ensure UNIFIL's

full operation in Southern Lebanon. The speed with which the United States acted in March 1978 for the establishment of UNIFIL and the interest it has shown since then adds to its responsibility. I must say that the power of persuasion will have no effect upon Israel; it will never produce the required results. Only the power of clout, the power of confrontation, will bring about positive results. One should not forget that Israel subsists on United States aid and is protected militarily and politically by it. Only two days ago *The New York Times* reported the decision of the Israeli Government to build three additional Jewish settlements in the West Bank and Gaza. Those settlements, which will be appearing soon in Southern Lebanon if UNIFIL's mandate remains obstructed, are occupied by adventurers who depend on Jewish and non-Jewish money that comes primarily from the United States.

46. My delegation is aware of the political complexity of bringing pressure to bear on Israel. But one must point out that UNIFIL is yet another victim of power politics.

47. The key for the success of UNIFIL lies in the pressure Member States exert on Israel—and not only the United States. As I said earlier, I am not convinced that the power of persuasion will work. There must be a pinch here and a punch there. Otherwise, UNIFIL will continue grappling with the same problems, with cries of agony from Lebanon and a bitter reaction from General Erskine and the staff of UNIFIL.

48. In the debate last month I asked the representative of Israel two questions. He dodged the issue with characteristic evasiveness. My two questions remain valid: is Israel willing to allow UNIFIL to deploy its forces on the international borders between Lebanon and Israel, and is it willing and ready to stop its assistance to the rebels in the south? The Israeli representative will assist us and, indeed, the Council in its deliberations on this subject if he answers those two questions.

49. It is a fact that UNIFIL represents a conflict between national interests and international obligations. Under the Charter all States are expected to assist in the implementation of the Council's resolutions and to abide by them. Here is a State that is unwilling to assist or to abide by the Council's decisions, in the full knowledge that power politics will protect it. It is unfair to leave the Secretary-General saddled with the issue, but it is also unrealistic to expect some members of the Council effectively to turn the heat on Israel.

50. But, be that as it may, one should not give in to despair. The Council should maintain the momentum which the report of the Secretary-General and the strenuous informal meetings of the Council have generated. In this respect, the statement of the President will have a very positive impact. Anything that is unusual captures unusual attention. It is unusual to adopt a resolution and a presidential statement on one question at the same meeting. But the situation is unusual, and therefore it requires an unusual approach. In our view, this will have a telling effect. Some may argue that the Council, having failed to turn the heat on Israel, has started to put the pressure on Lebanon. The answer to this argument is that the two documents should not be read in isolation but, it should be emphasized, in conjunction with each other. My reading of the resolution is that it places responsibility squarely on Israel, while

the presidential statement is addressed to Lebanon and invites its Government to assume its responsibility.

51. As long as the momentum is forcefully preserved, kept and maintained, these obstacles ought to give way to the logical demand of normality. We in Kuwait say that the only way to blunt Israel's obstinacy is to maintain unrelenting pressure. In this connexion I should like to use an old Kuwaiti proverb. In Kuwait we say that even iron bars give way to ceaseless pounding.

52. I should like to refer to another point. Only last night we heard about the dastardly, cowardly attack by Israel on Lebanon, which adds to the tension and the already precarious situation in the area. This criminal attack shows how contemptuous Israel is of international law, of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international relations. It has violated the sovereignty of Lebanon, it has breached its territorial integrity, and it has challenged the United Nations. Aggression and brutal force are the main tenets of the Zionist philosophy, for Israel is the product of aggression; it expanded by aggression; it exists on aggression. The dastardly onslaught upon Lebanon is yet another example in what have become almost routine techniques of spreading death and destruction inside Lebanon. Under no circumstances can Israel justify its brutal attack on Lebanon. Israel cannot place itself beyond and outside the pale of the law. The arguments about terrorism have become hackneyed. The cycle of violence will continue unabated as long as the underlying causes exist.

53. As we have been saying for years here, the Palestinians must exercise their inalienable right to self-determination in their own land. Without the exercise of this primordial right, violence will continue and the area will remain, as it has been for a long time, rent, punctuated, by truces and wars. The Zionists have been building Jewish settlements in the West Bank and Gaza, driving out the indigenous Palestinians, expropriating their land, diverting their water, deporting their young men and intimidating their elders. It is too much to expect the Palestinians to accept quietly the fate of deprivation and exile. Nothing invites violence more than deprivation, and there is no more acute deprivation than that of the Palestinians. Israel's treacherous policy of terrorizing its neighbours finds encouragement in the inability of the Council to act decisively against it. We have always said that the kid-glove treatment accorded to Israel will bring about dangerous results. In the light of its black record and bleak past, it is safe to say that the only language Israel can understand is that of force and confrontation.

54. The macabre crime perpetrated by Israel against Lebanon has shocked the world and produced international indignation. The Council therefore is in duty bound to reflect this sentiment and condemn Israel for its criminal and cowardly aggression against Lebanon. The urge for condemnation becomes stronger in view of the presence of UNIFIL in Southern Lebanon. Israel's action represents the blatant policy of discrediting UNIFIL, which monitors the aircraft carrying the aggressors flying over its area of operation, these aggressors whose ruthless and savage attack on defenceless Lebanese are the product of Israel's mentality. After all, Israel's Prime Minister is a notorious celebrity in the jet set of terrorists. Recently he received the Nobel Prize for Peace. Nothing illustrates the ridiculous paradox of this logic more than conferring on Begin the

medal for peace. The Lebanese, the orphaned children, the widowed mothers and the mutilated casualties of this barbarous attack will never forgive the butchers at Tel Aviv. First it was the people of Palestine, and now it is the turn of the Lebanese to be the object of Israel's policy of annihilation.

55. It is our duty, therefore, to speak out in the strongest terms against this new crime. Israel is unworthy of United Nations membership, unworthy of a seat in the United Nations and in the General Assembly, which was built on tolerance, understanding, respect for the right of peoples to self-determination and support for the sovereignty of Member States. It is indeed a shame to have Israel in the midst of the civilized nations represented in this building. It is an insult to our feelings.

56. My delegation thought of tabling a separate draft resolution on the aggression of Israel against Lebanon. The only reason for our restraint is that we do not want to distract attention from the important role UNIFIL plays at this juncture. But my delegation reserves its right to do so if the situation remains as dangerous as it is now.

57. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with what was said by the representative of Kuwait by telling you how much I have appreciated and admired the courteous, skilful and firm way in which you conducted the arduous negotiations which preceded this meeting. I should also like to welcome the Foreign Minister of Norway, who has been kind enough to honour the Council by participating in its debate.

58. On two previous occasions, on 18 September and 8 December last, the Council had occasion to regret that the missions it had entrusted to UNIFIL in March 1978 had not been carried out in their entirety. Today again, in spite of the constant efforts of the Secretary-General and his representatives over the last four months, we can only regret that it still has not been possible for the contingents of the Force to deploy, even in a limited fashion, in the frontier zone occupied by the *de facto* forces which are enjoying active support from Israel. The report of the Secretary-General makes it unambiguously clear that there is an almost deliberate intent on the part of certain people to hinder the action of UNIFIL, an intent which is furthermore reflected by frequent acts of harassment which endanger the security of the civilian population.

59. With regard to the second aspect of the Force's mission, we can of course only take gratification from the first measures which have been taken recently by the Lebanese Government, in co-operation with the UNIFIL authorities, to restore its legal presence in the south of the country. Nevertheless, we must recognize that on this point also the results achieved have been limited. We believe therefore that it is up to the Council to do everything in its power to help the Beirut authorities to continue and to strengthen their action in this field.

60. That is why the French Government today lent its support to the decisions we have taken renewing the mandate of the Force for a period of five months. We believe them to be wise and likely to respond to the requirements of the situation as I have just briefly outlined it.

61. Indeed, by not renewing the mandate of the Interim Force for a longer period of time, the Council indicated clearly, we believe, and this for the second time, that it did not intend to accept the present situation, which endangers its own authority, nor to resign itself to reducing the role of UNIFIL to that of a "buffer force" whose shape and functions, limited by the calculations of one side and by the ill-will of the other, would have assumed a final and permanent form. My Government would not have been in a position to give its consent to a decision which might have, or appear to have, such implications. If the French delegation finally agreed to the proposal to prolong the mandate for a period of five months, and not four months as it had done previously, we did so particularly in order to take account of the additional difficulties to which a short mandate would inevitably have given rise for the Secretary-General as well as for his services and the contributing countries.

62. The political will of the Council having thus been made absolutely clear in this way, the text of the statement which you read, Mr. President, seems to us to be of particular importance. In requesting the Lebanese Government to establish, in co-operation with the Secretary-General, a phased programme of activities which could be undertaken over the next three months to promote the restoration of its legal presence in the south of the country and in deciding to meet at the end of this period to reassess the situation, the Council was living up to its proper responsibilities and giving to those who hope for progress the support of its prestige and authority. That is the primary concern of my Government which has always made absolutely clear its support for the actions of the United Nations in Lebanon.

63. Permit me now to pay tribute to the leaders of the Force, officers and civilians, and also to the men serving in it. Day after day, sometimes at the sacrifice of their lives, they have been making a remarkable contribution to the search for peace and also to an improvement in the living conditions of the sorely tried population of Lebanon. We thank them all, through the person of their distinguished Commander, Major-General Erskine.

64. My Government wishes to repeat to the Secretary-General its expression of confidence and gratitude for his tireless efforts to enable UNIFIL to carry out its task.

65. Mr. NGUEMA-MBA (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, allow me first of all, on behalf of my delegation, to welcome most warmly the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Norway. His presence here in this chamber cannot fail to demonstrate his country's interest in our work.

66. Everyone remembers that when it established the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon the Council's basic concern was to confirm the withdrawal of Israeli forces, to restore international peace and security and, lastly, to assist the Lebanese Government in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the southern part of the country. The Council also called upon the parties involved and all others concerned to do everything they could to facilitate the operations of the Force.

67. In spite of that, and upon consideration of the Secretary-General's report, my delegation cannot but feel serious concern at the difficulty still faced by UNIFIL in its

attempts to implement its mandate in Southern Lebanon. The alarming news which reached us recently from that region certainly does not dispel our concern.

68. Since the establishment of UNIFIL, and in all its resolutions on the situation in Lebanon, the Council on every occasion, appealed to all concerned to co-operate with the Force. It seems, from the report of the Secretary-General, that this co-operation has not been forthcoming. This is certainly a situation which is difficult to accept.

69. My delegation feels that the time has perhaps come to impress upon all those concerned once more that they freely accepted the sending of the United Nations Force to Lebanon, as well as its mandate, and that, therefore, the United Nations is fully entitled to expect from them unrestricted co-operation with UNIFIL in the implementation of its task. Those same concerned parties should also be made to understand that if the present situation continues there will be no further reason to authorize the peace-keeping force to remain there. Then the problem will arise of reviewing either the nature of the Force or its mandate.

70. Yet today, once again, my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution which we have just adopted—and we fully support your statement, Mr. President—with the firm hope that despite the clear lack of progress in the deployment of UNIFIL over the entire territory of Southern Lebanon, everything will be done by all sides to induce the main parties concerned to respond at last to the appeals of the Security Council.

71. Before concluding, I should like to thank the Secretary-General for his objective report and to assure him of our support for all his efforts to have the Council's mandate implemented. On behalf of my delegation, I should also like to pay a tribute to the work accomplished by the Commander of the Force, Major-General Erskine, and the officers and troops in a situation which is particularly difficult.

72. Mr. ROBINSON (United Kingdom): First I should like to add my delegation's warm welcome to the Foreign Minister of Norway and thank him for joining the Council at this meeting on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, to which Norway has contributed so generously.

73. When the Council met last to discuss the problem of Southern Lebanon at the beginning of December, it was on the basis of a disturbing report from the Secretary-General in which he described the grave situation existing at that time in the area. The report [S/12929] underlined the fact that UNIFIL was not receiving co-operation from *de facto* armed groups which are supplied from, and in our view considerably influenced by, the Government of Israel. In the course of the 2106th meeting, Sir, your predecessor as President of the Council read the statement approved by consensus which, among other things, called upon those not fully co-operating with UNIFIL, particularly Israel, to desist forthwith from interfering with the Force's operations in Southern Lebanon and added the call to Member States in a position to do so to bring their influence to bear on those concerned.

74. My Government responded to that call and, no doubt like many others, made representations to the Israeli

Government about its activities in Southern Lebanon. The latest report by the Secretary-General is still more disturbing. It shows that these representations, and indeed the Council's action last month, have had no effect. The Secretary-General tells us:

“UNIFIL now lacks the co-operation both of the *de facto* forces under Major Haddad and of the Israel Defence Forces, in relation to the complete deployment of UNIFIL in its entire area of operation” [S/13026 and Corr.1, para. 34].

Further, a pattern of behaviour has emerged on the part of the *de facto* forces which suggests a deliberate attempt to harass UNIFIL in its efforts to implement its mandate. The fact and the timing of the Israeli operation last night underline the Secretary-General's remarks. The British Government is deeply concerned by this development. We condemn both the terrorist attacks in Israel and the Israeli reprisals.

75. This refusal to co-operate with the peace-keeping force of the United Nations threatens the fragile equilibrium in which Lebanon now survives. The latest incidents underline the need for a renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL. My Government accepts the Secretary-General's recommendation that UNIFIL's mandate should be renewed for a further five months. If UNIFIL cannot fulfil its mandate, it will be difficult for it to continue. Its disappearance could have very serious consequences.

76. Over the next three months we hope to see a determined and realistic effort to extend the presence of the Lebanese Government, civilian as well as military, to the south. Meanwhile, I should like to thank the Secretary-General and his staff for their efforts. Our confidence as well as our sympathy goes out to Major-General Erskine, his officers and men, in the task they face, which is being so unwisely made so difficult for them.

77. Mr. MUTUKWA (Zambia): This is the second meeting of the Security Council this month at which you, Mr. President, have demonstrated your prudent skills as a diplomat in guiding the work of the Council in an exemplary manner.

78. My delegation joins those that have preceded me in welcoming the Foreign Minister of Norway in our midst at this meeting of the Council.

79. I should like also to express the appreciation of my delegation to the Secretary-General for the comprehensive, lucid and objective report which he has presented on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, which details the operations and the problems confronting the Force in Southern Lebanon. That report is as revealing as it is sobering. It tells it all.

80. The report, which covers the period from 14 September 1978 to 12 January 1979, provides a vivid account of the gravity and the deterioration of the situation in Southern Lebanon, in that ever-troubled region of the Middle East. In his concluding remarks, the Secretary-General has pointed out that:

“... although UNIFIL continued to play an important role in maintaining peace and stability in Southern

Lebanon... there was virtually no further progress in deploying the Force in the area in the south held by *de facto* armed groups. This means that, despite continuous and persistent efforts at all levels, UNIFIL has reached the end of its second mandate without completing the tasks assigned to it in Security Council resolution 425 (1978)." [Ibid., para. 33.]

81. UNIFIL has been unable to fulfil its mandate primarily because of the intransigent attitude of the Israeli authorities who are also arming and abetting the armed groups under Major Haddad. The Israeli authorities continue to incite some elements in Lebanon to create havoc for UNIFIL in furtherance of their expansionist policies. The report on UNIFIL's operations shows that there have been a number of violent incidents which have been provoked and perpetrated against the ever restrained United Nations peace-keeping forces. Those soldiers of peace are being harassed and humiliated by Israel and its puppets both overtly and covertly.

82. Surely Israel cannot expect to win sympathy from the international community and world public opinion if it specializes in harassing United Nations peace-keeping forces. Within the last 24 hours, it has been reported that Israel has once again attacked certain areas in Southern Lebanon in the vicinity of the United Nations forces. Israel should be reminded that the present conflict situation, which necessitated the creation of UNIFIL itself, was a result of the acts of aggression committed by Israel against Lebanon.

83. The Force has a vital role to play in the service of international peace and security. It continues to prevent the resumption of hostilities between the armed groups in the area. Without it, the civilian population in Southern Lebanon would have abandoned their homes to become refugees elsewhere. That was the situation prior to the arrival of the United Nations peace-keeping forces.

84. Zambia urges the Israeli authorities to facilitate the work of the Force. Furthermore, Israeli authorities should desist from linking the present peace-keeping operation to any incidents occurring inside Israel—a linkage that was the purpose of their letter contained in document S/13028. If Israel wants peace with its neighbours, the proper approach is to co-operate with the demands of the United Nations and not to remain recalcitrant.

85. My delegation supports the request to extend the mandate of UNIFIL for another five months; that is why we voted in favour of the draft resolution just adopted. We did so in earnest, notwithstanding the interim nature of UNIFIL. We support this move because there is no alternative option open to us at present.

86. It is abundantly clear, in my delegation's view, that the present state of affairs in Southern Lebanon cannot be permitted to drag on. A more permanent and practical resolution of the problem is both desirable and urgent. The international community has a duty to force Israel to leave Lebanon and thereby allow the Lebanese people to live in peace without external interference. It is also evident that a resolution of the larger conflict in the Middle East is intricately intertwined with the Lebanese problem of which we are seized.

87. In conclusion, the Zambian delegation wishes to pay a tribute to Major-General Erskine and the United Nations forces in the field for their dedicated services and sacrifices in the cause of peace. We also commend those countries which have contributed and those which continue to contribute forces and logistical support to UNIFIL. It is only that collective international support that can further the noble goals of international peace and security.

88. Mr. YOUNG (United States of America): I should first like to welcome most warmly to the Council the Foreign Minister of Norway, Mr. Frydenlund. It is most appropriate for him to join with us on this occasion in light of the important contribution Norway is making to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and the long-standing support of Norway for all United Nations peace-keeping activities.

89. The action we have taken today reaffirms the determination of the international community to help the Government of Lebanon to restore peace and order, as well as its sovereignty, in the south. We should have preferred renewal of UNIFIL's mandate for a full six months; none the less, our decision to renew it for five months reflects our belief that UNIFIL will continue to be of vital importance for the maintenance of peace in Southern Lebanon. The extension also reflects the deep appreciation of the international community for the work of the officers and men of UNIFIL, who have performed admirably in the face of a very difficult political-military situation. I should like to review that situation briefly.

90. When the Security Council established UNIFIL, no one thought its task would be easy. For some time Southern Lebanon had been the scene of violence and insecurity, and the events of this week demonstrate once again that that tragically remains the case as the Council meets here today. We deeply deplore the cycle of violence and bloodshed of the incidents and attacks which have occurred in these days at Ma'alot, at Jerusalem and, last night, in the area north of the Litani River. This cycle, whose cost in fatalities and injuries to innocent civilians inevitably deepens hostility, resentment, impedes our efforts to attain stability and peace in the area. We earnestly appeal to all concerned finally to renounce violence and to commit themselves instead to seeking only peaceful solutions, through UNIFIL and the Security Council, to the difficult dilemmas of Southern Lebanon.

91. The important element of the UNIFIL mandate—and its most difficult—the restoration of Lebanese governmental authority in Southern Lebanon, clearly remains unfulfilled. The Secretary-General's report points out that unco-operative attitudes on the part of some of those involved have much to do with that lack of progress.

92. My Government is deeply concerned about the situation. We are concerned that the militia forces supported by Israel have inhibited UNIFIL's freedom of movement and deployment in its area of operation. More seriously, those forces have engaged in indiscriminate shelling of UNIFIL's area of operation. But it would be a mistake to conclude that co-operation by Israel and by the militia alone would resolve the issue. Others must co-operate as well. Those who have directed the infiltration into the UNIFIL area and, through it, into Israel by armed

Palestinian elements must cease their activity; they too must respect UNIFIL's mandate.

93. We all should support and encourage the Government of Lebanon in its efforts to introduce into Southern Lebanon those civilian and military elements which will enable it to assert its authority and make it possible for UNIFIL finally to conclude its work. In that connexion, we note with pleasure the recent deployment of a limited number of Lebanese army personnel to work with UNIFIL contingents.

94. In sum, all elements must co-operate with UNIFIL. All must recognize that the international community intends to co-operate with the Government of Lebanon in restoring its effective authority in all areas within its internationally recognized boundaries. That is the only long-term solution to the problems of Southern Lebanon. UNIFIL is an interim Force with a limited objective; it cannot be allowed to become permanent.

95. In stressing the need for co-operation by all parties, I wish also to point out, as the Secretary-General does, that the problem of Southern Lebanon is related to the problem of Lebanon as a whole. Positive efforts for national reconstruction and reconciliation are now being made by President Sarkis and his Government. The success of those efforts, in our view, can have significant benefits for the situation in Southern Lebanon. My Government strongly supports those efforts, which will require the co-operation of all parties concerned. We urge that all Lebanon's friends and neighbours should give their full support to the Lebanese Government.

96. In concluding, let me once again express my Government's profound admiration for the superb leadership shown by the Secretary-General, for the staff of the Secretariat and especially for Major-General Erskine and the outstanding performance of all UNIFIL's officers and men. They have set a standard of excellence for the Organization and we should all be proud of them.

97. Mr. KAISER (Bangladesh): I join other representatives here in expressing to you, Mr. President, our sincere admiration for the skill, ability and wisdom you have shown in guiding our deliberations in the last few days.

98. My delegation also welcomes very warmly the Foreign Minister of Norway, whose presence adds lustre to the proceedings of the Council. He represents a country that is held in very high esteem in my country. We are especially appreciative of the fact that Norway has undertaken to participate so ungrudgingly in the United Nations peace-keeping operation and in the furtherance of the objectives of the Charter.

99. The Secretary-General's report and the additional information provided by him today gives a lucid, dispassionate and incisive picture of the situation in Lebanon. It serves once again to highlight his proven qualities of impartiality, objectivity and responsibility. I take this opportunity to record formally our appreciation and admiration for the Secretary-General, his devoted staff, the Commander, Major-General Erskine, and the officers and soldiers of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for their unstinted dedication to the pursuit of the fulfilment of the difficult mandate that has been entrusted

to them. The situation in Southern Lebanon remains grim and foreboding, a situation that is perceptibly deteriorating into an impenetrable impasse. The Secretary-General has bluntly stated the obvious, that despite continuous and persistent efforts at all levels, UNIFIL has reached the end of its second mandate without completing the tasks assigned to it in Security Council resolution 425 (1978), the primary aim of which was to augment the military credibility and control of UNIFIL in the zone, to promote a return to normal conditions and to restore the effective authority of Lebanon in the area.

100. The situation obtaining today constitutes a serious challenge to the continuance of the peace-keeping operation, to the credibility of the Security Council and to the moral and political conscience of the Governments and peoples of the world. It is, as the Secretary-General characterized it, an impossible situation, an unacceptable situation. This is dramatically highlighted by Israel's attack last night deep within Lebanon, openly flouting its aggression and defiance of the United Nations. The United Nations force in Southern Lebanon not only have been obstructed and frustrated in their tasks, hamstrung as they are under terms of their mandate by the inability to retaliate through use of force, but have been subjected to continuous harassment, premeditated obstruction, threats and armed attacks, and even abduction by armed elements much larger and better equipped than they are. What is perhaps even more untenable is the humiliation that they must suffer in the pursuit of peace. In the final analysis, the treatment accorded to UNIFIL is a slur on the collective efforts of mankind and a slap in the face of the United Nations. It is a manifestly illegal and unjust situation which can no longer be countenanced without abdication of the Council's responsibility.

101. My Government has carefully studied the report of the Secretary-General and we fully endorse his observations and conclusions. In supporting the resolution we have just adopted, I should like to elaborate our concern on four essential aspects.

102. First, I shall refer to the decision whether or not to renew the mandate of UNIFIL. This decision has posed a fundamental dilemma, a choice between unpalatable alternatives and a situation of, as it were, double indemnity. On the one hand it is clearly recognizable that over a period of 10 months UNIFIL's role in Southern Lebanon has been effectively frustrated, circumvented and even truncated. It has not been able to complete its mandate, to say the least. But what is more dangerous is that its presence has been subtly distorted and manipulated to subvert the purposes for which it was originally intended and give it an altogether different one. Today, UNIFIL serves in essence to protect not the parties who were victims of invasion and aggression but the interests of those who initiated and inflicted the crisis on this area. Southern Lebanon has now become a *de facto* "security belt" for the aggressor, and UNIFIL is being used to perpetuate this position as a policeman. Indeed, UNIFIL authorities and the Secretary-General are being blatantly accused of permitting infiltration into this zone by Palestinians. Such an accusation is as incongruous as it is despicable and illegal. On the other hand, there can be no doubt but that UNIFIL has made a valuable contribution in maintaining peace in a large part of the area, by restoring normalcy, promoting the return of the original inhabitants and bolstering their confidence. UNIFIL moreover has performed a crucial preventive role by

containing the resumption of hostilities and their potential escalation into a more explosive danger to peace and security. It cannot be doubted that UNIFIL's removal would create panic and chaos among the inhabitants of the area and result in a return to a shooting war.

103. What I have said serves to highlight in some part the complexities of the situation. The Secretary-General himself has pinpointed the dangers of assuming an automatic renewal of UNIFIL, which has all along been envisaged as temporary and interim in nature. The danger is obvious. UNIFIL cannot be taken for granted by any party; its role cannot be reduced to the limited one of preserving in perpetuity a state of nebulous and suspended peace or of providing routine logistic support towards that end. Also, UNIFIL cannot be used, as has been aptly pointed out, to sustain a temporary respite after which the parties concerned and the Council itself can tackle anew a solution to the crisis.

104. The question arises, in the circumstances, whether the Council is right in renewing the mandate of UNIFIL or whether it should now seriously consider either its withdrawal or the strengthening of its mandate into an enforcement role under relevant provisions of the Charter. For our part, Bangladesh believes that given a lack of political will, we have no alternative but to accede to the renewal of the mandate. We reiterate, however, that this cannot be construed as an automatic right to serve limited ends and a reduced role, or one that should be allowed to be subverted to serve ulterior motives. The permanent members of the Council in particular have a clear responsibility to promote effectively UNIFIL's competence and capacity to fulfil its defined tasks.

105. The second aspect with which we are concerned relates to the duration of UNIFIL's mandate. Again we were faced with a choice affected by some of the factors I have already elaborated. Bangladesh has taken note of the Secretary-General's view that UNIFIL should continue for a further period of six months. We have also noted that this view has the concurrence of the Lebanese Government. The rationale for the extension by six months was intimately connected to logistic and administrative problems involved, and such an extension is in our opinion both justifiable and valid. However, the concerns expressed in support of a shorter period of four months so as to maintain political pressure and a psychological impetus for concerted action appear to us also to be constructive.

106. Bangladesh has supported, though somewhat reluctantly, the compromise decision for an extension of the mandate by five months. We agree that the real test for such a decision will be the effectiveness with which the mandate can be fulfilled and the psychological support given to the Lebanese people and Government by UNIFIL's presence. We also believe the longer period could have been justified because the resolution provided an essential watershed period after three months to review the situation.

107. The third aspect to which I wish to address myself concerns what Bangladesh considers to be essentially the hard core, the crux, of the problem: why UNIFIL's role has been so successfully and continuously circumscribed and frustrated. Successive reports of the Secretary-General have unambiguously and repeatedly indicted those responsible for this failure, namely, Israel and the outlaw forces under Haddad. Not only has co-operation not been forth-

coming—as further evidenced recently by the unresponsive meeting with the Israeli Defence Minister, Weizman—but overt opposition and resistance have been deliberately incited and escalated into a consistent pattern of behaviour. It is also evident to any objective observer that Israel's acceptance of a United Nations force in Lebanon and of its mandate was basically a cover-up for its real intentions—the maintenance of a *de facto* occupation zone in Lebanon, a vacuum so to speak, with the United Nations to police its outermost limits as an essential buffer and the outlaw elements of Haddad to mask Israel's dominance over this area and to conceal Israel's aim to perpetuate its control. Evidence of Israel's collusion with Haddad is now incontrovertible and needs no further elaboration.

108. The Secretary-General's several reports have all also clearly underscored the moderation and restraint of the Palestinians, and indeed the active positive co-operation and collaboration of the Lebanese forces, which are increasing their joint actions with UNIFIL. The presence in the Council of some of the Lebanese liaison officers is undeniable proof of their co-operation.

109. These remarks have brought clearly into focus the direction along which the Council must proceed. The consensus statement of 8 December 1978 [2106th meeting] indicated the fundamental premises for the Council's action. We are happy to note that these have progressed further in the present resolution, and that for the first time blame has been squarely placed on those responsible for the crisis in Southern Lebanon and on those who continue to sustain and foment the problem. We are conscious of and fully support the desire of the Council to act within the bounds of moderation and restraint. Nevertheless, Bangladesh still retains some moral and mental reservations with regard to the resolution, particularly since it would have preferred a more telling indictment and a condemnation of those who have initiated and fueled this untenable situation. In our opinion, the Council should have directly and clearly called upon Israel to desist from interfering with the operation of UNIFIL in Southern Lebanon and to cease forthwith its continued logistic support and military collaboration with the outlaw Haddad forces operating in that area. Clearly, Israel has a preponderant role to play in facilitating the exercising by UNIFIL of effective control in that region. Its own good faith is at stake. Bangladesh also believes that a cardinal element that required specific reiteration was the call of 8 December upon all Member States that are in a position to do so to bring their influence to bear on those concerned—and particularly on Israel—so that UNIFIL may discharge its responsibilities unimpeded. We see that the resolution has included this point.

110. The fourth aspect on which I wish to touch concerns the question of the time-table, or phased programme, for the full implementation of UNIFIL's mandate. Bangladesh fully endorses the introduction of this new element into the resolution and the statement of the President of the Council. For some time now, the Secretary-General in his reports has been underscoring what he considered to be the "essential pre-condition" for the effective functioning of UNIFIL in the remainder of its area of operation, "without any prejudice" to the full mandate entrusted to UNIFIL [S/12929 of 18 November 1978, para. 15, and S/13026 and Corr.1, para. 21].

111. We believe that these suggestions constitute the first step towards the ultimate aim of restoring not only the military credibility of UNIFIL in the entire area of Southern Lebanon, but also the deployment of the armed forces of Lebanon and its civilian presence in this region, thereby facilitating the return of the original Lebanese inhabitants to their homes in safety and confidence and, finally, the establishment of internationally recognized boundaries. The charge upon the Lebanese Government towards these ends is clear, and every encouragement and assistance must be provided to their efforts, in close co-operation with the Secretary-General and UNIFIL. We are aware that, given the constricted and complex ground position, these tasks cannot be defined with any degree of precision. Nevertheless, some beginning must be made towards the ultimate goal of our efforts. The ultimate yardstick for the Secretary-General's success will remain the degree of co-operation forthcoming from the parties directly concerned and the sanction that the Council can bring to bear on those who impede this process.

112. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like first of all to welcome to the work of the Security Council Mr. Knut Frydenlund, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Norway, a country with which the Soviet Union maintains relations of good neighbourliness and co-operation.

113. Today, as happened more than once last year, we have been compelled to return to the question of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon in connexion with the abnormal situation that for a long time now has existed in the south of that country. We continue to witness the explosion of mines and of shells, flying bullets, falling bombs and the death of innocent peaceful inhabitants.

114. The question arises: What is it that has changed in Southern Lebanon since March 1978, when Israel committed its act of aggression against this peace-loving Arab State, an act that entailed a considerable loss of human life and a tremendous amount of material damage? That act of aggression gave rise at that time to widespread and justified indignation throughout the world and became a subject for consideration by the Security Council, which, on 19 March of last year, adopted resolution 425 (1978), demanding that Israel should immediately cease its military action against Lebanon, withdraw forthwith its forces from all Lebanese territory and strictly respect the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of that country. However, during the last 10 months the only thing we have seen is Israel, on various pretexts, attempting to sabotage the precise implementation of the Security Council's decisions.

115. Up till June 1978, Israel had recourse to all kinds of different devices and subterfuges in order to avoid withdrawing its troops from the whole territory of Lebanon. Subsequently, formally withdrawing its troops, it actually handed over control over important frontier areas not to United Nations forces, as provided for by decisions of the Security Council and as was called for by the Lebanese Government, but to anti-Government armed units under the command of Haddad, which are purely and simply agents in the service of Israel. That all went to show that Israel had no intention of respecting the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon but, rather, was striving to leave the door open for itself for new acts of provocation and aggression against that country.

116. This has been confirmed by many facts. Over the last month alone, members of the Security Council have learned of incidents of almost incessant artillery fire conducted by the Israeli army against peaceful settlements in Southern Lebanon, raids by Israeli military patrols and squads penetrating deep into Lebanese territory, air raids by the Israeli air force on Palestinian refugee camps, and also diversionary actions and artillery fire from ships and launches of the Israeli navy. In all those acts of aggression, the only victims were the unarmed civilian population.

117. On 8 December [2106th meeting], a statement of the President of the Council was confirmed and approved by consensus. It contained a direct demand addressed to Israel to desist forthwith from interfering with UNIFIL's operations in Southern Lebanon and to comply fully and without any delay with resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978).

118. In the report submitted by the Secretary-General for the consideration of the Council, responsibility for the continuing tension in Southern Lebanon is unambiguously attributed to Israel and its protégés, the anti-Government detachment under the command of Haddad. The Council cannot but heed the warning of the Secretary-General that the acts of provocation on the part of Israel and its protégés are clearly deliberate in nature and that, inasmuch as they apparently are going to continue, "it may be necessary for the Council to consider what course of action would be warranted to deal with this situation" [S/13026 and Corr. 1, para. 35].

119. On 15 January, Israeli naval vessels subjected a Palestinian refugee camp to artillery fire and carried out a landing on Lebanese territory. On 20 December last year, the Israeli air force bombed settlements in Southern Lebanon, an act which caused casualties among the peaceful population and widespread destruction. It is clear that the Security Council cannot overlook those blatant acts of aggression or the flagrant violation of the sovereignty of the State of Lebanon.

120. Even now, during the Council's discussion of the question of renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL, Israel, in cynical disregard for the will of the international community and the decisions of the Council, is intensifying its policy of aggression and international terror. Last night, Israel, using aircraft and tanks, carried out a new, barbarous raid on settlements in Lebanon and Palestinian refugee camps, which left numerous casualties among the peaceful population.

121. The constant acts of aggression on the part of Israel against Lebanon, the continuing flagrant Israeli intervention in the internal affairs of the State of Lebanon, serve only to complicate further an already dangerous situation in that area. Israel and its protectors are doing everything in their power to perpetuate their seizure of Arab territories and to deprive a whole people—the Palestine Arabs—of their inalienable national rights. The policy of separate deals pursued by Israel and Egypt with the active participation of the United States is inimical to the interests of bringing about a just and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East and encourages Israel in its attempts to consolidate the results of its aggression against Arab countries. It is only natural that the policy of separate deals should have met with broad condemnation throughout the world, primarily

from the Arab States and peoples themselves. A major achievement of the patriotic forces of the Arab world was the results of the Baghdad conference, the decisions of which are playing an important part in the struggle against the policy of separate anti-Arab deals and for the attainment of a just settlement of the Middle East problem.

122. There is a path towards the establishment of lasting peace in the Middle East, although the approaches to it have now been essentially blocked by those who have turned from that path in the pursuit of one-sided advantages for themselves. This is the path of a comprehensive settlement which would make it possible for the Arab countries to recover the lands seized from them in 1967 and enable the Arab people of Palestine to exercise their lawful national rights, including their right to self-determination and the creation of their own State, while enabling all States of the area to enjoy the guaranteed right to a secure existence and development. It is precisely this kind of settlement which the Soviet Union and other fraternal socialist countries have been supporting. They stated this once again at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty held at last November in Moscow.

123. Taking into account the position of the Arab parties directly interested, which have declared their support for an extension of the mandate of UNIFIL, the delegation of the Soviet Union did not object to the Security Council's adoption of the relevant decision. However, the Soviet delegation confirms the position of the Soviet Union with regard to UNIFIL on, *inter alia*, questions related to the direction of those forces by the Council, the principles for the selection of national contingents and the system of financing them. We wish to stress once again that all the costs connected with the elimination of the consequences of Israel's armed aggression against Lebanon should be borne by the aggressor.

124. In conclusion, the Soviet delegation wishes to express its serious dissatisfaction at the fact that the resolution of the Council does not contain a firm condemnation of Israel for its continuing sabotage of Council decisions or for its incessant acts of aggression and flagrant intervention in the internal affairs of Lebanon. In the light of recent events in Southern Lebanon, this condemnation is more necessary than ever. We believe that the adoption of effective measures to ensure compliance with the decisions adopted by the Council in connexion with Israel's aggression against Lebanon is long overdue. It is a secret to no one that this has been hindered primarily by the position of the United States, which maintains "special" relations with Israel and has been blocking such effective measures.

125. Mr. GUIMARÃES (Portugal): Before I proceed with my statement, I should like to join other delegations in greeting Mr. Knut Frydenlund, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Norway—a country with which Portugal has the most cordial and close relations—whose presence here today is particularly appropriate, taking into account the important role Norway has played in United Nations peace-keeping operations.

126. Portugal voted in favour of the resolution just adopted by the Council, in the belief that the withdrawal of UNIFIL from its area of operation would in the present conditions only worsen the situation in Southern Lebanon and, as the Secretary-General stresses in his report, "disrupt the fragile peace which now exists" there [*ibid.*, para. 40].

127. Furthermore, we supported this resolution because we felt that, despite all the difficulties it has met, UNIFIL has played an important role in restoring peace, security and normal living conditions for a large part of the inhabitants of its area of operation. The sufferings these populations have had to undergo during recent years have been once again brought to our minds today by an attack carried out on Lebanese territory, which we cannot but strongly deplore. These sufferings are more than enough to justify all our efforts to spare them from the horrors of war and to assure them a life as secure as possible under the prevailing conditions in that region. The position of the Lebanese Government favourable to the renewal of UNIFIL's mandate is therefore understandable and has our support.

128. Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the serious difficulties United Nations forces have met with while performing the tasks assigned them by the Security Council. We learn from the Secretary-General's report that the interference with UNIFIL action by the *de facto* Lebanese armed groups has, if anything, stiffened and that these forces, as well as the Israel Defence Forces, bear major responsibilities in impeding "the complete deployment of UNIFIL in its entire area of operation" [*ibid.*, para. 34].

129. We are deeply concerned with these facts and we deplore the attitude of the parties that do not fully cooperate with UNIFIL. Any obstruction brought about to the deployment of a United Nations peace-keeping force or any interference aimed at making more difficult the accomplishment of its mandate is, in our view, an unacceptable defiance of the Security Council's authority, which cannot but meet with our strong disapproval.

130. We are aware that the situation existing in the area where UNIFIL operates is closely linked with political developments in Lebanon and, indeed, in the whole afflicted region, but we believe that an over-all settlement of the Middle East problem will be much easier to reach if sectorial problems are previously solved.

131. My delegation therefore believes that there can be no excuse for the lack of co-operation with UNIFIL that some of the concerned parties have shown, notwithstanding all the calls made upon them to collaborate in the implementation of Security Council resolutions, thus creating the risk of jeopardizing the co-operation UNIFIL has so far received from other elements.

132. We acknowledge the progress—however small—achieved in the period to which the Secretary-General's report refers on the strengthening of the authority and presence of the Lebanese Government in Southern Lebanon. We do hope that these steps will mark the beginning of a path leading to the full restoration of Lebanese authority in that area.

133. Nevertheless, we think it should be stressed that the renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL cannot be assumed to be automatic and indefinite and that all the parties concerned must endeavour to make their best efforts to enable UNIFIL fully to carry out its mandate before its eventual withdrawal.

134. Before I conclude, I should like to join with others around this table in commending the Secretary-General for

the clear and helpful report he has presented to us and also to express to him our gratitude for the skilful way in which he and his assistants have been carrying out their complex duties concerning UNIFIL.

135. I should also like to pay a tribute to Major-General Erskine and to all the officers and men serving under his command, as well as to UNIFIL civilian personnel, for the devoted and courageous way in which they have discharged the difficult task assigned to them, under the pressures and dangers the situation involves. We hope that their efforts will contribute to restore real and lasting peace in Lebanon, a country with a rich cultural heritage and a long tradition of tolerance whose recent plight has so deeply moved the people of Portugal.

136. Mr. FUENTES IBÁÑEZ (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is a great pleasure for me to welcome His Excellency the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Norway, whose presence in this chamber is a further demonstration of the constant interest of his Government in the United Nations and especially in the work of the Security Council.

137. The Council has once again renewed the mandate conferred upon the Secretary-General under its resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) for the establishment and functioning of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. This additional extension, which follows the adoption of resolution 434 (1978), is taking place at a time when there is visible concern and discouragement at the little progress achieved since the Force was established.

138. It should be recalled that the decision of March last year gave rise to new hopes. It was thought that the efforts and the joining of wills that that represented would be duly appreciated and that it would be possible to count on the co-operation of all forces involved, regardless of how opposed their interests might be, and that the reiteration of the international community's will for peace might have a pacifying effect, permit the restoration of the full authority of the Lebanese Government and make it possible for its long-suffering people to live in peace.

139. Unfortunately, this has not been the case and this has created a climate of dissatisfaction and, one might say, discouragement. As has happened in other cases, the Interim Force is tending to lose its temporary nature and, rather than just an emergency Force, it is becoming an expeditionary Force whose mandate, when it cannot promptly achieve the objectives for which it was established, has to be renewed periodically. One may conclude that this could become a routine and automatic action that in fact contravenes the reasons for which the Force was established. To prevent this happening, readjustments must be made; pressure must be brought to bear on the reluctant sectors. And that is the reason why the Council has today adopted two decisions. In the first, it reiterates the objectives for which the Force was established and the essential, imperative need for co-operation on the part of all parties concerned in the elimination of the obstacles in the way of more effective implementation of resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978). Although it has finally been decided that the mandate will be extended for five months, a new provision is included

for a report to be made within 90 days on progress achieved.

140. Since the Force lacks the possibility of actually making war, its capacity for action is limited to mere vigilance and persuasion, short of dissuasion. That circumstance leads to the danger I have already mentioned, that the Force could become a simple observer and one with limited means for resolving situations or even for defending the authority with which it is invested. Here we see once more the dilemma of the authority of United Nations peace-keeping forces. This is a problem faced by the Security Council and by the United Nations itself, and from that dilemma one can see the difficulty of resolving problems that involve the vital interests of peoples, interests which at times challenge the very principles of morality and justice. These are the problems that generate the wars that afflict peoples and in the face of which action by the Council alone is not sufficient to restore peace, unless that action is accompanied by political will on the part of those that are most called upon to co-operate in the implementation of the Council's decisions.

141. But we are not here to speculate. We must act in a direct and objective manner. The Force must be a persuasive entity, one enjoying the complete support of the international community. That is the intent of operative paragraph 6, which indicates that, in favour of peace, influence should be brought to bear from outside the area of conflict on those concerned, especially by the Member States that are in a position to exercise influence on the parties to the conflict.

142. Although in principle my delegation feels that every resolution adopted by the Security Council should of itself unequivocally justify the measures that have been judged appropriate in each case, in the consideration of the renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL, it has been decided to make the Council's action even stronger by a statement by the President. In spite of the foregoing, my delegation saw nothing against associating itself with the feelings of the majority if that will clarify and strengthen the co-operation between the international community, represented by the Security Council, and the Government of Lebanon. It is essential that the latter should continue its efforts for the full restoration of its authority and for the establishment of a gradual programme of measures which will result in the greater effectiveness of the Force in re-establishing the full authority of the Lebanese Government. So far so good, but there is a new element requiring a re-examination of the situation in the near future in order to find more effective ways and means to secure the implementation of the terms of resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978).

143. Some of the comments I have made stem from a valuable and objective source: the report of the Secretary-General in document S/13026 and Corr.1. That report reflects the disappointment we all share. But despite that disappointment there is also a renewed affirmation of faith that we are in duty bound to support, especially those Governments that are in a position to influence all the forces involved in the conflict.

144. We are certain that Major-General Erskine and his officers and men, as well as the civilian support personnel, will continue to serve the objectives of the Organization in a spirit of self-sacrifice, dedication and

competence, as they have done up to the present, and that they will continue to do so until they have fulfilled their mission.

145. Lastly, I should like to commend you, Mr. President, for the outstanding manner in which you have been guiding our work. This has not surprised us, since we are familiar with your talent and experience, and is a guarantee that we shall fulfil our responsibilities.

146. Mr. HRČKA (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): I would first associate myself with those delegations that have welcomed to our midst the Foreign Minister of Norway.

147. The Security Council is meeting again after four months to consider the question of the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. As the report of the Secretary-General shows, the situation in that area has not only failed to improve but, because of the continuing interference by Israel in the internal affairs of Lebanon, has become explosive, even more unstable and ever more complicated.

148. The resumption and perpetuation of the legal power of the Lebanese Government over the whole territory of the State is one of the tasks facing the Force. It is a task that still remains unfulfilled because of the refusal of the Israeli Government to abide by the decisions of the Council, in particular resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978). As the report states, such a state of affairs cannot fail to encourage the Council to consider the question of "what course of action would be warranted to deal with this situation" [*S/13026 and Corr.1, para. 35*]. We entirely agree with the comments of the Secretary-General

"that the situation in Southern Lebanon cannot be divorced from the situation in the rest of the country . . . and that external factors have a bearing on [the Force's] possibilities of making further progress" [*ibid., para. 37*].

149. Indeed, why should Israel want to cease its intervention in the internal affairs of Lebanon? After all, it is being supported by every possible means. It is being treated most politely as an irreplaceable ally in that region by those very forces that want to pose before the world as friends of the Arab peoples. In a word, as long as support persists for the aggressive policy of the Israeli Government, Israel's policy of provocation against Lebanon will continue.

150. We cannot and should not look in Southern Lebanon for any influence of the Camp David agreements, because their purpose is not a just and lasting peace in the Middle East; it is not the satisfying of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine; it is not the withdrawal by Israel from all the Arab territories it has occupied; it is not a comprehensive and collective solution to the conflict within the framework of the Geneva Peace Conference. It is nothing more than a separate deal behind the back of the Arab peoples and at the expense of their vital interests.

151. The most recent Israeli invasion of the territory of Lebanon is only one further piece of evidence that Israel is continuing its aggression against neighbouring Arab countries and disregarding the efforts of the United Nations and the dispatch of the United Nations Interim Force into the area. This intrusion goes to show once more that

conditions of peace and the restoration of the authority of the Lebanese Government over the whole territory of the country can be brought about only by means of increasing pressure on Israel. In this sense we view positively certain aspects of the statement made today by the President of the Council.

152. In this situation, the position of the Czechoslovak delegation remains unchanged. We want to express our regret at the fact that, in spite of the difficulty and danger of the situation in Southern Lebanon, and in spite of Israel's latest attack upon Lebanon, the Council has not succeeded in arriving at an agreement on the question of condemning Israel for its continuing intervention in the internal affairs of a Member State or for its failure to comply with the resolutions of the Council.

153. We once again confirm the reservations and the position with regard to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon that our delegation explained at the meetings of the Council on 19 March, 3 May and 18 September 1978 [*2074th, 2076th and 2085th meetings*]. We also wish to confirm our position with regard to the financing of the Force. This time too, therefore, the Czechoslovak delegation abstained in the voting on the resolution just adopted.

154. Mr. HARRIMAN (Nigeria): Mr. President, I am sure that my delegation welcomed you earlier, but I have great personal pleasure in welcoming you to the presidency of the Council. I always recall how apparently enthused you were every time some of us whom you described virtually as men from the political planet descended on the Group of 77. You always regarded our participation as stimulating and refreshing. May I reciprocate by saying that we welcome your versatility in transforming your role as a keen negotiator of the Group of 77 on the new international economic order into one on international peace and security. We have seen your prowess in the one and we are assured of your success in the other.

155. The presence of the Foreign Minister of Norway, Mr. Knut Frydenlund, here today is a reflection of the dedication of the Government and people of Norway to international peace and security, to human values and to a better world.

156. My delegation appreciates immensely the lucid and succinct report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon.

157. I am particularly happy that Nigeria continues to be able to play its part in the peace-keeping responsibilities of the Security Council. This we feel obliged to do as members of the Council and as a country that believes that universal peace cannot be achieved if situations like that in Lebanon and other international brush-fires are not quickly and effectively contained. Nigeria was thus very pleased to have been able to meet the additional requirements of UNIFIL following the withdrawal of some Iranian and French contingents.

158. The whole episode of Southern Lebanon appears to be nothing but a red herring to divert attention from the eroding, if not crumbling, credibility of Israel in the over-all Middle Eastern arena.

159. Israeli intransigence is demoralizing to UNIFIL forces. Most of them—especially those from Africa—still

living in tents in wintry conditions are being continuously humiliated by Israel and its armed stooges led by Major Haddad. Supply routes continue to be harassed, leading to greater cost of operation.

160. The contingents of the Force, without the authority to fight back, have been able only to look on while civilian settlements in the UNIFIL area have been shelled and fired upon with automatic weapons by the so-called Christian militia acting for Israel by proxy.

161. Israel's cowardly invasion of Lebanon yesterday and the boastful glee expressed at least by the press at Israel having crossed United Nations lines is another reflection and evidence of an attempt to discredit UNIFIL. This process of defiance of the United Nations by Israel is obviously a process aimed at deterring the United Nations, provoking its exit and thereby enabling Israel to implement its policies of expansionism.

162. In conclusion, my delegation would like to pay tribute to the Commander of UNIFIL, Major-General Erskine, his staff, both civilian and military, and the officers and men of the contingents of UNIFIL for their courage, dedication and sustained discipline in the face of a very difficult and sometimes dangerous situation. To have kept their composure in spite of deliberate provocation from Israel's client agents in the region of their operations is no small achievement.

163. In order to accelerate the process of implementation of UNIFIL's mandate, the Council must reaffirm the principle of strict respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. We should always keep in clear perspective this cardinal aspect of the Force's mandate in order to avoid the unpleasant and, indeed, unacceptable situation of UNIFIL being institutionalized into a force for the protection of Israel's northern border.

164. In this regard, we deplore vehemently Israel's defiance of the decisions and authority of the Security Council. Should Israel persist in its acts of recalcitrance and defiance, the Council will be left with no option other than to take appropriate measures under the Charter to compel Israel to co-operate with UNIFIL in the fulfilment of its mandate.

165. My delegation believes that the cost to the international community of Israeli aggression in the Middle East is becoming intolerable. Last year we had 10 formal meetings of the Council on UNIFIL alone, the largest number of such meetings held on any issue apart from Namibia, the meetings on which also added up to 10, and many more agonizing hours in informal consultations, also at great cost. We had initially supported the Secretary-General's recommendation for a six-month renewal period for mandate of UNIFIL but reluctantly agreed with the consensus contained in the resolution just adopted. However, we wish to stress the fact that this gesture was designed to facilitate the work and operations of UNIFIL since the longer period naturally provides for more viable planning by UNIFIL. At the same time, we feel concerned that a shorter renewal period might lend credence to or heighten the current atmosphere of uncertainty leading to unexpected explosions of no small dimension. The Council should not give any impression that it is scuttling its responsibilities with regard to international peace and

security and that is why we fully supported the six-month extension period for the Force's mandate, as recommended earlier. In addition to the proposal to reassess the situation after a three-month period, we insist that the issue should be kept under constant review.

166. Finally, I should like to pay tribute to the Secretary-General for his endeavours to enable UNIFIL to fulfil its mandate at an early date.

167. I cannot but conclude by praying that those Powers which have the leverage with Israel will use that influence to prod Israel into ending its defiance of concerted international decisions.

168. The PRESIDENT: I shall now make a statement on behalf of the delegation of JAMAICA.

169. I wish at the outset to welcome His Excellency, the Foreign Minister of Norway, Mr. Knut Frydenlund, to this meeting of the Security Council. His participation is particularly appreciated since it underlines Norway's interest in the question which is before us, an interest which has already been demonstrated by its participation in UNIFIL as a contributing Government.

170. My delegation echoes the expressions of gratitude and appreciation already addressed to the Secretary-General by several representatives for the excellent report in document S/13026 and Corr.1. That report, to which I shall refer again, has greatly enhanced our understanding of the grave and complex situation in Lebanon.

171. The issue with which the Council is now concerned is one which critically tests the capacity of the United Nations to respond to its Charter provisions for peace-keeping. At one level, our task today might be seen as a simple matter of renewing the mandate of UNIFIL in the face of the continuing critical situation in Southern Lebanon. But my delegation also takes full account of the difficulties and limitations in respect of peace-keeping machinery, and the fact that the situation in Southern Lebanon is an integral part of the wider and decidedly complex Middle East problem.

172. My delegation was prepared to support fully the renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL for a period of six months. We were prepared to do so in the light of the imperative need for this and the significant contribution which the Force has made in the area to which it is assigned. We were prepared to do so because of our belief in the need to make every possible effort to prevent further deterioration in the situation in Lebanon and to contribute to the maintenance of the fragile peace in the Middle East.

173. Jamaica takes this position, despite the inescapable fact that, in the 10 months of its existence, UNIFIL has been prevented from fully implementing its mandate, and that the attitudes and actions of certain parties directly involved place serious limits on the prospects of UNIFIL's success in the period ahead. The report submitted by the Secretary-General makes it quite clear that despite the Force's creditable efforts, the objectives of the Security Council are being thwarted by the lack of co-operation of the Lebanese *de facto* armed groups and the Israeli authorities. My delegation is most concerned that the attitudes of these two parties have negated the Force's efforts to extend its area of

operation into Southern Lebanon, in fulfilment of its mandate. We share the concern, expressed by the Secretary-General in his report, at

“a pattern of behaviour on the part of the *de facto* forces that would suggest a deliberate intention to harass UNIFIL in its efforts fully to implement resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978)” [S/13026 and Corr.1, para. 35].

174. It is to the credit of UNIFIL that, despite the serious operational obstacles and the consequent frustration that it experiences, it has made such a valuable contribution to peace in Lebanon. In its area of operation, the Force's efforts have restored life to villages which were emptied by the previous military situation, and have created an atmosphere of security in which people can once more seek to lead relatively normal lives. The dedication and discipline of the troops in the face of a dangerous situation, in which there have been 6 soldiers killed and 67 wounded in action, are highly commendable. Their conduct is a tribute to the countries which have sponsored them. My delegation adds its sincere expression of gratitude to Major-General Erskine and the troops of UNIFIL for their efforts in the cause of international peace and security.

175. Jamaica, none the less, cannot accept that UNIFIL should become a permanent fixture in Lebanon. The presence of the Force should not be a factor aiding the congealing of the present situation in which the Lebanese territory is divided and its legal Government deprived of the opportunity of exercising its rightful authority. My delegation wishes to reaffirm the applicability to the Lebanese situation of the principles of respect for sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity and of non-intervention in internal affairs. We therefore deplore the support by the Israeli authorities of the Lebanese *de facto* armed groups. We call upon the Israeli authorities and these *de facto* armed groups to co-operate with UNIFIL and to cease those activities which prevent the legal Government of Lebanon from exercising its authority in the southern section of the country. Jamaica believes that those countries that are in a position to exert influence on Israel and the *de facto* armed forces should take such action in support of peace in the area and also of the Security Council in respect of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and international security. In view of our position on this issue, my delegation voted in favour of the resolution which has now been adopted by the Council.

176. Before concluding this statement, I must, on behalf of my delegation, refer to the recent action by Israeli forces, on which the Secretary-General has just reported to the Council. This attack is clear evidence of Israel's refusal to co-operate with UNIFIL. The preambular paragraphs of the resolution which has just been adopted by the Council draw attention to the grave situation in Southern Lebanon resulting from obstacles placed against the full implementation of the mandate of UNIFIL and state that “the continuation of the situation constitutes a challenge to” the authority of the Security Council “and a defiance of its resolutions”. The recent attack must be seen as an outright defiance of the Council, not only because the Israeli invading troops crossed the UNIFIL area of operation, but also because the invasion was effected at the height of the Council's consideration of the renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL.

177. It therefore becomes increasingly urgent and necessary that all Member States which are in a position to do so should use every effort to secure Israel's co-operation with UNIFIL.

178. My delegation deplores all acts of violence which disturb the already precarious situation in Southern Lebanon and present further difficulties in the way of the Force's task.

179. Returning now to my role as PRESIDENT of the Council, I call on the next speaker, the representative of Lebanon.

180. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): I should like to thank you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council for granting my request to take part in this debate. Given the late hour, I shall try not to abuse the time of the Council, though I do want to stress some of the points that have already been made by members.

181. I should like to associate my delegation with the remarks made in the Council in welcoming the Foreign Minister of Norway. His presence here at a debate concerning my country represents to us in Lebanon a further sign of the devotion of his country, his Government, its delegation here, and the soldiers of his country in Lebanon to the cause of peace and justice, and offers testimony of how much they have all contributed to that cause.

182. I also wish to welcome the presence of Major-General Erskine. I believe that his presence with us here will enable him, when he returns to the very difficult task which he is performing, to convey to his men the importance which the Security Council and the world community attach to the magnificent work which they are all doing in the face of the tremendous difficulties which confront them.

183. I shall not follow the conventional pattern of congratulating you, Mr. President, on assuming the presidency of the Council, as this chamber still echoes with the unanimous expressions of praise for your leadership during the past debate. Hardly could such a delicate task and in such a tragic context be performed with more dexterity, objectivity and genuine concern for peace and justice. I should like to add that your leadership in the long consultations that took place before the Council voted on the draft resolution is in itself another tribute to you. We all thought that this was going to be another solemn and quiet debate on the renewal of the UNIFIL mandate. However, the Israeli aggression last night, which was an aggression primarily against UNIFIL, makes it imperative that I should comment on it, and I should like to reserve my right to make further comments in the Council on this issue at a later stage if necessary.

184. We lodge with you and with the Council the strongest protest against an inadmissible act which we think has been carefully timed to take place, as you said, Mr. President, while we are meeting to salvage what we can of peace and security in the area.

185. I should like now to thank the Council for the resolution that it has just adopted. We find it within the usual practice and within the usual framework to be the strongest possible resolution, although my Government

would have preferred a more explicit condemnation of Israel, a much stronger endorsement of the Secretary-General's report and his personal action, and certainly a further strengthening of the effective capabilities of UNIFIL.

186. We think that this morning's aggression is another proof that the situation in Southern Lebanon has become untenable and inadmissible. It highlights the clear reference in the Secretary-General's report to the continued Israeli presence inside Lebanese territory. It highlights the fact that Israeli withdrawal is still a fiction. It highlights Israel's continued arrogant defiance of the Security Council, the international community and every single principle of international law and order. It also highlights the fact that Israel has opted for continued war in Lebanon while pretending to seek peace elsewhere.

187. If we here, all of us together, do not put an end to what is in fact the continued occupation of Southern Lebanon by Israel there will not be peace in the Middle East, and that most explosive area will endanger peace and security everywhere else in the world.

188. That is the tragedy, and we know that representatives share not only our sufferings but also the torture of soul-searching questions about the future which we bring today before the Council—the future of a country which the world has loved, the future of peace in the area, an area so vital to the world, the future of a peace-keeping operation launched less than a year ago which has since been eroded to the point of being described in the Secretary-General's report in the most dramatic terms, so much so that Mr. Waldheim felt obliged "to inform the Council that the present situation cannot... continue indefinitely", and to add that,

"Through no fault of its own, UNIFIL has not been in a position to alter... a situation which is neither acceptable to the Government of Lebanon nor compatible with the intentions of the Council." [S/13026 and Corr.1, para. 41.]

That means that,

"despite continuous and persistent efforts at all levels, UNIFIL has reached the end of its second mandate without completing the tasks assigned to it in Security Council resolution 425 (1978)" [ibid., para. 33].

The report continues:

"If the restraint being shown by UNIFIL continues to be exploited in this way, it may be necessary for the Council to consider what course of action would be warranted to deal with this situation." [ibid., para. 35.]

189. Elsewhere, the Secretary-General addresses some very significant and more explicit and potent warnings which I feel compelled to underline at this stage of our presentation, despite the fact that many members of the Council have already referred to them:

...UNIFIL continues to prevent the resumption of serious hostilities between the armed groups in the area. There can be no doubt that, without UNIFIL,—"and it pleases me to underline that—"these hostilities would be contributing another explosive element to the

already highly sensitive situation in Lebanon." [ibid., para. 38.]

"... UNIFIL performs an essentially stabilizing function and... its premature withdrawal would inevitably disrupt the fragile peace which now exists in Southern Lebanon.

"... I therefore appeal to those immediately concerned to reconsider urgently their attitude to UNIFIL and to ask themselves whether, in the context of the maintenance of international peace and security, they would really be better off if UNIFIL were obliged by continuing frustration to withdraw without fulfilling its mandate." [ibid., paras. 40 and 41.]

190. That is a very gloomy prospect, but we are confronted with it. We are confronted with it at the beginning of this new year. Therefore I should like to respond to the Secretary-General's warning by quoting the President of the Republic of Lebanon in his annual address to the diplomatic corps on 6 January last:

"With every passing day we ask ourselves again: How much longer can our country bear the catastrophes that continue to fall upon us, endlessly...? Yet I want solemnly to proclaim that Lebanon is determined to make of this new year, in the name of the ideals which we cherish, a year of hope and peace, of reconciliation and of resurrection."

Speaking of the situation in Southern Lebanon, President Sarkis said in that same address:

"Peace in one country cannot be established by waging war in another...; you do not solve the Palestinian problem by creating a Lebanese question; nor can one settle the fate of a dispersed people by the dispersal of another peaceful people... Southern Lebanon has been subjected to repeated acts of aggression of varying kinds, some directly and some by proxy... The international forces [the United Nations forces] that have come to put an end to such violations of Lebanese sovereignty have, in turn, been the victims of provocation, obstruction and aggression... We who have known, in the critical days of our history, the meaning of hardships and sacrifice, know as well how to appreciate the efforts of those who have come to help us overcome our present difficulties. We had not even waited until our Army was reconstructed to send a detachment that could co-operate with the United Nations forces. We felt that it was our national duty that we should stand as one with soldiers who had come from all parts of the world to lend us their help and assistance... For we strongly believe that such attitudes are the most genuine expressions of the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, and an act of faith in the principles of the international Organization...

"We therefore address our sentiments of particular appreciation and gratitude to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for his special role in making such attitudes possible."

191. While conveying those thoughts of the President of the Lebanese Republic, I will undoubtedly be forgiven lengthy quotations. I should like to return in a moment to the report, because I think it is my duty, now that the resolution has been adopted and we have heard the

President's statement, to put things in their proper perspective. I also thought that my country's attitude, as expressed by the highest legitimate constitutional authority of the land, should be put on record here.

192. Drawing further on the Council's patience, I wish to add that in the same solemn address the President of the Republic of Lebanon expressed some thoughts that seem to meet the Council's and Secretary-General's sentiments today: our common concern for international peace-keeping and our common belief that beyond a certain stage of defiance and obstruction it becomes imperative to strengthen United Nations forces and give them the means of fulfilling their mandate forcefully and with confidence and assured success.

193. I shall not burden the debate with further repetitions of facts and figures that are by now clearly established. The Secretary-General's report now under consideration is so factually well substantiated that we really have nothing to add to it. Previous reports, and particularly the report of 13 September 1978 [S/12845], are no less eloquent.

194. What, therefore, is our case?

195. First, we accuse Israel of, beyond any doubt, obstructing international peace-keeping, in continued defiance of United Nations resolutions and the universal consensus.

196. Secondly, we also accuse Israel of wilfully attempting to use UNIFIL as a cover to perpetuate its aggression against Lebanon, the practical occupation of Lebanese territory and the violation of Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity and its internationally recognized boundaries.

197. Thirdly, we further accuse Israel of trying to establish, unimpeded, vicarious occupation of Southern Lebanon, usurping authority through mutineers and mercenaries, not only to prevent the restoration of Lebanese sovereignty, but with the express purpose of disrupting our society and, through the destabilization of Lebanon, imperilling the chances of peace and security in the whole Middle East.

198. The time has come to put an end to Israel's self-given licence to exploit the sufferings of our people, for we have paid too dear price for the wars that have been fought on our land, transforming us into an arena for everybody's wars and everybody's revolutions as well.

199. Such is the accountability of the nations in Lebanon's tragedy that the time has come for the international community, here represented, to carry with us the responsibility of Lebanon's salvation to the end.

200. In that perspective, and in the context of our present concern with the Force's mandate, what have we asked for? That UNIFIL should be given the power to succeed in fulfilling its mandate.

201. My Government has no desire to perpetuate the presence of UNIFIL. We have repeatedly stated that we consider the United Nations Force to be an interim arrangement. But we strongly believe that there is there a

clear international commitment which Israel's defiance cannot challenge and destroy.

202. The time has probably come for us, in the Council, to take a fresh look at the basic principles that prompted the inception of UNIFIL, its terms of reference and the guidelines by which its action was and is to be governed—and those terms of reference and guidelines are referred to in the resolution adopted today.

203. Ten months ago exactly, in a moment of great enthusiasm, with a unique perception of historical responsibility, and in a context of drama and revolt, the representative of the United States of America, Ambassador Andrew Young, introduced, in the following terms, the draft resolution which became resolution 425 (1978):

"The Security Council meets today against a background of tragedy but with an opportunity to play a constructive role in restoring security and stability in violence-torn Southern Lebanon.

"The aim of the Council must now be to end as quickly as possible this new cycle of violence, and to deal with some of the immediate underlying causes. . .

"... First, we expect Israel to withdraw from Southern Lebanon, and we have made our views in this respect known to the Israeli Government. Secondly, the territorial integrity of Lebanon must be fully respected. Thirdly, the United Nations has a vital role to play in assisting the Government of Lebanon to restore... conditions that will facilitate the re-establishment of its authority and provide a return to security and a peaceful life for the people of the south." [2073rd meeting, paras. 11, 12 and 13.]

204. I could go on quoting, but I shall stop with the following sentences:

"... the United Nations would have responsibility to establish and provide security in the southern border region of Lebanon and,"—and I emphasize those words—"it would assist the Government of Lebanon in promptly re-establishing its authority in that area and, once this was established, relinquish its responsibilities to Lebanon." [Ibid., para. 14.]

"... When that is done, the objectives established by this draft resolution"—that is, the draft resolution that became resolution 425 (1978)—"will have been fully achieved and, we fully expect, the cause of peace and justice in the Middle East substantially advanced." [Ibid., para. 17.]

205. Such were the words of Ambassador Andrew Young, and we all know the marvellous response: in less than three days, two resolutions were adopted, the Force was constituted, and peace-keeping was beginning while Israel was still pursuing its aggression.

206. If the Council will bear with me a little longer, I submit that we may find it appropriate to read from the Secretary-General's report on the implementation of resolution 425 (1978)—a report presented to the Council on the evening of 19 March 1978 and approved almost

instantly, that same night, by resolution 426 (1978). This was said in that report:

"The terms of reference of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) are:

"...

"(b) The Force will confirm the withdrawal of Israeli forces, restore international peace and security and assist the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area;

"...

"(d) The Force will use its best efforts to prevent the recurrence of fighting and to ensure that its area of operation will not be utilized for hostile activities of any kind;" [S/12611, para. 2].

Further on, under "General considerations", we read the following—and the Force will have to take this into account under the resolution adopted today:

"Three essential conditions must be met for the Force to be effective. First, it must have at all times, the full confidence and backing of the Security Council. Secondly, it must operate with the full co-operation of all the parties concerned. Thirdly, it must be able to function as an integrated and efficient military unit.

"...

"(b) The Force must enjoy the freedom of movement and communication and other facilities that are necessary for the performance of its tasks. . .

"...

"(d) The Force will be provided"—and this is an important passage—"with weapons of a defensive character. It will not use force except in self-defence. Self-defence would include resistance to attempts by forceful means to prevent it from discharging its duties under the mandate of the Security Council. The Force will proceed on the assumption that the parties to the conflict will take all the necessary steps for compliance with the decisions of the Council." [Ibid., paras. 3 and 4.]

207. Since the report of 19 March 1978 many things have happened, but also many things have not happened that should have happened and that were expected to happen. We have also had many reports, all equally explicit, many speeches, all eloquent, and many resolutions that have all reiterated the same principles.

208. In the light of all that, my delegation feels, in conclusion, that we must emphasize the following:

—First, Israel has not complied with resolution 425 (1978) nor has it complied since with resolution 426 (1978) or 434 (1978), nor has it responded to the various "calls upons" or "deplores" or "regrets": all of them expressions that have been used here in the Council.

—Secondly, diplomatic action has not persuaded Israel to comply or respond. The time has come to put a limitation

on the use of the diplomatic option. Yet we doubt that the military option will ever be more than a mere deterrent, although we hope it will succeed.

—Thirdly, UNIFIL has not found it possible or necessary to use all the ways and means at its disposal to fulfil its mandate and exercise its rights without exceeding its military prerogatives. It has not been possible or necessary, so far, even to use a show of force or establish its military credibility by asserting its right to self-defence against those who would hinder its freedom of movement or deployment. And here again I come back to the warning by the Secretary-General that the restraint shown by UNIFIL should not be mistaken for incapacity.

209. That having been said in all candour, I should like once again to state our conviction that the time has come for new but vigorous action, bearing in mind the lessons of the past and the lessons of today—indeed this very morning—but more concerned with projecting the unfulfilled objectives into a perspective of the future. This should necessitate the establishment of a definitive plan of action, within a limited time-frame. We are happy that the resolution adopted today calls for that.

210. Not only does my Government feel confident that it is today in the position of being fully associated with UNIFIL in such a plan of action, but it is also the unanimous and clearly expressed determination of the House of Parliament of Lebanon that it should be so. For we then would feel that even if we failed to recover our territory by force, we would at least have retrieved our rights, restored the dignity of our constitutional institutions, and earned the respect of those of our friends whose sympathy cannot be drawn on for ever, unmatched.

211. Mr. President, I cannot conclude without referring to the statement that you read and for which we thank you and the Council. We consider this statement to be a consecration of my Government's commitment to the Council on 8 December 1978 [2106th meeting], when I said that the Lebanese Army was prepared to start assuming its responsibilities and requested a joint planning between UNIFIL and the Government of Lebanon.

212. I remember, however, that at that meeting of 8 December the representative of Kuwait had addressed to the representative of Israel a direct question, which he reiterated today: Is Israel or is it not going to withdraw from Lebanon? His question is today answered, but, alas, in the most negative and destructive manner. As for us in Lebanon, we maintain our pledge, and we consider that this pledge has acquired, through the Security Council, through the Lebanese Parliament and through acts of the Lebanese Government, the highest possible—we hope—credibility. We hope also that it will change the face of things in Lebanon. My country is not for sale nor is it for hire, and I hope that we shall be able to prove it.

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

214. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Mr. President, let me begin by paying my warmest respects to you as President of the Security Council for this month. Let me also take the opportunity to congratulate Jamaica, a country with which we enjoy cordial relations, on its election to the Council. We

are confident that it will carry out the international responsibilities entrusted to it with all the seriousness and objectivity that they demand. We are also confident that you, as its Permanent Representative, will carry out your duties in the Council with all the wisdom and skill that you have so amply demonstrated in your other capacities within the United Nations.

215. I should also like to associate myself with all those who have welcomed the Foreign Minister of Norway to the deliberations of the Council this afternoon.

216. All of us here are painfully aware that Lebanon's problems far transcend the issue of the operations of UNIFIL in the south of that troubled country. Not only have those problems existed for more than two decades, but unless they are confronted directly and with determination they will continue to plague the country long after UNIFIL withdraws. The situation now prevailing in the south of the country is merely one symptom of a much larger problem.

217. The internal problems of Lebanon are of long standing. They were greatly aggravated by the arrival of large numbers of armed terrorists from the organization known as the PLO. With its expulsion from Jordan in September 1970 and its exclusion from other Arab countries, the so-called PLO took advantage of Lebanon's inherent weaknesses to establish operational bases and headquarters there. Indeed, the erosion of Lebanon's sovereignty, to which resolution 425 (1978) refers, began in the early 1970s when the PLO set up what was virtually a state within a State in Lebanon, principally in Southern Lebanon, where one of the areas was dubbed as "Fatahland".

218. Over the last few years, the PLO, with increasing intensity, has turned Southern Lebanon into a staging post for its murderous incursions into Israel. Names like Avivim, Ma'alot, Kiryat Shmona and Nahariya came to denote the scenes of bloody massacres of women and children. All these acts were perpetrated by PLO terrorists operating from Lebanese territory.

219. In the last four years alone there have been close to 2,000 individual acts of aggression involving artillery, Katyusha, mortar and other attacks mounted against Israel from Lebanon and resulting in hundreds of Israeli casualties. This intolerable situation culminated in the particularly brutal attack on a civilian bus on the Haifa-Tel Aviv highway last March.

220. Nor were the PLO's terroristic activities confined to Israel. A reign of terror swept Lebanese villages in the south as the PLO gradually tightened its grip over the area. Moreover, Southern Lebanon became the training ground, logistics centre and refuge for members of the Terrorist International from all over the world. Their activities have plagued numerous countries and the international community at large.

221. When the Security Council met in March last year to deal with the problem of Southern Lebanon, it was well aware of the international issues flowing from the situation in that country. The Council took cognizance of the problem of Lebanon in its entirety, fully understanding that the presence of 30,000 Syrian troops and thousands of PLO terrorists on Lebanese soil constituted major barriers to the

reassertion of Lebanon's authority over its own territory and to the establishment of international peace and security. With those considerations in mind, the Council called for "strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence"—and I stress, "political independence"—"of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries". UNIFIL was entrusted with an appropriate mandate. It was established not only for the purpose of confirming the withdrawal of the Israel Defence Forces, but also for "restoring international peace and security and assisting the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area". In order to achieve this purpose, UNIFIL was ordered to prevent the infiltration of armed personnel into the areas under its control, an instruction aimed at preventing the PLO from returning to the region, this being a necessary condition for the establishment of international peace and security.

222. I have deliberately recounted the background to resolution 425 (1978) in some detail because we have recently witnessed a distinct tendency to ignore essential elements of that resolution. Both in the current debate and in the debate on the Secretary-General's interim report last December, there has been an undisguised attempt by some participants to gloss over the real issues faced by Lebanon and to direct the focus of their comments on Israel instead.

223. Indeed, this truncation of the original UNIFIL mandate may even have been construed by some from the Secretary-General's last two reports, which may lend themselves to a narrow interpretation. On that interpretation, the function of UNIFIL would be confined to confirming Israel's withdrawal and to the establishment and maintenance of an area of operation. In the process, attention may have been diverted from the centrality of the other inseparable components of UNIFIL's mandate, which are restoration of international peace and security and assistance to the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area.

224. It is patently clear that the Council has so far failed to come to grips with the fundamental issues undermining Lebanon's sovereignty and stability. This was demonstrated most dramatically last October, when the Council peremptorily called for a cease-fire at Beirut, without any deliberation whatsoever on the issues. Indeed, members of the Council will recall that it took only four minutes to adopt a resolution which nervously avoided even indirect reference to the outside State involved in the massive bombardment and destruction of civilian quarters of Beirut.

225. Nor is this a matter of the past: another major exchange of gunfire between Syrians and Lebanese at Beirut, as reported by *The New York Times* on 14 January, resulted in a toll of at least 18 dead and 73 wounded, according to hospital and relief sources. In the words of *The New York Times*, "It was the worst clash here since the United Nations Security Council called in October for a cease-fire". Nevertheless, it is unlikely that the Council will meet to discuss the problem of the Syrian occupation of Lebanon. Instead, it will concentrate on far more marginal matters in the south.

226. So far, Israel's withdrawal from Southern Lebanon remains the only part of the UNIFIL mandate that has been

unconditionally fulfilled, as confirmed by the Commander of UNIFIL, Major-General E. A. Erskine, and reported in OPI Press Release UNIFIL/8 and document S/12620/Add.5, both of 13 June 1978. It is a matter of great concern and regret that the other two parts of the mandate have not yet been implemented.

227. Israel's concern in this matter derives from a direct and vital security interest. Like any Government, the Government of Israel has the right, and indeed the duty, to protect the lives and safety of its own citizens. What happens in Southern Lebanon directly affects the daily lives of our people who live in the towns and villages throughout Israel, and in particular in the north of the country. We have closely followed the concerted efforts of the PLO in recent months to increase the infiltration of its terrorists into Southern Lebanon with the declared aim of using the area as a base for operations against civilian targets in Israel, as it had been for several years in the past. Indeed, shortly after the establishment of UNIFIL, Abu Iyad, Yasser Arafat's second-in-command and architect of the murderous attack on the Israeli bus on the Tel Aviv-Haifa highway last March, stated in an interview with the Swiss newspaper *Tages Anzeiger*:

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

Already, the PLO has managed to move several hundred of its terrorists back into the region in order to resume criminal activities against Israel.

228. The PLO has not hidden its intentions but has proudly claimed responsibility for each new act of barbarism perpetrated against Israeli civilians. When on 21 December 1978 the PLO, shielding itself behind the UNIFIL area of operation, fired Katyusha rockets from Lebanese territory at the Israeli town of Kiryat Shmona, killing one elderly man and wounding five persons, including a 10-year-old child, the PLO brazenly took responsibility for that outrage.

229. As I indicated in my letter of 21 December 1978 [S/12979], a spokesman for the so-called Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, which is a constituent of the PLO, said that terrorist operations, which have increased over the last few months, would continue. In the six weeks prior to that rocket attack, the PLO perpetrated 14 outrages and attempted acts of terror in residential areas. When 20 civilians were injured in the blowing up of a Jerusalem bus on Sunday, 17 December 1978, the terrorist faction known as the "Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine", which also operates under the PLO umbrella, took responsibility, as reported in my letter of 21 December [S/12978].

230. Just last week, on 13 January, PLO terrorists, who had crossed from Lebanon, attempted to commandeer a guest-house in the town of Ma'alot in northern Israel. Fortunately and providentially, a tragedy of massive proportions was only narrowly averted by the alertness of the Israel Defence Forces. As Council members have been informed in my letter of 14 January [S/13028], 230 men, women and children were staying in the guest-house when the terrorists attempted to hold them hostage. One woman, who tried to escape through a window, fell to her death, and

two others were wounded. The three terrorists were killed, and on their bodies were found leaflets identifying them as members of a terrorist group called the "Popular Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine" (PDFLP) yet another constituent of the terrorist PLO.

231. On the same day, radio stations in Syria and Iraq broadcast a statement from the PDFLP openly taking responsibility for that criminal action. A leader of that group held a press conference at Baghdad on 13 January, in which he described the terrorist act as part of a campaign to escalate armed attacks on Israel, and as being connected with the meeting of the so-called "Palestine National Council", opening at Damascus on Monday, 15 January. He particularly noted that Yasser Arafat and all the constituents of the terrorist PLO had applauded that act.

232. It should be noted that this is the second time that PLO terrorists operating from Lebanon have attacked a civilian target in Ma'alot for the purpose of holding hostage large numbers of innocent and unarmed civilians. On 15 May 1974, PLO terrorists murdered 21 Israeli school-children and wounded 70 more in a school building in that town. I refer members to documents S/11290 and S/11295.

233. To revert to the present, as I indicated in my letter of 17 January, on 16 January—just three days ago—a Mercedes car was spotted suspiciously parked in one of the main thoroughfares of Jerusalem. The police discovered a powerful explosive device concealed in the vehicle. The device was safely dismantled and thus what might well have been a major human tragedy was averted. The PLO openly took responsibility for this attempted outrage.

234. Yesterday, as I reported in my letter of 18 January [S/13041], an explosive device went off in the Mahane Yehuda open market at Jerusalem, injuring 20 civilians, some seriously. The device was timed for the middle of the morning on what is traditionally the market's busiest day of the week, with the clear intention of causing havoc and indiscriminate murder.

235. All these recent incidents have one thing in common. They aim at the mass murder of civilians. A bomb explodes in a civilian bus at Jerusalem on 17 December. The town of Kiryat Shmona is shelled on 21 December. On 13 January a guest house at Ma'alot with 230 visitors is attacked. On 16 January a car loaded with explosives is left in the centre of Jerusalem. Two days later an explosive device goes off in an open market teeming with people. This has been the consistent pattern of the PLO's cowardly activities throughout its existence. This is not the work of a national liberation organization, as the PLO incongruously purports to be. It is the work of international criminals of the worst kind bent on the indiscriminate mass murder of civilians. This is the true character and the true face of the terrorist PLO. This is the true face of the terrorists we are dealing with. Their current aim is—as Yasser Arafat has made clear—to try to disrupt the peace process in the Middle East. As reported in *The New York Times* of today, Yasser Arafat at Damascus yesterday called for an increase in terror attacks on Israel "as part of the Arab effort to resist Egyptian-Israeli peace moves". A more accurate quotation was carried by Reuters yesterday, where Arafat was reported to have called for the defeat of what he termed "US-Zionist plots" in the Middle East. This is of course standard PLO jargon to describe the PLO's efforts to subvert the ongoing peace process in the Middle East.

236. Here at the United Nations the PLO does not reveal its true colours. Intent on cultivating a false image of moderation, it has mastered the art of double-talk in order to maintain an aura of respectability. Sometimes, however, its guard slips even here. On 26 December 1977 the PLO information agency announced that orders had been issued "to liquidate a number of agents" after President Sadat's visit to Jerusalem and boasted that it had already killed Hamdi Kadi, in charge of education at Ramallah. The same day, the PLO observer at the United Nations publicly justified the murder, telling NBC news:

"The collaborators with the forces of occupation are executed. They are not assassinated. So this man must have been executed because of his collaboration with the forces of occupation."

Asked by the disbelieving NBC interviewer whether he actually condoned what had been done, Mr. Terzi replied: "Those who collaborate with the enemy should be executed, yes".

237. Despite the obvious danger which the PLO constitutes to international peace and security, it enjoys observer status in the United Nations and has been accorded irregular privileges as well as opportunities to participate in the deliberations of various organs of the United Nations, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of the rules of procedure of the organs concerned.

238. These latest incidents are indicative of the increased PLO infiltration into Southern Lebanon. They also underline the fact that UNIFIL's task of restoring international peace and security, as set out in resolution 425 (1978), not only remains unfulfilled but also is openly and directly challenged by the same subversive elements which have consistently endeavoured to use Lebanese territory for the purpose of launching attacks on Israel, thus undermining international peace and security throughout the region.

239. In the first months after the establishment of UNIFIL, the PLO chose to keep a relatively low profile. This was highly convenient from its point of view, since it allowed the PLO to introduce hundreds of its terrorists into the Force's area of operation. Besides that, there is ample evidence that the PLO is infiltrating arms and ammunition into the Force's area of operation. On 24 December 1978, Israel handed the UNIFIL commanders evidence that weapons were smuggled into the Kafar Kila area—well within the Force's area of operation—which were passed through the Iraqi diplomatic pouch into Lebanon disguised as medicaments.

240. In recent months, however, the PLO has raised its profile and, as I have just said, begun to challenge UNIFIL directly in the exercise of its mandate. In the Secretary-General's interim report dated 18 November 1978 [S/12929], some of these provocations were briefly mentioned. Since that report, the frequency and gravity of these terrorist-instigated incidents have increased and they can no longer be brushed aside. Between 1 November 1978 and 17 January 1979, there were at least 35 major incidents of this kind. I shall not burden the Council with the details of those incidents, for many of them have also been reported in the press. This form of direct challenge to

UNIFIL, acknowledged in the Secretary-General's last report, is an indicator of a major unsolved problem which requires serious discussion in this chamber rather than the virtual conspiracy of silence which surrounds it.

241. There are also other grave aspects of the PLO activities in the Force's area of operation which should be closely examined and brought to a halt. On 18 December 1978, villagers near the water installations of Taibe and Hulleh were attacked. On the same night other villagers near observation post Ras were shot at, and anti-tank mines and other military equipment left by the terrorists were discovered. On 10 January 1979, villagers in Tir-Harfa were attacked by 11 terrorists.

242. Members of the Council will readily understand that we are talking here of a considerable threat by the so-called PLO to three tangible targets: to the citizens of Israel, particularly in the north of the country, to the villagers in Southern Lebanon, and to the men of UNIFIL in the fulfilment of their duties. I say a "considerable threat" admittedly because there are today some 2,000 armed PLO terrorists in Southern Lebanon. I repeat, there are 2,000 in Southern Lebanon—that is, south of the River Litani.

243. I would respectfully draw the attention of Council members to the map attached to the Secretary-General's last report. They will note that UNIFIL is not deployed in the Tyre area, a narrow tongue on the Mediterranean coast which reaches within 8 miles of Israel. In that area there are today some 1,500 terrorists, deployed deliberately in refugee camps as well as in the town of Tyre and elsewhere. These are the same terrorists who in a series of bloody encounters prevented UNIFIL deployment in the Tyre area. They are the same terrorists who have consistently prevented the entry or passing of any elements of the Lebanese army. They are within easy striking distance of the north of Israel. Moreover there are terrorist groups totalling about 500 men throughout the Force's area of operation, in encampments and even in private houses in villages. These terrorists carry out various activities in the area of operation, including patrols, entry into villages to pressure, blackmail and intimidate the local population, and, as I have explained above, harassment of the United Nations forces.

244. This is by no means the end of the story, because directly north of the Litani, at Nabatiya and in the region of Sidon, not to speak of Beirut and Tripoli, another 10,000 to 12,000 PLO terrorists are to be found. This, then, is the true measure of the problem. Until it is faced, no real improvement in the situation can be expected.

245. The tactics of PLO have not changed. As has been their deliberate practice in the past, they hide behind Palestinian refugees and simple Lebanese villagers. They do so for the transparent purpose of shielding themselves and making it all the more difficult to root them out. I can do no better than to quote once again the former Permanent Representative of Lebanon, who in October 1976 informed the General Assembly that:

"... [The Palestinians] transformed most—if not all—of the refugee camps into military bastions ...

"... common-law criminals fleeing from Lebanese justice found shelter and protection in the camps ...

Those camps in fact became centres for the training of mercenaries who were sent and financed by some other Arab States.²

With regard to the ordinary Lebanese, Ambassador Ghorra said:

“Palestinian elements belonging to various... organizations resorted to kidnapping Lebanese... holding them prisoners, questioning them, torturing them and even sometimes killing them... They committed all sorts of crimes in Lebanon... They smuggled goods... They went so far as to demand ‘protection’ money...”

“It is difficult to enumerate all the illegal activities committed by those Palestinian elements.”³

246. This practice is still going on in the UNIFIL area of operation. It is admitted by United Nations officials in Lebanon, as reported by Mr. Ned Temko in an article from Beirut published in *The Christian Science Monitor* on 15 January 1979. It is clearly reflected in the cautious language of the Secretary-General in his last report [S/13026 and Corr.1] in which, in paragraph 18, he states:

“In the area where UNIFIL has full control, it continued to... provide the population with some measure of assurance and safety.”

The operative word is “some”. I repeat “some measure of assurance”.

247. But there is also a new element in the tactics of PLO. Previously they hid behind a shield of refugees and villagers. Now they are trying to hide also behind a shield of United Nations peace-keeping forces. This surely is totally inadmissible and can only be regarded for what it is: the total abuse of international peace-keeping.

248. Israel cannot acquiesce in these tactics being adopted by the PLO. In the light of the true character of the PLO, and given Israel's right, and indeed duty, to protect the lives and safety of its citizens, Israel will continue its policy of taking the necessary action against PLO bases used for the training of terrorists and for launching criminal activities against Israel.

249. In striking at the terrorist bases from which the PLO murder squads launch their criminal missions against the civilian population in Israel, my Government is exercising its inherent right of self-defence, a right enjoyed by every sovereign State, a right recognized also under Article 51 of the Charter. Like any other Government, the Government of Israel, as I have said before, has the right and the duty to take all the measures necessary to protect the lives and safety of its citizens.

250. A State's right to take the measures necessary to halt and to foil terroristic activities emanating from across its boundaries is a principle well recognized by international law and by international practice alike. What is more, the very toleration by a State on its territory of armed bands engaged in hostile activities against another State is considered a breach of international law on the part of the State tolerating the presence of such bands on its territory.

251. I should like to remind the representative of Kuwait, whose distasteful remarks of 8 December of last year were only surpassed by the excesses of his vulgarity today, that a State cannot invoke in its favour benefits deriving from certain provisions of international law without being prepared at the same time also to abide by the duties flowing from international law. Arab States, including Kuwait, seek to impose on Israel duties stemming from the international law of peace while simultaneously claiming for themselves the privileges of the international law of war.

252. If certain Arab Governments are either unwilling or unable to prevent the harbouring, training and financing of terrorists operating from their territories with a view to harassing other States, they must surely be prepared to face the risk of those States taking the necessary counter-measures to stop such harassment. That is not only a fundamental premise of international law, it is also a conclusion dictated by simple logic.

253. In this connexion, and in view of certain charges which have been raised, I should like to point out that the Israel Defence Forces have standing orders preventing any shooting in the direction of UNIFIL positions. These orders are and will be scrupulously observed.

254. It is a matter of regret that the Council has so far been unable to face squarely the question of why Lebanese authority has not been restored in Lebanon. Some have attempted to avoid the real issue by focusing on the local Lebanese forces which emerged as a reaction to the PLO presence.

255. To detach the question of Southern Lebanon from the situation in Lebanon as a whole will not enhance the cause of peace. So far as Israel is concerned, we remain irrevocably committed to the twin principles of restoring international peace and security and of restoring effective and genuine Lebanese authority throughout Lebanon. It is also our view that the Government of Lebanon cannot succeed in this undertaking when a Syrian occupation army maintains its gunsights on the civilian population of Beirut and while armed PLO terrorists are allowed free rein on Lebanese soil.

256. In the Security Council's debate on the Secretary-General's interim report dated 18 November 1978 [S/12929], the representative of Lebanon made it clear that he was aware of the true dangers, the real dangers, inherent in the situation. He indicated that Lebanon was disturbed by the incidents between the PLO and UNIFIL, and then went on to make the following appeal:

“While hoping that the Palestinians—all the Palestinians, both in the area controlled by UNIFIL and beyond—will not be led to a change of attitude, we wish to reiterate in this chamber previous Lebanese appeals that Lebanon should not again be the substitute arena for a substitute war. We think this message should be clear to all. We think further that the greater the response from the Palestinians to this role of partners in peace, the greater will be the chances of peace, all chances of peace: peace with Southern Lebanon, peace in Lebanon as an independent State restored to its unity and sovereignty, and, above all, peace in the Middle East.” [2106th meeting, para. 144.]

² Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Plenary Meetings, 32nd meeting, paras. 64 and 65.

³ Ibid., paras. 65 and 66.

257. Equal awareness of the threat which the PLO and, for that matter, the Syrians constitute to the peace and security of Lebanon was expressed in a letter addressed to the President of the United States by a Lebanese group in Venezuela, published in *The New York Times* today. As members will have noted, the heading to that open letter declared unequivocally that

“The presence of the Syrian and Palestine armed forces hinders the peace in the millenary country of the cedars, the open door to the cultural interchange between the East and the West.”

258. It is a matter for regret that the Security Council has failed thus far to come to grips with the real and central issue alluded to in these statements. Instead, it has again produced a highly one-sided and unbalanced political resolution. The operative part of that resolution begins by singling out Israel for criticism, while at the same time turning a blind eye to the real threat to UNIFIL in the implementation of its mandate and to international peace and security in the region. The prominence given by this unbalanced approach to Israel detracts much from the resolution's standing. But this is not unusual. It is a sad comment on the authority and credibility of the Council's resolutions that members have had to request the President of the Council to make a separate statement on matters contained in the resolution in the hope that that statement will make a more solemn impression than the resolution itself.

259. Before concluding, I wish on behalf of my Government to express once again our appreciation to those States Members of the Organization which have contributed contingents to UNIFIL. Their officers and men are operating under difficult and trying circumstances.

260. Let me also observe that peace-keeping operations can be a double-edged sword. They can contribute towards creating the political climate for the making of peace and for the advancement of international security. But there is also a danger that they can be used, or rather misused, by those bent on subverting peace, while behind the cover of the peace-keeping forces the ground is being prepared for resumed hostilities and further threats to international peace and security. Israel trusts that this danger will be recognized and that all effective steps will be taken to avert it.

261. The PRESIDENT: I have received a letter dated 19 January from the representative of Kuwait [S/13048] in which he requests that the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization should be invited to participate in the discussion. This proposal is not made under rule 37 or rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure but, if approved by the Council, the invitation will confer on the PLO the same rights of participation as those conferred on a Member State when it is invited to participate under to rule 37. Does any member of the Council wish to speak on this proposal?

262. Mr. PETREE (United States of America): The United States delegation has consistently taken the position that representatives of the Palestine Liberation Organization could be granted a hearing under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure but not, as proposed, with the same rights of participation as a Member State.

263. While we are, of course, aware of the decision previously taken in this regard by the Security Council, we believe that the special procedure employed by the Council in the past and that proposed today is not appropriate. Members of the Council are familiar with the reasons for our position and I need not repeat them here.

264. Accordingly, Mr. President, we request that you should put to the vote the question of the invitation to the Palestine Liberation Organization.

265. The PRESIDENT: If there are no other members wishing to speak, I shall put to the vote the proposal to grant the request for participation now before the Council.

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 the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

266. The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic in which he requests that he should be allowed to participate in the discussion. I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in conformity with the provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

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

267. The 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.

268. Mr. ABDEL RAHMAN (Palestine Liberation Organization): Mr. President, I should like at the outset to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month.

269. I should like also to join the speakers who preceded me in welcoming the Foreign Minister of Norway to this meeting.

270. I would not have asked to be allowed to speak today, had it not been for the barrage of lies and distortions to which the Council has been subjected by the representative of the Government of Menachem Begin. I should like to put on record that Menachem Begin was the man who led the massacre of 254 Palestinians—children, men and women—on 9 April 1948. Menachem Begin is the man who was hunted by the British authorities for crimes he committed

during the British Mandate against Palestinian civilians as well as officials of the British Government.

271. Our position on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon is very clear. From the very beginning we stated that we would co-operate with UNIFIL. The report of the Secretary-General clearly points out that the Palestine Liberation Organization has been co-operating with and assisting UNIFIL in carrying out its mandate in Lebanon.

272. Our position on Lebanon is also very clear. We affirm once more our total commitment to respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon.

273. Today the representative of the Zionist Government of Israel tried to tell the Council that acts of resistance to occupation, which are respected by the Charter of the United Nations, are acts of terror. I think that many of the representatives present here today have suffered from foreign occupation and have themselves participated in resistance to foreign occupation, particularly our French colleagues who fought against Hitler when he occupied France during the Second World War.

274. I am amazed that some representatives speak of the cycle of violence and counter-violence. In that sense, they are equating the criminal with the victim. That is unfair to the Palestinian people, because under no circumstances can the victim and the victimizer be put on an equal level. The Israeli Zionist establishment has usurped our homeland, destroyed our national heritage and converted us into a nation of refugees or people under military occupation. It still denies us our right to self-determination; it still calls us aliens in our homeland; it still treats us as second-class citizens—in fact, as third-class citizens because there are some dark-skinned Jews who are considered to be second-class citizens. Does anyone really expect us to throw flowers at the Israelis? I must say to those who expect the Palestinian people, to throw flowers on their usurpers that they are wrong. The Palestinian people, in accordance with their human, political and moral rights, are just resisting the occupation of a country that they love, Palestine. It is our country. I do not know how the representative of the Government of Menachem Begin, who probably was born somewhere in eastern Europe, and his leader, who was born in Poland, can have the audacity to tell me, a Palestinian who was born in Palestine, that I am an alien in Palestine, and expect me to remain silent and throw flowers at him. Under no circumstances can we accept that situation.

275. Therefore, our acts of resistance to the illegal occupation which has been so declared by the international community and by this body are legal in themselves. The General Assembly as well as other organs of the United Nations have supported and upheld the right of the Palestinian people to struggle by all means to attain their inalienable rights in their homeland, namely, their right to self-determination, their right to national independence and their right to return to their homes and properties. Israel for the last 30 years has subjected the Palestinian people to criminal acts.

276. Last night's attack against the people of Lebanon and against Palestinian refugees, who are not in Lebanon by choice but were forced to become refugees, is another crime in the series of crimes that have been and still are committed on a daily basis by the Israeli Zionist Government.

277. I do not want to dwell at length on Israel's record, because other United Nations organs have condemned Israel on many occasions. However, I should like to reaffirm once more that our resistance to Israeli occupation will persist as long as our national rights in Palestine are not recognized and as long as the Government of Menachem Begin, supported by the United States of America, continues to commit crimes every day against our people. Our resistance will cease only when our people are able to enjoy their rights and live in dignity like all the other peoples of the world.

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

279. Mr. EL-CHOUDI (Syrian Arab Republic): I should like first of all to congratulate you, Sir, on assuming the responsibilities of the presidency of the Security Council and to associate myself with all members of the Council who paid a tribute to your skill and statesmanship.

280. I welcome the presence of the Foreign Minister of Norway at this important meeting of the Council. Once again Norway is proving its dedication to the work of the United Nations.

281. The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic extends its thanks to the Secretary-General for his report on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon in document S/13026 and Corr.1. We believe that that report sheds light on the actual situation in Southern Lebanon and clearly points to the party responsible for the obstacles that have been placed in the way of UNIFIL's unimpeded functioning to establish normalization and eventually help in restoring peace in strife-torn Lebanon. The facts and documented incidents contained in the Secretary-General's report speak for themselves, and the facts point to Israel as the only culprit in this tragic quagmire in Lebanon. While repeated Security Council resolutions have called for co-operation with UNIFIL, Israel has retained its typical belligerent posture.

282. The threefold task of UNIFIL is clearly stated in the Secretary-General's report. Paragraph 17 of the report reads in part:

"First, UNIFIL continued to ensure that the area where it was fully deployed would not be used for hostile activities of any kind and to promote a progressive return to normal conditions. Secondly, it sought to extend its deployment in the border area, which had been handed over to the Lebanese *de facto* armed groups by the Israeli forces during the last phase of their withdrawal. Thirdly, it continued its efforts to assist the Government of Lebanon in restoring its effective authority in the area."

283. To the first objective Israel has responded with sheer arrogance, as it continues to commit periodic acts of military provocation and sabotage; and it has not been content with those. Israel has also chosen to subject civilian settlements to harassment as well. To the second objective Israel shamelessly attempts to whitewash its criminal collusion through its continued provision of logistical and other forms of support to Major Haddad's renegade leadership of armed militia who have resisted all efforts of UNIFIL fully to deploy itself in Southern Lebanon.

284. My delegation strongly condemns Israel's intransigence and sheer arrogance in obstructing UNIFIL in the execution of its task. Its outright refusal to recognize the authority of UNIFIL amounts to blatant defiance of Security Council resolutions and clearly indicates its unwillingness to heed the international community's desire for peace in Lebanon and the Middle East as a whole.

285. That belligerent posture is again made clear in Israel's latest act of aggression in Lebanon. Today Israeli ground forces supported by artillery carried out a two-pronged attack deep in Southern Lebanon. An Israeli battalion advanced towards the area of Deir Mimas-Yahmor-Arnoun-Qalaa under cover of shelling from a tank support column and bombardment from positions in Marjayoun and Qlea. Israel's air force also participated with machine-gunning. At the same time another Israeli force advanced on the Marjayoun-Khardali-Dimashqiyyeh axis under cover of artillery. Meanwhile, the Israeli navy shelled Jisr-Al Qasmiyyeh. Israeli artillery bombarded the area extending from Nabatiyyeh to Hasbani. Those atrocities resulted in the death of six persons, the wounding of nine others and the destruction of several houses.

286. It is clear that the Israeli penetration involved crossing UNIFIL's area of operation. That is the clearest evidence of Israel's non-recognition of UNIFIL's or any international body's authority. I should like to quote the following from today's United Press International release:

"The Israelis passed through a zone that should have been patrolled by United Nations peace-keeping forces, but a United Nations spokesman in Beirut said Israel's Christian militia allies had zoned off the attack route a few days earlier and made it off-limits to United Nations troops."

287. In the face of this clearly condemnable act, Mr. Tom Reston, United States Department of State spokesman, commented: "The United States Government regrets the Israeli decision to carry out the raid this morning into Southern Lebanon". We believe that the United States has an obligation to do much more than merely to regret. As a permanent member of the Security Council, it has an international obligation to uphold the Charter of the United Nations, that is, to stop aggression and punish the aggressor. The United States, as the financier and supporter of Israel, has an ethical obligation to assure that its armament, its money and its political support are not being used for purposes of aggression.

288. Finally, I should like to state that this latest Zionist incursion into Lebanese territory cannot be viewed apart from the long Zionist history of acts of aggression, expansion and occupation. In fact, the arrogant refusal to co-operate with UNIFIL can be understood only in relation to the very nature and philosophy of Zionism—an ideology founded on an insatiable desire for war, acts of aggression, occupation and annexation.

289. As a last point, I would state that the issue before us is clear: whether UNIFIL will be given the opportunity to carry out its functions of helping to restore normalcy and peace in Lebanon. This consequently involves a strong determination by this body to eradicate all obstacles in the way of the accomplishment of this goal. And should it involve the strong condemnation of Israel, then this body

should do that; should stronger and more substantial measures be necessary to compel Israel to comply, then such measures should be taken.

290. I hope that the attempts by the representative of Israel to cloud the issues at hand will be clearly seen as another attempt to confuse this international body. He tried to distort facts and to distort the discussion here and to place it in another arena, by referring to what he called the Syrian occupation in Lebanon. The Syrian forces in Lebanon are part of the Arab deterrent force agreed upon and authorized by the League of Arab States. We have no intention of remaining in Lebanon for a single day without the explicit request of the constitutional Lebanese Government.

291. Our declared position has been, is and will ever remain support for Lebanese sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence. The talk by the representative of the expansionist Zionist State about a Syrian occupation is but flagrant and arrogant distortion. It is an attempt to mislead the Council in its deliberations. It is another example of the character of the Zionist expansionist entity that is called Israel.

292. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Kuwait wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply and I now call on him.

293. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): I have listened to the statement of the representative of Israel. I would have hoped that he would sit here throughout the Council's deliberations, instead of making one statement and then retiring to the sidelines. That would have been better. That is the way it should be: to listen to facts and then try to refute them.

294. In my view, the lengthy statement of the representative of Israel is childish gibberish; it is infantile swashbuckling. But that is not important. This is what is important: As I listened to the representative of Israel, I thought that the item we were discussing was the PLO presence in Lebanon, or PLO activities in Lebanon. But we have not come here to discuss the presence of the PLO in Lebanon. We have not come here to discuss what he called "terrorism". If the representative of Israel wants a debate on terrorism, we are ready for it, in any forum—in the United Nations or outside it. We shall identify, with documents from the horse's mouth, the real terrorist.

295. But that is not the point of my intervention. The representative of Israel was criticizing not only the Security Council, as the representative of the international will, of international aspirations and determination, but also the whole world. His statement was full of criticism of the whole world. But it is not the world that is at fault. Who is at fault? It is Israel that is at fault. It is Israel that has departed from the norms of international law—those norms that he spoke about at such length in attempting to justify Israel's brutal, criminal attack on Lebanon.

296. The complaints against UNIFIL by the representative of Israel were not only unjustified but unacceptable. Had Israel accepted UNIFIL's full deployment on the internationally recognized borders, the complaints with which his statement abounded would have been completely unnecessary.

297. All this can be compared to the situation in which a guard is tied tightly to a post by his master and then is taken to task by the master of the house because he was unable to chase out an element unwelcome to the master. Who is to blame here? The guard who was tied tightly to the post? Or the master who tied the guard tightly to the post, making it impossible for him to chase out the unwelcome element? In this case, the guard has been taken to task: that is the essence of the criticism against UNIFIL now. UNIFIL has been criticized by the representative of Israel because, he says, some elements crossed the borders. But UNIFIL is not responsible. Who is responsible for hamstringing UNIFIL? On what do we base our judgements here? Not on documents issued outside the United Nations, not on press releases or press reports. We base our judgements on the documents submitted by the Secretary-General on the activities of UNIFIL. Even a cursory glance at those documents proves to any reader that the blame lies with Israel for blocking the full deployment of UNIFIL on the international borders, because Israel assists these robots who are its barking dogs in preventing UNIFIL from functioning properly and effectively along the international borders.

298. So any criticism of UNIFIL by a Member State which does not fulfil its commitments and obligations voluntarily is unacceptable. The failure of Israel to carry out criticism of UNIFIL does not cut any ice; it holds no water.

299. My final point is this. There can be no consideration under international law or the standards of decency or the Charter that can justify a Member State's violation of and encroachment upon the sovereignty of another Government. Lebanon is not a policeman for Israel. And the Lebanese people are not the protectors of Israel. Allegations that some unwelcome elements came over from Lebanon cannot be used as a pretext for violating territorial sovereignty or political independence. There can be no justification whatsoever for this.

300. The resolution that we adopted and the statement of the President do not satisfy my delegation. They are mild in their language. There should have been condemnation of Israel for its brutal attacks on Lebanon; but we accepted their restrained language because we do not like to create difficulties. We did not want to upset the apple cart. I could have submitted a draft resolution condemning Israel for its brutal attacks, but I restrained myself simply because it is useless to upset the apple cart when there is harmony on certain elements, and what is important for us is the renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL. As long as UNIFIL is there, we believe that the brutal policy of Israel is bound to be contained, and that is why I said in the course of my statement that it is very important to pound hard even on iron bars because even iron bars will eventually give way to hard and severe pounding.

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

302. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Although I am addressing the Security Council as a whole, I am well aware that there are some members to whom any appeal for a reasoned, objective approach would be in vain. The representative of Kuwait, for example, represents here not only his own country but a particular bloc of States that is directly

involved in the Arab-Israel conflict. To appeal for an objective approach from a representative who is also a party to the dispute would be a futile exercise. In fact, his very participation in the decision-making process here is a violation of the elementary principle that no one should be a judge in his own case. I will refrain again, as I have done in the past, from commenting on the style he has chosen to employ in these discussions. It is apparently a matter of personal taste, and as the ancient Romans taught us, "*de gustibus non est disputandum*".

303. Similarly, the Soviet Union, which did not support the creation of UNIFIL in the first place, is today being asked to evaluate the success of that Force in restoring international peace and security in the region. This at a time when the Soviet Union is making every effort—and we have heard references to that effect here in the Soviet statement this afternoon—to torpedo the peace negotiations and to prevent the establishment of international peace and security in the Middle East. To such States, whose prior political objectives render them incapable of even hearing Israel's case, I make no appeal for objectivity.

304. However, there are many other representatives who are willing to hear both sides of a dispute and who are capable of understanding and evaluating the actions of a small State attempting to protect its citizens from the scourge of terrorism. Indeed, many of those representatives represent States that have seen innocent men, women and children among their own nationals brutally murdered by the terrorist international. Many of them are acutely conscious of the responsibilities of a State to protect its civilian population, and some have themselves struck back forcefully in exercise of those responsibilities.

305. Unfortunately, repeated efforts to move the United Nations to assume such responsibility on behalf of all its Members have been frustrated time and again by those who openly protect and encourage the assassins. After the murder of 11 Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympics in 1972, the Secretary-General asked the General Assembly to devise measures to eradicate the scourge of international terrorism. The issue was manipulated until the world Organization came up with such a convoluted definition of the question that it could almost be construed as support for terrorism, and that is where the matter rests, having been buried in committee ever since.

306. It is thus no wonder that when the President of the United States Airline Pilots' Association, John O'Donnell, testified before the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee last year, he discounted a United Nations action against hijacking, saying

"We are totally convinced that the United Nations has neither the will nor the means to effect any meaningful solution in fighting terrorist hijackings."

That was contained in a Reuters report of 30 January 1978.

307. In response to this failure of the world Organization, many States have taken individual action to protect their citizens from the terrorist menace. Some have combined for the purpose. On 17 July of last year, the seven leaders of the largest democracies, meeting at Bonn, announced an unprecedented anti-terrorism agreement which indicated a new resolve to act outside the framework of the United Nations.

308. Indeed, it is interesting to note that even those countries that have been most active in frustrating international efforts at combating terrorism will brook no such attack on their own soil or against their own citizens. When Palestinian terrorists seized a Kuwaiti aeroplane in July 1977, the Kuwaiti newspaper *Al-Rai al-Amm* of 10 July stated:

"Kuwait will be excused if it reacts violently against such a reckless movement The world will excuse us if we strike a painful blow in defence of ourselves and our security and stability The solution should be in the hands of Kuwait alone—in the use of an iron fist."

Despite the stance of the Kuwaiti representative in the Council, his people appear to understand well the sentiments of the Government and people of Israel. Even President Assad, at present serenading the terrorist organizations at their National Council meeting at Damascus, reacted differently when PLO terrorists attacked the Semiramis Hotel at Damascus. Mr. Assad stated on Radio Damascus on 27 September 1976: "We condemn this act of terror, committed by a gang of traitors and criminals. We refuse to bargain with them."

309. Indeed, I would ask: How many States represented here would sit back passively and watch their own women and children being killed and wounded by terrorists? As the representative of a country that is one of the prime targets of international terror, I can only repeat what I have told the Council before—that the Government of Israel is in duty bound to take all measures necessary to protect the lives and safety of its citizens.

310. In our own region, the terrorists have consistently resorted to the most vicious and cowardly methods. Their victims are invariably unarmed and defenceless civilians—schoolchildren on vacation, women doing their shopping, civilians asleep in their homes.

311. The terrorists hide in crowded refugee camps and use their own women and children as shields. Now they are using the United Nations itself as a one-way shield, infiltrating the UNIFIL zone to perpetrate attacks inside Israel and hiding behind UNIFIL lines to protect themselves from Israel's acts of self-defence. This cowardice has been compounded by deception, as the terrorists cultivate a false image of "moderation" under the guise of a national liberation movement. They speak with a forked tongue, openly gloating over their barbaric deeds on Radio Damascus and Radio Baghdad and then reverting to the mellifluous sounds more appropriate to international diplomacy here at the United Nations. Once in a while the two faces converge embarrassingly, as I have had occasion to point out in my previous statement.

312. As we have said, because of its structure we do not expect the United Nations actively to support the peace efforts in the Middle East. But we do insist that this Organization should not assist the terrorist PLO in subverting the peace process. The Security Council should respond forcefully to the recent PLO attempts to abuse UNIFIL. UNIFIL's mandate requires it to restore international peace and security, an impossible task if the PLO becomes able to use UNIFIL as a shield for terror attacks aimed precisely at sabotaging the peace efforts.

313. This danger would not exist if other subversive hands were not involved. I have on past occasions drawn the Council's attention to Syrian designs in Lebanon, pointing out that the role of the Syrian occupation army in Lebanon was directly related to the long-standing Syrian aspirations for a *Suria al-Kubra*—or "Greater Syria". Syria's determination to torpedo a peace settlement, its failure ever to establish diplomatic relations with Lebanon, which has been explained here by reference to the allegedly fraternal relations between the two countries, its barbarities against the population of Beirut which are now common knowledge—these are not isolated incidents but integral parts of an over-all policy. Those members which have been hesitant to accept our interpretation of these events in the past may more readily listen to Yasser Arafat. At a recent rally at Beirut of the Lebanese Ba'ath Party, Arafat reported a meeting with Syrian President Assad:

"Al-Assad said that Palestine is the southern part of Syria. I told him that Palestine is southern Syria and Syria is northern Palestine."

That was reported on the "Voice of Palestine" on 18 November 1978. A few days later he told Palestinian workers at Damascus:

"Syria is an extension of Palestine, and Palestine is an extension of Syria, as President Hafez Al-Assad has said."

That was reported on "Damascus Domestic Service" on 20 November 1978. And as recently as last week, Arafat said that Syria

"forms the northern part of Palestine, forms with Palestine, which is Syria's south, a whole which cannot be partitioned".

Is that the import of the current so-called Palestine National Council meeting at Damascus?

314. It is a very odd "national liberation movement" which serves the stated imperialist designs of a neighbouring State. It would be odder yet for the Security Council to support those designs. It is, in short, the responsibility of the Council to ensure the fulfilment of the UNIFIL mandate, not its subversion.

315. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Lebanon, who has asked to exercise his right of reply.

316. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): Mr. President, I repeat my thanks to you for accepting my request to participate in this debate. I do not want to abuse the right, and indeed the hour is late, but I cannot let the remarks of the representative of Israel go by unanswered.

317. Riding high on the tide of State terrorism, the representative of Israel, in his consummate art of misquotation, has come before the Council not to contribute to resolving the issue at stake—namely, how we might make peace-keeping a success—but, rather, to threaten and to confirm the aggressive intentions of Israel. In the light of what happened last night, I cannot let that go by without asking the Council to take note of the fact that further threats have been expressed here before this body, at a moment when we were all meeting to see how we could advance the cause of peace.

318. Furthermore, I think that there is something we here must be cautioned against—and that is the art of distraction. Every time we have addressed ourselves to an issue—and this is probably the third or the fourth meeting at which we have examined the situation in Southern Lebanon—we have found the representative of Israel exercising, again in a consummate manner, his art of creating a false problem, pretending to deplore it, and then preventing us from reaching a solution. I shall not go into a long discourse, but I beg the Council not to allow itself to be distracted. I want, however, to reassert that what happens between Lebanon and other Arab States—the relations between Lebanon and Syria, between Lebanon and Kuwait, between the Lebanese and the Palestinians—is something that concerns the Lebanese, the legitimate, sovereign authorities of Lebanon, and the various sovereign Governments of the Arab States.

319. Those issues are not at stake here. What is at stake here is the fate of peace-keeping in Southern Lebanon, which the Israelis chose today to challenge, as I said earlier, in a most defiant, arrogant and cynical manner. I would, therefore, while asking the Council to take notice of renewed threats that have been addressed to us, ask it to take notice also of the fact that the representative of Israel gives himself the right to be judge and jury in questions that are the exclusive province of my country and my Government.

320. I also wish to say, like my Kuwaiti colleague, that should other issues be brought before the Council—and I have reserved my right to lodge a formal protest against the renewed aggression—then probably the Council would be asked by Lebanon kindly to look into and study and adopt whatever resolutions it may deem appropriate concerning Israeli aggressions.

321. If I wanted to follow the Israeli representative's example in the art of quotation, I could cite a list of aggressions perpetrated by his Government against my country. This list, which I have here, goes very far back, and I wonder whether it does not reflect Israel's consistent policy: not to prevent Palestine from becoming southern Syria, but probably to make Lebanon northern Israel.

322. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Bangladesh to exercise his right of reply.

323. Mr. RAHMAN (Bangladesh): We are exercising our right of reply in the belief that Israel's statements are directed against the Council as a whole, of which we are an integral part, and also to counter the allegation that the Israeli representative has made, that the accusations against Israel emanate from one particular prejudiced group of States. We believe that these charges emanate from all universally.

324. The subject we are discussing today is a limited and restricted one; it is the mandate of UNIFIL and its renewal in the face of obstacles that have prevented its fulfilment.

325. Israel has characteristically injected a series of irrelevant, extraneous and unjustified accusations directed at a host of countries but has ignored the cardinal issue at stake—its own responsibility in the matter. That there is lack of co-operation on Israel's part—to say the least—has

been testified to explicitly and repeatedly by the Secretary-General in his several reports, by the overtly expressed condemnation of the great majority of States members of the Council, by the resolution that has just been adopted today deploring this fact, and also indirectly by itself, for it has repeatedly sought to evade answering this issue.

326. Israel cannot drown its responsibility and guilt in a cacophony of accusations against others.

327. What is even more disconcerting is that Israel has expressed concern and regret that Lebanon's sovereignty has not been restored. Yet, we have heard the categorical accusations of the representative of Lebanon that it is Israel and Israel alone that is impeding this process. The conclusions are obvious. Israel invaded and brutally occupied Southern Lebanon, in violation of international law and all norms of civilized conduct. In spite of its acceptance of UNIFIL's presence and mandate, it is Israel that is openly flouting, obstructing and preventing the fulfilment of its mandate.

328. It is in the light of the above that Bangladesh rejects Israel's remarks as distasteful, hypocritical, irrelevant and unacceptable and calls upon the Israelis first to mind their own responsibilities instead of harping on those of others.

329. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

330. Mr. EL-CHOUFI (Syrian Arab Republic): If it had not been for the distortions and lies of the representative of Israel, I would not in fact have detained the Council any longer. I shall not try to defend the Syrian position and policies, which are not at stake or under discussion in these deliberations. I was hoping against hope that the representative of Israel would show some objectivity in co-operating with the mandate of UNIFIL. Paragraph 1 of the resolution which has just been adopted by this Council

"Deplores the lack of co-operation, particularly on Israel's part, with the efforts of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon fully to implement its mandate, including Israel's assistance to irregular armed groups in Southern Lebanon".

This is really the issue, and I hope that the influence, the prestige of the Council will be brought to bear for the fulfilment of the mandate of UNIFIL in Southern Lebanon.

331. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Kuwait has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I call on him.

332. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): The Israeli representative cast slurs on our integrity when he said we could not be objective. This is not the point. The point is that we are partisans of the Charter, partisans of United Nations resolutions, partisans of United Nations principles. When principles are challenged, when decisions are violated, when the authority of the Security Council is truncated and defied, objectivity becomes meaningless. What is the meaning of the resolution we have just adopted, one which reflects the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of the members of the Council? It means that the overwhelming

majority of the members of the Council, including those who had reservations not on the merit of the document but on the absence of certain elements, have rallied to preserve the Council's image, its authority and to support the performance of UNIFIL. The word "objectivity" cannot crop up here; it is meaningless; one cannot isolate the word "objectivity" from elements that have not been raised here. What is at stake is the authority of the Council; what is challenged is a resolution of the Council; what is defied is UNIFIL, the project of the Council. We are partisans of UNIFIL, partisans of the Charter, partisans of the authority of the Council.

333. The representative of Israel quoted from a newspaper of Kuwait. This is not a new quotation. I heard him many times using the same quotation. Well, I am glad that our press in one way or another contributes to his statements. But using one quotation for many years gives us certain credit. He and his delegation, and perhaps all the Zionist organizations doing research work, suffer from a dearth of criticism against us, against Kuwait, my country, and I note the lack of abundance of quotations which he could use against us. One quotation has been used for many years; it has become hackneyed; it has become mundane; it has become ineffective. Other quotations should be used; but he has not used any. His delegation suffers from a

dearth of quotations, notwithstanding all the assistance it receives from the Zionist organizations in this country.

334. Finally, I heard his remark about the effectiveness of UNIFIL and the maintenance of its image in, to use his words, fulfilling its mandate. I hold him to these words. I hope that his Government will co-operate for the fulfilment of the Force's mandate, in order to save us the trouble of having to come back again after two or three months and have an unnecessary exchange of remarks. The fulfilment of the mandate of UNIFIL will come about if the Government of Israel co-operates with UNIFIL. This fact has been reflected in all the documents submitted by the Secretary-General. I hope that the representative of Israel will stick to his words when he prays for the fulfilment of the mandate of UNIFIL.

335. The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers. I should like at this time to express my appreciation to all members of the Council and the Secretary-General and others associated with him for the manner in which the consultations on this difficult matter were carried out and the constructive spirit in which they all sought to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion within a very tight time-frame in terms of the renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL.

The meeting rose at 9 p.m.