

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FOURTH YEAR

2149th MEETING: 14 JUNE 1979

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2149)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 30 May 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13356);	
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/13384)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

2149th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 14 June 1979, at 4 p.m.

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

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2149)

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

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

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 30 May 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13356);
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/13384)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): In accordance with decisions taken at our previous meetings [2146th-2148th meetings], I invite the representative of Lebanon to take a place at the Council table, I invite the representatives of Egypt, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Netherlands and Syrian Arab Republic to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, and I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon) took a place at the Council table, Mr. Elaraby (Egypt), Mr. Shemirani (Iran), Mr. Keating (Ireland), Mr. Blum (Israel), Mr. Shamma (Jordan), Mr. Kikhia (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya),

Mr. Scheltema (Netherlands) and Mr. El-Choufi (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, and Mr. Abdel Rahman (Palestine Liberation Organization) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): Members have before them a draft resolution contained in document S/13392, which was prepared during consultations with Council members.

3. Mr. KAISER (Bangladesh): Mr. President, please accept our warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency. We are confident that under your experienced and able leadership we will be able to fulfil our responsibilities promptly and effectively. I take this opportunity also to reaffirm the close ties of friendship and co-operation that have always existed between our two countries. It is our conviction that our relations will continue to be strengthened to our mutual benefit and satisfaction.

4. I also wish to express our gratitude to your predecessor, Ambassador Futscher Pereira of Portugal, for the dedicated manner in which he conducted our affairs during the month of May, with infinite patience, skill and impartiality. He has won the sincere admiration of us all.

5. Southern Lebanon continues to remain a scene of violence. The mandate entrusted to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) under resolution 425 (1978) to augment its military credibility and control of the zone, to promote a return to normalcy and to restore the effective authority of Lebanon in the area is yet to be fulfilled at the end of the Force's third term. The situation obtaining today constitutes a serious challenge to the continuance of the peace-keeping operation, to the capacity of the Security Council to respond to Charter provisions regarding peace-keeping and to the moral and political conscience of the Governments and peoples of the world.

6. No one can doubt that the hard core of the problem remains Israel's intransigence about co-operating with the United Nations. Successive reports of the Secretary-General have made that fact clear. In his latest report, the Secretary-General reiterates that:

"Continued representations to the Israeli authorities have as yet failed to achieve the change of position required for a significant improvement in the deployment of UNIFIL." [S/13384, para. 35.]

7. So much, then, for Israel's commitment to co-operating with UNIFIL. Not only has such co-operation been lacking, despite painstaking efforts by all concerned, including successive Presidents of the Council, but opposition, resistance and persistent harassment of UNIFIL has been deliberately incited and escalated in a consistent pattern of behaviour. This makes one feel that the real intent of Israel's professed willingness to co-operate is to erode and truncate the UNIFIL mandate while supporting its continued presence.

8. The objective of restoring the legitimate authority of Lebanon up to its internationally recognized border with Israel also remains impeded and unrealized. We can only note with gratification the efforts pursued by the Government of Lebanon in co-operation with UNIFIL to restore its military and legal presence in the south in accordance with the phased programme of activities initiated under resolution 444 (1979). That, too, has seen but limited progress as a result of Israel's determined opposition.

9. The Secretary-General's report has also highlighted the reaffirmation by the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization of their commitment not to initiate action from inside the UNIFIL area of operation or to shell targets of the Israeli Defence Forces or illegal Had-dad forces from Lebanese territory unless attacked first. Moreover, the PLO has also reconfirmed its decision to evacuate all armed forces from villages and towns in Southern Lebanon and to remove its offices from Tyre. Those are welcome developments in an otherwise depressing situation.

10. We listened with attention to the response of the Israeli representative on Tuesday last [2147th meeting] deriding this welcome announcement by the PLO and perhaps by this—although we hope not—preparing the case for further bombing by air and sea of innocent civilians—men, women and children.

11. Lebanon remains seemingly a pawn whose sovereignty and territorial integrity can be respected or violated at Israel's whim. Over the past months, Israel has launched a series of predatory attacks across the face of Lebanon by land, sea and air, shelling its ports, raiding its northern areas, launching an armed invasion across its southern frontier and aiding and abetting its own henchmen in Southern Lebanon in an indiscriminate spate of blood-letting and violence. It seems to us a supreme irony that, in spite of such repeated acts of aggression, Israel insists on reiterating its commitment to respecting the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and charges Beirut with not responding to Israel's offer of peaceful negotiations. It is even more ironical that Israel should take refuge in international law to rationalize its actions and should with verbal sophistry subvert and interpret international law to suit its own purpose.

12. It is true that the situation in Lebanon is the inevitable fall-out of the Middle East problem. It is also true that the heart of the problem is the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and the vacating of territories illegally occupied by Israel in 1967. Israel's continued occupation of lands acquired by force is unjust and illegal. Israel's belated claim to permanent occupa-

tion on the basis of ancient legitimacy is a travesty of international law. Israel has dispossessed the true inhabitants of the land; it has curtailed and deprived the rights, possessions and resources of those who remain. It has with intensity sought to root out and to exterminate those driven into exile in neighbouring lands, particularly in Lebanon, violating, *inter alia*, the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country. The world community must judge who are the terrorists and who are the terrorized. It is in this context that the Council cannot but take note of the moving statement of the PLO representative on Tuesday in this Council when he said:

"...peace is our goal, our objective; we struggle for it, we want it—for we are not a bunch of masochists. We do not enjoy suffering and we do not enjoy dispersion; we do not enjoy exile either. ... We want to live together as Palestinian people; we want to be allowed the opportunity to build a nation, to reconstruct our national identity, to create a culture, put it together and establish normal relations with everyone in the world." [*Ibid.*, para. 163.]

Significantly, the PLO representative went on to spell out what he considered the essentials for peace. He stated:

"...those conditions are: total Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories; recognition of the national rights of the Palestinian people, which include the right to self-determination and national independence; and a just solution of the Palestinian refugee problem, in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations pertinent to the refugee problem. When those conditions are met, peace can be established very soon thereafter." [*Ibid.*, para. 164.]

13. It is in the context of those remarks that we now turn to the directions in which the Security Council should proceed. We fully concur with the Secretary-General that, despite obstacles strewn in its path, UNIFIL has performed an indispensable function and has contributed decisively towards restoring calm and maintaining peace and stability in Southern Lebanon and, indeed, in the region as a whole. We believe that it is necessary to retain the UNIFIL presence, not least because its withdrawal would have serious repercussions for the people of the area. It would also challenge the credibility of the United Nations concerning its ability effectively to deal with issues relating to international peace and security.

14. Nevertheless the decision to retain UNIFIL is not a very happy one. Virtually all Member States and the Secretary-General have cautioned against the assumption of an automatic renewal, particularly in view of imperfections and of advantages that accrue to Israel. UNIFIL cannot be taken for granted by any party. Its role must not be reduced to a limited preventive one, or to one of preserving in perpetuity a state of nebulous suspended peace. The Council has a clear responsibility to promote UNIFIL's competence and its capacity to fulfil its defined tasks. In this connexion, Bangladesh fully endorses the recommendation of the Secretary-General for a six-month extension of the mandate of UNIFIL, as also the views expressed in paragraph 42 of his report regarding the essential conditions for its fulfilment.

15. No one can usefully deny that the UNIFIL mandate has been obstructed or be ignorant as to who is primarily responsible. In the absence of the combined will and support of all members for stronger remedial action, despite the deteriorating situation, the Council must pursue the only remaining remedy, that of effectively applying pressure on Israel to make it fulfil its obligations and comply with its commitment to co-operate with UNIFIL. We are aware of the past efforts pursued in this direction by those who have influence on Israel, and also of those of the troop-contributing countries acting individually and collectively. We welcome these bilateral efforts, though they have not borne much fruit.

16. In the final analysis, however, the Council itself cannot be bypassed, and it must exercise its combined weight and jurisdiction in consonance with its responsibilities under the Charter. Bangladesh is committed to supporting all measures that will lead to an effective progression and the realization of the aims spelled out in the resolutions of the Council. To that end we are willing to co-operate in any move that can successfully contribute to this objective, including the adoption of measures laid down in the Charter.

17. In conclusion, I wish to express our deep gratitude to the Secretary-General and his representatives for their consistent and devoted efforts and to General Erskine, the Commander of UNIFIL, and the troops in the field under his command, who have performed with exemplary heroism under difficult and humiliating circumstances, not hesitating to make the supreme sacrifice. In that regard, we have already taken specific cognizance of the efforts undertaken by the Lebanese Government to reassert its presence and authority in the area under the most adverse circumstances. But we believe that it is our duty to continue to assist and support Lebanon during this time of crisis until the final restoration of its full authority in the area.

18. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I thank the representative of Bangladesh for the kind words he addressed to me. I thank him also for his remarks concerning the friendly relations existing between his country and mine.

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

20. Mr. BLUM (Israel): This is the eighth time in the course of the last 15 months that the Security Council has discussed the situation in Southern Lebanon. However, thus far we have been treated to a very selective reading of the situation. As on previous occasions, an undisguised attempt has been made by some participants to gloss over the real issues relating to Lebanon and instead to focus their comments on Israel almost exclusively, in a highly mischievous and diversionary manner.

21. All of us here are painfully aware that Lebanon's problems did not begin with the events that led to the establishment of UNIFIL and are by no means confined to the area of its operation. In their present form, Lebanon's problems began in the early 1970s, when the terror-

ist PLO injected itself in large numbers into Lebanon and set up a State within a State there, particularly in the area of the south of that country, which was dubbed Fatahland. Then, during the civil war that began in 1974, Syria exploited the opportunity to invade Lebanon on the pretext of aiding the Government of Lebanon against the PLO and of restoring peace. Having ruthlessly massacred Palestinians in Tel al-Zaatar and elsewhere, it then turned upon the Christians and in the process not only laid the country bare but also tore it apart.

22. The members of the Council are more than familiar with these facts, and there is no need to elaborate upon them here. What should be stressed, however, is that the situation now prevailing in the south of Lebanon is a direct outcome of the situation in other parts of that deeply troubled country, and in particular at Beirut and its environs.

23. When the Council met in March 1978 to deal with the question of Southern Lebanon, it was well aware of those facts. Thus the Council took cognizance of the problem of Lebanon as a whole, fully understanding that the presence of thousands of armed PLO terrorists and the presence of up to one third of the Syrian army on Lebanese soil constituted major barriers to the establishment of international peace and security and to the reassertion thereafter of Lebanon's authority over its territory. With those considerations in mind, in its resolution 425 (1978), 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".

24. UNIFIL was established not only for the purpose of confirming the withdrawal of the Israeli Defence Forces, but also for the purpose of "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 that 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—that being a necessary condition for the establishment of international peace and security.

25. In recent months we have witnessed a distinct tendency to ignore essential elements of resolution 425 (1978). Indeed, the truncation of the UNIFIL mandate may even be inferred from the subsection entitled "Guidelines and terms of reference" which has appeared in the last three reports prepared by the Secretary-General in anticipation of the periodic renewals of the UNIFIL mandate. On that interpretation, UNIFIL's function would be confined (a) to confirming Israel's withdrawal—which was done on 13 June 1978; I refer members to the Secretary-General's report of the same date [S/12620/Add.5]—and (b) to the establishment and maintenance of an area of operation.

26. Somehow, attention seems to have been diverted from the centrality of the other inseparable components

of the UNIFIL mandate, which are, first, the restoration of international peace and security—and, I should point out, “international peace and security” is a two-way street—and, secondly, assistance to the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area—that is, only after restoring international peace and security.

27. Israel's concern in these matters derives from a direct and vital security interest. What happens in Southern Lebanon directly affects the daily lives and safety of our people who live in the towns and villages throughout Israel, and in particular in the north of our country. The speedy return of PLO terrorists to Southern Lebanon as a base for operations against civilian targets in Israel, as it had been for several years in the past, is therefore a matter of deep concern.

28. As I pointed out in my letter of 9 May 1979 [S/13312], the PLO made no attempt to hide its intentions. Shortly after UNIFIL was established, Abu Iyyad, one of Yasser Arafat's leading henchmen, indicated in an interview with the Swiss newspaper *Tages Anzeiger* in April 1978 that the PLO would return to its bases in Southern Lebanon.

29. The PLO moved quickly to carry out its threat, and within months of the establishment of UNIFIL, about 2,000 of its armed terrorists found their way south of the River Litani. Some 1,500 of them are located in and around the area of Tyre, which reaches within eight miles of Israel—an area which was originally conceived as part of the UNIFIL area of operation and which UNIFIL was prevented from entering by PLO terrorists who did not hesitate to use armed force and to kill and wound UNIFIL soldiers. To make matters worse, there are also today several hundred other armed terrorists inside the UNIFIL area of operation, whom the Force allows to receive supplies on a regular basis.

30. Moreover, as indicated in paragraph 21 of the Secretary-General's latest report, in recent months there have been increased efforts by PLO terrorists to infiltrate the area under UNIFIL's control. The Secretary-General speaks of “40 major infiltration attempts involving 140 armed elements”—“armed elements” being the euphemistic term adopted here for PLO terrorists. Those involved “were escorted out of the area”—presumably still in possession of their weapons and no doubt to try their luck on another occasion.

31. This is by no means the end of the story, for there are another 10,000 to 12,000 armed terrorists in areas of Lebanon north of the Litani.

32. In the first few months of UNIFIL's existence, the PLO maintained a relatively low profile, especially with regard to the Force. However, as the Secretary-General indicated in paragraph 19 of his report of 19 April 1979 [S/13258] and then stated emphatically in paragraph 24 of his latest report:

“The number of incidents involving Palestinian and Lebanese armed elements and UNIFIL has increased

during the period under review. The majority of those incidents involved attempts at infiltration of armed personnel into the UNIFIL area of operation which were successfully prevented by UNIFIL.... The most serious of those incidents occurred on 3 February in the Fijian battalion headquarters area at Qana, which resulted in the death of two Fijian soldiers and the wounding of four others. On that occasion, four Norwegian medical personnel aboard a UNIFIL helicopter that had been dispatched to evacuate one of the wounded Fijian soldiers were also killed as the craft accidentally hit an overhead electric cable and crashed.”

The list given by the Secretary-General is, as he himself indicated, by no means complete.

33. In the light of such provocations by the PLO, the UNIFIL spokesman issued the following statement on 23 May:

“A significant increase in the number of attempts by various groups of armed elements, in particular those in the Tyre pocket, to harass UNIFIL personnel and to infiltrate into the UNIFIL area of operation has become a source of growing concern to the Force's command. This disturbing trend has manifested itself recently in frequent ambushes laid to UNIFIL vehicles on the road linking Naqoura, the Force's headquarters, to Tyre. Such totally unwarranted and irresponsible acts, in addition to material losses, have led to increased tension in the area which may result in unnecessary fatalities.

“The UNIFIL command is well aware of the fact that these armed elements are encouraged by their conviction that disciplined UNIFIL troops will not use arms except in the strictest sense of self-defence.”

34. In parallel, there has been a distinct and serious escalation of the exchanges of fire within the area under UNIFIL control. The gravest of those incidents involved heavy exchanges of fire over a period extending from 26 to 30 May between the PLO and the local Lebanese forces in the south. As the Secretary-General pointed out, both in his statement before the Council on 31 May [2146th meeting] and again in paragraph 30 of his latest report, most of the firing was initiated by the PLO.

35. In this connexion, a joint communiqué was issued a few days ago by the PLO and its Lebanese allies regarding their alleged redeployment in Southern Lebanon. As I observed in my statement before the Council two days ago [2147th meeting], the practical implications of that communiqué are virtually meaningless and there can be little doubt that its sole purpose is to serve as a smoke-screen for continued PLO violence both within the UNIFIL area of operation and across the border with Israel.

36. Let me remind members of the Council that in the past six months, and in particular since the signing of the Israel-Egypt peace treaty on 26 March 1979, the PLO has once again activated Southern Lebanon as a base for indiscriminate attacks on civilian centres in northern Israel. In my letter of 9 May, I gave an extensive list of terrorist attacks launched by the PLO by land and sea from Lebanese territory against civilian centres in the north of Israel.

37. I shall not go into the gory and brutal details. These have been described in the letters submitted by me, as the worst of the atrocities that have occurred. I shall only remind members that in the past six months some 20 major outrages have been perpetrated or attempted against Israel by PLO criminals setting out from Lebanon.

38. Moreover, as pointed out by the Secretary-General at the beginning of the present debate and in his latest report, those attacks by land and sea from Lebanese territory are not isolated acts. They are part of a much wider pattern and must be seen as such. Hence, during the same period, that is in the past six months, there have been over 30 other major acts of PLO terror in Israel.

39. In sum, the criminal activities of the PLO over the past six months have resulted in 19 fatalities and the injury of 232 people in Israel. All the casualties have been civilians, and many of them children.

40. The PLO, as is its wont, has openly boasted of its responsibility for all those acts. Moreover, in almost every case it was through its news agency at Beirut and on its radio station broadcasting from Lebanon that the PLO bragged of this responsibility. Members of the Council will find ample evidence of this phenomenon with regard to the outrages in my letters of the past six months circulated as official documents.

41. All the recent incidents have one thing in common. They aim at the mass murder of civilians. That 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. That is the true character and the true face of the terrorist PLO.

42. Moreover, the PLO has also stressed its intention of continuing its criminal activities, particularly in connexion with the signing of the Israel-Egypt peace treaty on 26 March 1979. Thus, on 12 March, Yasser Arafat was quoted by the Associated Press at Beirut as saying:

"Carter, Begin and Sadat should understand that we will burn everything.... Our people will continue to fuel the torch of the revolution with rivers of blood."

On 2 April, Farouk Khaddoumi, another of Arafat's henchmen, openly said in an interview with the Kuwaiti newspaper *al-Ra'i al-'Amm* that the PLO would escalate its activities against Israel.

43. That then is a true reflection of the PLO's intentions—despite its so-called "renewed commitment" not to shell Israeli Defence Forces or the local Lebanese force targets "unless attacked first" and not to launch attacks across the Lebanese border. As I said in my statement on Tuesday, the PLO was in fact in the process of violating that "commitment" in Southern Lebanon at precisely the same time as it was supposedly "reaffirming" it through United Nations channels at Beirut.

44. It is difficult to grasp how some members of the Council can ignore the fact that UNIFIL is now being

blatantly used as a cover behind which PLO terrorists can shelter whilst planning and launching their attacks and then hide their tracks after carrying out their criminal acts. It is equally difficult to grasp how in the light of this wholly reprehensible record of direct challenges to and abuse of UNIFIL, the PLO can be portrayed here in a favourable light and requested merely to continue its over-all co-operation as an essential condition for the effective discharge by UNIFIL of its duties. What is really called for is a forthright condemnation of the PLO's flagrant violation of the UNIFIL mandate.

45. As I said in my statement in the Council on 19 January 1979 [2113th meeting], a new element in the PLO's tactics has emerged in recent months. 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. That surely is wholly inadmissible and can only be regarded as what it is—the total abuse of international peace-keeping.

46. In the attempt on the guest house at Ma'alot on 13 January 1979, reported in my letter of 14 January [S/13028], it was clear that the three PLO terrorists involved crossed through UNIFIL lines on the way to carrying out their criminal act. The same holds true for a group of six PLO terrorists encountered and eliminated on 16 April by the Israeli Defence Forces near the village of Zar'it near the northern border of Israel, as reported in my letter of 19 April [S/13261]. The background to the PLO terrorist attack on kibbutz Manara on the border with Lebanon on 9 May, reported in my letter of the same date [S/13312] is equally disquieting. In that incident a patrol of the Israeli Defence Forces wounded and captured one terrorist. He disclosed that the group had set out from Tyre. They entered the UNIFIL area of operation from the north and proceeded through the UNIFIL lines to the village of Shaqra which is well within the UNIFIL area of operation. At the village they received weapons and instructions about their operation before crossing the border into Israel. Their orders were to carry out the mass murder of Israeli civilians. After an exchange of fire with the patrol of the Israeli Defence Forces, the terrorists who were not wounded fled to Lebanon in the direction of Mis al-Jebel and from there they backtracked to Shaqra.

47. 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 abused, 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. That danger must be recognized and all effective steps must be taken to avert it.

48. In striking at the terrorist bases from which the PLO murder gangs launched 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 which has found expression in Article 51 of the Charter.

49. I must reiterate that, statements to the contrary notwithstanding, 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 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, irrespective of whether it is unwilling or unable to curb such activities. In Oppenheim's authoritative treatise on international law, it is explicitly stated that:

"...States are under a duty to prevent and suppress such subversive activity against foreign Governments as assumes the form of armed hostile expeditions, or attempts to commit common crimes against life or property."¹

Another foremost authority on international law, Hans Kelsen, stated in very similar terms:

"...States are obliged by general international law to prevent certain acts injurious to other States from being committed on their territories, and if prevention is not possible, to punish the delinquents and force them to repair the damage caused by the delict. Such injurious acts are, for example, ... hostile expeditions organized in the territory of a State and directed against the territorial integrity of a foreign State."²

50. In the course of the present debate, the representative of Lebanon has repeatedly relied on the Israeli-Lebanese General Armistice Agreement of 23 March 1949.³ However, as I have already pointed out, that Agreement was brought to an end by Lebanon in June 1967. That conclusion is warranted by the fact that the Lebanese attack on Israel during the Six Day War of 1967 was in the nature of a "material breach" of the Agreement, article I, paragraph 2, of which had provided that:

"No aggressive action by the armed forces—land, sea, or air—of either Party shall be undertaken, planned, or threatened against the people or the armed forces of the other."

And it is an accepted principle of international law, which has now also found expression in the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, that:

"A material breach of a bilateral treaty by one of the parties entitles the other to invoke the breach as a ground for terminating the treaty or suspending its operation in whole or in part."⁴

I might add that subsequent to June 1967 the Government of Lebanon also repeatedly demonstrated that it no longer

¹ L. Oppenheim, *International Law: A Treatise*, 8th ed., H. Lauterpacht, ed. (London, Longman's), vol. I, pp. 292-293.

² Hans Kelsen, *Principles of International Law*, 2nd ed., Robert W. Tucker, ed. (New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.) pp. 205-206.

³ *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 4.*

⁴ *Official Records of the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties, Documents of the Conference* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.70.V.5), document A/CONF.39/27, art. 60.

considered the Armistice Agreement in force by concluding a series of agreements with the terrorist PLO that were totally incompatible with its basic obligations under the Armistice Agreement.

51. We have heard much about the local Lebanese forces in the south. While Israel is not responsible for their attitudes and actions, it cannot be indifferent to the fate of the villagers in the south. The PLO terror is aimed equally at them, and they act accordingly in what they judge to be a matter of their own survival. What seems to be forgotten is that the local forces in the south are Lebanese, and that their perceptions and responses are conditioned in the context of Lebanon as a whole. They are in continual contact with the north. Day by day, they receive detailed reports about what is happening there. That is what influences and determines their actions. This is acknowledged in paragraph 39 of the Secretary-General's latest report, and even more explicitly in his report of 12 January 1979 which states that:

"...the situation in Southern Lebanon cannot be divorced from the situation in the rest of the country and to a lesser extent in the region as a whole. This factor unquestionably plays an important role in determining the attitude of various parties to UNIFIL, an attitude which is strongly influenced by their perception and interpretation of developments in Lebanon and in the region as a whole. It is important to remember that UNIFIL is not acting in isolation in Southern Lebanon." [S/13026, para. 37.]

52. To detach the question of Southern Lebanon from the situation in Lebanon as a whole will not enhance the cause of peace. It is Israel's view that peace cannot be restored in Lebanon while a Syrian occupation army trains its gun-sights on the civilian population of Beirut and while armed PLO terrorists are allowed free rein on Lebanese soil.

53. As we heard from the representative of Syria this morning [2148th meeting], the Syrian army of occupation continues to masquerade in Lebanon as an "Arab deterrent force". But, as is well known, all the other national contingents of that force, whose task it was to cover up the true character of the Syrian occupation, have since been withdrawn. The Syrian representative can thus no longer hide behind such a transparent fig leaf.

54. Israel appeals to the Security Council to face the fundamental problems of Lebanon with realism. Until the nettle of restoring international peace and security is grasped, there can be no real prospect of restoring Lebanese sovereignty in its international boundaries.

55. Israel would like to pay a tribute to the Commander of UNIFIL, Major-General Emmanuel A. Erskine, and his staff, as well as to the soldiers of all ranks serving with UNIFIL in the most arduous of circumstances. Israel opposes without qualification any firing on or shelling of UNIFIL. As Prime Minister Begin said in the Knesset on 7 May:

"Israel wishes to co-operate with UNIFIL. The Force fulfils an important function in Lebanon. No

injury must be caused to the men of UNIFIL. They must not be placed under siege. They must not be shelled. They must not be fired at."

56. Israel would like to take this opportunity to express its condolences to the families of UNIFIL soldiers of all nationalities who have lost their lives in Southern Lebanon in recent months and to convey its wishes for a speedy recovery to the officers and men of UNIFIL who have been wounded during this period.

57. Let me repeat that the position of Israel vis-à-vis Lebanon remains consistent: Israel supports the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. The Government of Israel wants peace with Lebanon, and made a formal proposal to that effect last month. On 31 May, and again on 12 June, in this chamber, I drew the attention of the Lebanese representative to that proposal to make peace between our two nations. The Government of Israel still awaits the response of Lebanon to that proposal. A quotation from an American newspaper, as offered by the Lebanese representative two days ago, cannot be regarded as an adequate response.

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

59. Mr. KEATING (Ireland): Mr. President, first of all may I thank you and the other members of the Council for your courtesy in giving me this opportunity to express my country's views to the Council today. May I also congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month and wish it every success in its deliberations under your distinguished leadership.

60. This has been a very wide-ranging debate. It is my purpose not to extend its limits but to concentrate on one particular aspect of the matter which has been raised by the Secretary-General in his report on UNIFIL for the five-month period ending on 8 June and the present role and future of the Force. It is not usual for the Irish representative to seek to intervene in the debates before the Council, but we feel we have a particular interest in making a contribution on this matter because of the involvement of an Irish contingent in the Force we are now discussing.

61. In making this statement, my delegation does not intend to minimize or to show any lack of appreciation for the very great problems and difficulties that face all the participants in the Southern Lebanon tragedy. We know that they are all faced with serious and weighty choices which affect inevitably the future of all they hold dear. Any comments we make are made with a view to being constructive and are made with that particular restraint which we feel our involvement in a United Nations peace-keeping operation in the area imposes.

62. The Government and people of Ireland have been particularly moved by the tragedy and suffering of the people of Lebanon in recent years. We have felt a fellow

feeling for the inhabitants of small countries entangled in a geopolitical situation which imposed difficulties and hard choices. Hence we welcomed Security Council resolution 425 (1978) of March 1978 which seemed to us to offer all participants an honourable solution to the entangled situation which had arisen and which contained concrete and constructive proposals to bring about the withdrawal of the Israeli Defence Forces from Southern Lebanon and to re-establish the authority of the legitimate Government of Lebanon in that area. The achievement of those two objectives, we hoped, would bring peace and security to the people of Southern Lebanon and contribute to the attainment of the same peace and security by the peoples of all the States in the region.

63. We were encouraged by the fact that there appeared to exist the requisite goodwill on the part of those involved in the conflict in the area. The Government of Ireland in May 1978 agreed to contribute a contingent to the Force on the understanding that all sides would co-operate fully with UNIFIL as it carried out the mandate entrusted to it by the Council, and we accepted the necessity for it. We had no direct interests or involvement in the region, but as a small country we felt it a duty to respond to a request from the Secretary-General to contribute to a peace-keeping operation established by the Council on behalf of the international community as a whole. This then is the basis on which we made an Irish contingent available for service with UNIFIL.

64. My Government is now extremely concerned at the latest report of the Secretary-General which indicates quite clearly that the requisite co-operation has not been forthcoming from all the parties to the conflict. On the contrary, the report catalogues a history of harassment and intimidation of the soldiers of UNIFIL by various armed groups. Those armed groups, equipped by external forces, have to date prevented UNIFIL from deploying fully in its defined area of operation and have intimidated, harassed and directly attacked members of the Force.

65. Although UNIFIL has been harassed by both sides to the present conflict, the most immediate threat continues to come from the *de facto* forces of Major Haddad which have been supplied and equipped by Israel. As is clear from the Secretary-General's report, these forces have prevented the deployment of UNIFIL and have harassed and attacked both the members of UNIFIL and the local Lebanese civilian population.

66. All the States Members of this Organization must, I am sure, express the utmost concern at this situation. For the troop-contributing States, this problem is a most immediate one. Our Governments have contributed troops to the United Nations Force in order to help to bring peace to that troubled region. We feel that all Member States have an obligation to co-operate with the Force which is attempting to implement the mandate entrusted to it by the world community on their behalf. This obligation is particularly great in a case where a State clearly has very considerable influence over, and indeed supplies, the forces which harass United Nations forces.

67. The objectives of UNIFIL were set out in resolution 425 (1978) as confirming the withdrawal of Israeli Defence

Forces from Southern Lebanon, restoring international peace and security and assisting the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area.

68. The Force has confirmed that the Israeli Defence Forces have withdrawn from Southern Lebanon. However, my Government regrets the decision then made to hand over many positions to the *de facto* forces of Major Haddad. We note that the Secretary-General's report indicates that a total of 291 border violations by the Israeli Defence Forces have been witnessed by UNIFIL over the past five months. My Government views this situation with the utmost concern.

69. The Force in its initial stages has been successful in ensuring peace and security for the inhabitants in its area of operation and in ensuring the return of a level of normality in Southern Lebanon. This has been perhaps the greatest achievement of the Force. However, the continuing shelling, harassment and intimidation of both UNIFIL and the civilian population by the *de facto* forces in recent months has led to a deterioration in this regard. I am sure that all Member States must deplore and condemn the recent shellings which have forced much of the civilian population in the area to flee their homes, as reported in paragraph 26 of the Secretary-General's report.

70. We recognize, of course, that there is also at times a problem of the attempted infiltration of the area by other armed elements seeking to make incursions into Israel and we would not wish to minimize that aspect of the issue. However, we are encouraged to note that the Secretary-General makes clear in paragraph 24 of his report that the Force has been successful in preventing most of those incidents of attempted infiltration by armed personnel into or through the existing area of operation of the Force and that, as he also states, the Palestinian Liberation Organization has pursued a policy which has for the most part kept such activities in check.

71. It is clear from that report of the Secretary-General and indeed from the experience of our own contingent, that the major problem facing UNIFIL for some time now has been, and remains, twofold—the entrenched position of the Haddad forces in part of the area which has prevented the full deployment of the Force, and the continuing and dangerous harassment which UNIFIL suffers from the Haddad forces as it carries out its mandate in the area where it is deployed. This regular interference with UNIFIL on a large scale, and regrettably, it appears, with external support, cannot but in the long run damage its effectiveness and indeed possibly affect the over-all credibility of United Nations peace-keeping forces in the region. It is that, as well as the direct danger to our troops on their peace-keeping mission, which causes my Government such grave concern and which has led my delegation to take the, for us, unprecedented step of asking to speak in the Council in a debate of this kind.

72. With the aim of ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area, the Government of Lebanon, in consultation with the United Nations, drew up a phased programme of activities. The first phase of their programme envisaged, on the one hand, a return of Lebanese civilian

and military personnel to the area and, on the other, a consolidation of the cease-fire, an end to the harassment by the *de facto* forces and further deployment by UNIFIL in the border area, particularly around the headquarters of UNIFIL at Naqoura. My Government is happy to note from the Secretary-General's report that part of the programme has been achieved, namely, the deployment of Lebanese civilian, administrative and military personnel in the UNIFIL area and agrees that these represent important steps towards the restoration of the Lebanese Government's authority. We should like to express our thanks to the Government of Lebanon in this regard. However, my Government must express its utmost concern that, in relation to the other part of the phased programme of activities—to quote the Secretary-General—"little progress has been achieved so far" [S/13384, para. 20]. This is despite much high-level diplomatic activity by various well-disposed parties.

73. I have outlined in some detail the relative successes of the Force which, I believe, are often too easily overlooked. UNIFIL has been a force for stability in the region and has achieved much in that regard. It has, in our view, acted impartially and to the best of its ability to implement the mandate with which it has been entrusted by the world community. I believe that no one can seriously question its impartiality or its activities since its inception. There is, however, as outlined by the Secretary-General, an urgent need for progress to be made towards the complete fulfilment of the UNIFIL mandate, in the first instance by a cessation of harassment by the *de facto* forces of both the members of UNIFIL and the Lebanese civilian population. In addition, there is an obvious immediate need for an adequate security perimeter for the headquarters of the Force at Naqoura.

74. The situation in Southern Lebanon poses a serious threat to the peace and stability not just of Lebanon but of the entire region. The world community has through the Security Council taken action to defuse this threat by establishing an interim force which was given a defined mandate. The international community cannot and indeed must not allow UNIFIL to fail. A failure by UNIFIL to carry out its mandate would have the most serious consequences for peace in the region, for the peace-keeping role of the United Nations and, consequently, for the United Nations itself. It is the responsibility of all Member States to ensure the success of UNIFIL.

75. I should like to appeal to all the parties involved, and particularly to the Government of Israel, to co-operate fully with UNIFIL and to assist it actively in carrying out the mandate entrusted to it by the Security Council. In that connexion we note the statement of the representative of Israel in the Council debate last Tuesday [2147th meeting] that Israel will continue to co-operate with the Force. We would hope that that co-operation will, as he said, lead to the solution of the outstanding problem to the satisfaction of those directly and legitimately concerned.

76. In conclusion, I should like to express our thanks to the Secretary-General and his most able staff and to the Force Commander of UNIFIL, General Erskine, for the way in which they have conducted this important peace-keeping operation of the United Nations. I should like to

express the hope that the statements during this debate, and the resolution which is to be adopted, will help in ensuring the success of UNIFIL.

77. Mr. PETREE (United States of America): Mr. President, first of all I wish to join with others around this table in welcoming you to the presidency of the Council. I am happy to assure you of the full co-operation of the United States delegation in the heavy schedule of work facing us this month. I also wish to take this opportunity to express our appreciation and admiration for the manner in which your predecessor, Ambassador Futscher Pereira of Portugal handled his responsibilities during the busy weeks of May.

78. Recent events in Lebanon give our meeting a special importance. The stability which we had hoped would flow from the introduction of UNIFIL into Southern Lebanon has not followed with the rapidity and the results that we had expected. The co-operation which the Council has every right to expect from the Governments and the parties concerned has not generally been forthcoming. The result has been persistent instability, terrorism and violence in Southern Lebanon and a continuing challenge to the authority of the Council and of its decisions.

79. As we renew the UNIFIL mandate, we must commit ourselves anew to exploring what avenues and steps are available to calm the situation, reduce the prospects of violence and allow UNIFIL to fulfil its ultimate objective—the restoration of Lebanese governmental authority in Southern Lebanon.

80. Let me first state my Government's position on the issues involved.

81. First, the United States supports unconditionally the sovereignty, unity, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon. Actions from any quarter which threaten, qualify or raise reservations about Lebanon's integrity are totally unacceptable to the members of the Council and to the international community as a whole.

82. Secondly, the United States supports UNIFIL and the continuing efforts to ensure the implementation of its objectives. It is important to acknowledge that, despite the very difficult circumstances under which the officers and men of UNIFIL have operated, some gradual progress has been made in the direction of re-establishing Lebanon's sovereignty over its territory. Two months ago a battalion of Lebanese troops deployed south of the Litani. That deployment was not without difficulties, but it finally did take place and succeeded because at least some of the parties involved, including Israel, were willing to co-operate. Those forces, along with the increasing numbers of Lebanese civilian and police administrators in the south, seem to us to offer a hope of steady progress towards meeting the stated objectives of the Council. We welcome these steps taken by the Lebanese Government in conjunction with UNIFIL.

83. Thirdly, the Arab world must assist Lebanon in requiring the extremist elements of the Palestinians in Lebanon, whose terrorist activities inflame the situation, to cease their activities against Israel. In this regard let me note that, while my Government supports the draft resolution

before us [S/13392], we must express our concern that its operative paragraph 1 lacks balance. For that reason, if the paragraph were voted on separately, it would be most difficult for us to support it. We deplore acts of violence against Lebanon, but we equally deplore acts of violence and terrorism directed indiscriminately against Israeli citizens, including women and children. The Council must insist on Israeli co-operation with UNIFIL; and it must also insist with equal vigour that those in a position to influence Palestinian extremists make strong efforts to end the mindless terrorism which contributes to the pattern of violence and counter-violence on Lebanese and Israeli territory.

84. Fourthly, the United States believes that Israel has not co-operated fully with UNIFIL as it carries out the tasks the Council has assigned to it. Israeli actions have contributed to the atmosphere of tension which exists in Southern Lebanon today. We simply cannot accept a situation in which UNIFIL is constantly harassed by forces supplied and supported by Israel and its officers' and men's lives placed in constant danger, with some of those officers and men having already been killed.

85. As many at this table have noted, as a result of recent actions, scores of innocent civilians have been killed or wounded, and many have fled from the area fearing a continuation of the violence. UNIFIL itself has lost brave men and finds its authority flouted by the irregular Christian militia, by Israel and by the Palestinian terrorists who attempt to infiltrate through UNIFIL lines. As a peace-keeping force which is not heavily armed, UNIFIL must rely on the co-operation of the parties in the conflict. But the lack of co-operation has meant that instead of concentrating on its major goals UNIFIL increasingly has had to defend itself from unprovoked attacks by elements in the area of operation who know that UNIFIL's defensive weapons are no match for their fire-power.

86. Action by a variety of parties and Governments will be needed if UNIFIL is to achieve its objectives. The Government of Lebanon must continue its efforts to extend its authority in the south in co-operation with UNIFIL. All Governments which have influence with the parties concerned must insist that UNIFIL's authority be respected and its mandate fulfilled. We note and welcome in that regard Prime Minister Begin's statement of 7 May in the Israeli Parliament in which he said that Israel supports the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of Lebanon and expressed Israel's determination to co-operate with UNIFIL, whose role he called "important" and "positive". The Prime Minister further stated that UNIFIL must not be shelled and that Israel had made that clear to the private militias in the south. We hope that statement will produce the desired results in the coming period.

87. With regard to operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, we support the machinery provided by the 1949 Armistice Agreement as offering one way for the Governments of Israel and Lebanon to be in contact. The Armistice Agreement remains in force, and we believe Lebanon and Israel should attempt to use the arrangements under it.

88. We note also the Palestinian statement of 5 June expressing the intention of taking certain steps to reduce the

tension and violence in Southern Lebanon. We are not aware to date that those measures have been implemented. We hope that commitment will be carried out in practice and we shall watch closely to see if it is translated into a new reality on the ground. We would welcome steps of restraint.

89. Finally, let me once again express my Government's admiration for the dedicated and selfless efforts of the officers and men of UNIFIL. No peace-keeping force has served in a more important capacity nor in more trying and difficult circumstances. The bravery those men have shown is unmatched in the history of peace-keeping. They deserve our heart-felt thanks and our support. Let us dedicate ourselves to renewed, vigorous efforts to advance towards the goals we have set for UNIFIL.

90. Mr. NEIL (Jamaica): I am pleased at the outset to express to you, Sir, my delegation's warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. Your formidable skills as a diplomat, your experience and your excellent rapport with Council members give full assurance of effective leadership in the busy and possibly difficult days ahead. We are pleased to pledge our full co-operation to you, particularly in the light of the friendly relations which exist between our two countries and which have been further strengthened during the recent visit by my Prime Minister to your country.

91. We should also like to congratulate your predecessor, Ambassador Futscher Pereira of Portugal, for his effective presidency during the month of May when he displayed impressive qualities of leadership, patience and perseverance in advancing the work of the Council.

92. As we continue our consideration of the problems in Southern Lebanon, we are aware that, despite the efforts of the Security Council, the Secretary-General and certain Member States, the situation has continued to deteriorate. Since the events of the latter part of April, sporadic incidents of fighting have occurred with distressing frequency, causing considerable danger to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, the civilian population of the area and difficulty to the over-all maintenance of peace there. The Secretary-General's latest report gives a full picture of those events.

93. Most alarming is the continued provocative attitude of the rebel forces of Haddad and their persistent resort to violence. In addition, Israel's military incursions into Lebanon, its bombardment of Lebanese territory and the collaboration of its defence forces with the illegal forces controlled by the rebel Haddad have continued. Since the cease-fire arranged by UNIFIL on 31 May, there have been reports of renewed violations by Israel of Lebanese air space, as well as further Israeli shelling of and air raids into Lebanese territory. These actions have increased tension in the area and made the search for a solution even more difficult.

94. My delegation has noted the decision of the Palestine Liberation Organization to withdraw its armed forces from the villages and towns in Southern Lebanon and to remove its offices from Tyre in an effort to prevent further Israeli military incursions and bombardment of that area. We

welcome the announcement that the PLO leadership has reiterated its pledge not to initiate action against the *de facto* forces and the Israeli Defence Forces from within the UNIFIL-controlled sectors and to continue its policy of co-operation with UNIFIL. To us that represents a positive development which takes into account the interests, safety and welfare of the Lebanese people and which, if matched by a corresponding commitment from the opposed parties, could significantly reduce tension and contribute to the restoration of calm in Lebanon.

95. Far from co-operating with UNIFIL, however, the *de facto* forces have remained intransigent and have deplorably escalated their harassment and attacks against UNIFIL and the civilian population within the UNIFIL area of operation. What is described in the Secretary-General's report in paragraphs 25 to 27 is tantamount to a war launched by the *de facto* forces against UNIFIL. They have shelled UNIFIL positions, producing casualties among UNIFIL forces and Lebanese civilians. They have abducted United Nations military and civilian personnel and cut the supply routes of three Irish positions. Most recently, in the course of our consideration of the situation in Lebanon and the question of the renewal of the UNIFIL mandate, the *de facto* forces attacked the Dutch contingent of UNIFIL and engaged it in a lengthy exchange of fire. That assault was totally unprovoked, as was the initial attack against the headquarters of UNIFIL at Naqoura on 19 April.

96. Not only have the illegal Haddad forces prevented UNIFIL from extending its area of control in Southern Lebanon, as mandated by the Security Council, but they have so far resisted all efforts to establish a security zone for the UNIFIL headquarters. In that very dangerous situation, UNIFIL has none the less continued its efforts to carry out its mandate. My delegation commends Major-General Erskine and the troops of UNIFIL on their courage, their discipline and their restraint in very trying and dangerous circumstances. We strongly deplore the incidents that have caused the deaths of four members of UNIFIL and we regret the accidents that took the lives of six others. Jamaica extends its deepest sympathies to the families of those who have lost their lives or suffered injury.

97. When we consider the risks to which UNIFIL has been exposed and the extremely dangerous situation in which it must operate, we believe it all the more deplorable that a State Member of the United Nations should be supporting the *de facto* forces in armed separatist activities and thus in their war against UNIFIL. This collaboration and Israel's persistent military incursions into Lebanon and its stated determination to continue to carry out pre-emptive strikes against PLO bases in Lebanon heighten the intractability of the Middle East problem while at the same time frustrating international efforts to restore calm, even in the limited area of Southern Lebanon. It would undoubtedly be in the best interests of Israel to co-operate with UNIFIL in fulfilling its mandate, which is essential for the preservation of peace on its borders with Lebanon.

98. Jamaica recognizes the need for the retention of UNIFIL since, despite the problems and the dangers of the situation, UNIFIL has been a deterrent to an all-out war in

the area. We therefore support the recommendation of the Secretary-General that the UNIFIL mandate be renewed for a further six-month period. We commend and support the steps taken by the Lebanese Government towards the restoration of its sovereignty and authority and territorial integrity. Jamaica will continue to support measures such as those in the phased programme of activities to achieve that result and thus facilitate the fulfilment of the UNIFIL mandate.

99. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I thank the representative of Jamaica for the kind words that he addressed to me. I should also like to thank him for his reference to the amicable relations that exist between his country and mine.

100. Mr. BLANKSON (Nigeria): Mr. President, as my delegation is speaking for the first time in the month of June, I should like to join with others who have addressed compliments to you in congratulating you on your accession to the presidency of the Council. I have no doubts whatsoever that your great talents and qualities and your rich experience will be valuable assets in your conduct of our deliberations during your tenure of office. At the same time, I should like to commend Ambassador Futscher Pereira of Portugal on the able manner in which he handled the affairs of the Council in the busy month of May.

101. My delegation has listened with a heavy heart to the harrowing account of the scope of the devastation and decimation wrought against Lebanon by Israel since 25 April. Ambassador Tuéni of Lebanon has had to perform the unpleasant task in the Council of giving a detailed account of the aggression carried out against his country. His version of what happened has since been vindicated by the world press, even by those sectors of it which have traditionally betrayed in their reportage a distinct bias in favour of Israel. As a result of that unprovoked aggression, tens of thousands of simple and peaceful Lebanese citizens have become refugees in their own homeland. Israeli aircraft continue to pound what have now been cynically described as terrorist bases. But what is the end result of such raids? Innocent and defenceless Lebanese citizens have perished; their homes have been destroyed; children have become orphaned and parents have lost their offspring. It is indeed a tragedy too pathetic to be described adequately in words, and it is the Council's obligation to put an end to this situation.

102. My delegation believes that the Lebanese tragedy is inextricably linked to the Palestinian problem, which continues to remain at the core of the larger Middle East crisis. Only a political solution guaranteeing unfettered freedoms and the right of self-determination to all Palestinians of the diaspora is likely to lead to a durable peace in the region. In order for that to be achieved, Israel must renounce in word and in deed its expansionist policies and respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of its neighbours. It must also desist from subverting the authority of the Lebanese Government and sever all links with the notorious bandits under the control of Major Haddad.

103. I should now like to offer some observations on the situation in Southern Lebanon, with particular reference to

the mandate granted to UNIFIL, a mandate which has once again come up for renewal before the Security Council. I should add that my Government supports the extension of the UNIFIL mandate for a further six-month period.

104. My delegation would like to express its gratitude to the Secretary-General for the lucid and comprehensive report on the activities of UNIFIL during the period between 13 January and 8 June 1979. The report in its entirety, however, hardly bears any good news, as it is filled with frustrating details of the serious difficulties facing UNIFIL in the implementation of resolution 425 (1978), which had the primary objective of restoring the authority and sovereignty of the State of Lebanon in the southern part of that country.

105. We have been told of endless consultations between the Secretary-General and his representative, on the one hand, and the Governments of Lebanon and Israel, on the other, in order to facilitate the task of UNIFIL, as stipulated in its mandate by the Council. It is a matter of deep regret and concern to my delegation that those consultations have not borne any positive results primarily because Israel has persisted, even in the face of resolutions adopted in the Council to the contrary, in continuing to take action the end result of which subverts the independence, authority and sovereignty of a Member State through the brazen support given to the bandits in the so-called *de facto* forces under Major Haddad.

106. UNIFIL, it may be recalled, set before itself four main objectives—first, an increase by the Lebanese Government of a Lebanese civilian administrative presence in the south; secondly, the introduction of a battalion of the Lebanese national army into the UNIFIL area of operation; thirdly, the consolidation of a cease-fire in the area and the cessation of harassment of UNIFIL and the local population in its area by the *de facto* forces; fourthly, the further deployment of and control by UNIFIL in the border area controlled by the *de facto* forces on the basis of the proposals put forward by the UNIFIL Commander.

107. Although the first two objectives seem to have been achieved, it is not without significance that the latest round of harassment of UNIFIL personnel, the shelling of their area of operation and the unprovoked attacks on innocent villagers, triggering off new and agonizing waves of immigration, were timed to coincide with Lebanon's deployment of its military units in the south.

108. Major Haddad, apparently intoxicated by the assurance of continued Israeli military support, has had the effrontery not only to declare the six-mile belt—which was handed over to him, as it were, on a platter of gold—the independent State of "Free" Lebanon but also to demand that his armed bands be paid by the Lebanese exchequer. That action, like others before it, ranks among the worst displays of military arrogance in recent times.

109. It is not my intention to recount in greater detail some of the recent excesses of the *de facto* forces. The most recent have been graphically described in the latest report of the Secretary-General. But undoubtedly we are now confronted by an ominous escalation of the despicable activities of the *de facto* forces. UNIFIL observation posts have

become targets for illegal and provocative raids by Haddad's men. UNIFIL soldiers have been abducted in full view of their comrades and held for a long time. Those UNIFIL soldiers were released only after a determined intervention by the Force Commander. Some UNIFIL units have been denied their regular supplies simply because the Haddad men have decided to cut off their supply routes.

110. In the view of my delegation, Haddad is a puny character who would have long ago been put in his proper place if all possible pressure had been employed to block the flow of weapons to him from Israel. It is that indefensible policy of the Israeli Government that lies at the roots of the current paralysis in which UNIFIL has found itself. Israel has the most important answer to the current stalemate in Southern Lebanon. Haddad's scope must be reduced if UNIFIL is to be enabled to fulfil its mandate in accordance with resolution 425 (1978). We reject Israel's oft-repeated declaration that the Haddad forces are beyond its control. It is now clear that the cutting off of supplies to those surrogates or even the invocation of the threat to do so by the Israelis is the major key to stability in Southern Lebanon and, indeed, in the whole region.

111. Now that it seems fairly clear why peace has eluded us for so long in the area of the UNIFIL operation, my delegation is just wondering how long we shall sit with folded arms here and watch rather helplessly while Israel continues to defy the Council and to subvert Lebanese sovereignty by proxy. Fortunately, there are provisions in the Charter prescribing measures for dealing with States which indulge in disruptive activities that have a potential for undermining international peace and security. It is no longer enough for the Council to call on Israel to respect its resolutions or to condemn its acts of aggression against its neighbours. The Council must now consider taking effective measures to compel Israel to comply with its resolutions.

112. Unless we do just that, the Council runs the risk of institutionalizing peace-keeping forces all along Israel's borders and even of providing the Israelis with indirect and illegal logistic support. Should it do so, the Council would not only appear to be condoning aggression but would, in consequence, be undermining its own credibility as mankind's custodian of international peace and security. My delegation would not subscribe to a situation in which the Council was merely summoned to rubber-stamp, as it were, the renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL. The Council is obliged to act fast and firmly to bring an end to the political charade created in the region by defiance and recalcitrance. In that context my delegation hopes that the Council will take concrete measures to underline its indignation if Israel does not act soon to bring its surrogates—that is, the *de facto* forces—back to the path of sanity so as to enable UNIFIL to achieve the long overdue fulfilment of its mandate in the area.

113. Finally, we should like to pay a tribute to those valiant men of UNIFIL who have lost their lives or been maimed in the course of the performance of their duties. My only hope is that the Council will act in such a way as to ensure that the supreme sacrifice they have made has not been made in vain. We salute all personnel of the Force for their courage, dedication and level-headedness in the face of

such blatant provocations by the *de facto* forces. We equally commend General Siilasvuo and General Erskine for the exemplary leadership they have provided during such trying times. We equally laud the efforts of the Secretary-General, his relentless and indefatigable efforts towards the successful and early completion of the UNIFIL mandate. We wish to assure him and all his staff of Nigeria's unreserved support as he continues in his difficult and delicate task.

114. Mr. LAI Ya-li (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Mr. President, first of all I should like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of June and to express our appreciation and congratulations to Ambassador Futscher Pereira on his outstanding performance in the presidency for the month of May.

115. The developments in Southern Lebanon have caused widespread concern. Over a long period, Israel has attempted to dismember and annex Lebanese territories, undermine and sow discord in the relations between the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples and undermine the Palestinian cause of national liberation.

116. Following its massive invasion of Southern Lebanon in 1978, Israel instigated the secessionist forces to set up a "State within a State" in Southern Lebanon in a stubborn attempt to obstruct the Lebanese Government's exercise of its sovereignty there. Israel's outrageous acts have been unanimously condemned by the people of the world. The General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted a number of resolutions demanding that Israel should immediately halt its aggression against Lebanon and strictly respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

117. However, the Israeli Zionists, turning a deaf ear to all this, have further intensified their aggression. In recent months, they have repeatedly and flagrantly dispatched gunboats, military aircraft and ground forces to attack Southern Lebanon and slaughter innocent civilians, causing great loss of life and property among the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples. This is a renewed wanton provocation committed by the Israeli authorities against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples and all the Arab peoples, as well as a gross violation of and trampling upon the United Nations Charter. The Chinese Government and people strongly condemn the Israeli Zionists for their crimes of aggression and extend our deep sympathy and resolute support to the Lebanese Government and people in their just struggle to resist aggression and defend their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

118. We have always held that in order to solve the Middle East question it is imperative to remove super-Power meddling and interference, force Israel to withdraw from all the occupied Arab territories, and regain the national rights of the Palestinian people. Only thus can peace be realized in the Middle East and the security of the Arab countries be ensured. We maintain that the Security Council should speak up for justice, uphold the principles of the Charter, strongly condemn the Israeli crimes of aggression, take effective measures to halt all Israeli acts of aggression against Lebanon, firmly support the Lebanese Government

in re-establishing its sovereignty over Southern Lebanon, and give firm support to the Lebanese, Palestinian and other Arab peoples in their just struggle against aggression. The independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon must be strictly respected, and must in no way be encroached upon.

119. In view of the fact that the draft resolution contained in document S/13392 mainly concerns the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL, and based upon the position of principle we have always held on that matter, we have decided not to participate in the vote. Nevertheless, we support the positive elements in the draft resolution condemning Israeli aggression and demanding Israel's strict respect for the independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

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

121. Mr. SHAMMA (Jordan): I need not recall to the short memory of the Israeli representative that my statement this morning [2148th meeting] contained nothing about the PLO and its past differences with my Government. It seems, and of course it is, a Zionist habit to side-track the discussion at hand if things do not go along with Zionist values of cruelty, evil and hatred. But, since the professor of international law has brought up the matter, let me remind him that the events of September 1970 were caused by the Zionist values of cruelty, evil and hatred.

122. A cancer of zionism is being planted in the midst of our peace-loving Arab nation. Nurturing on the black values of zionism, this cancer has spread and brought destruction to the Palestinian people, and deprived them of their homeland and their livelihood. The Palestinians became refugees because of the cruel and evil values of black zionism, which do not contain anything of the values of peace, justice or humanity. It is because of that phenomenon that the Palestinians have not been allowed to go back to their homes in Palestine. Frustration, deprivation and misery led to the regrettable events of 1970 between some Palestinian elements and the Jordanian army.

123. We value peace, we value justice, and we value human life. But zionism values none of these, and that is why it attacks with cruelty, terrorizes with evil, and murders with no shame. That is exactly what zionism is doing in Palestine, in the West Bank of Jordan, in Gaza and in the Golan Heights—and now in Lebanon.

124. We ask the international community, through you, Mr. President, to ensure that Israel is contained, that its black Zionist values are eradicated, and that it is brought back to the fold of human values.

125. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): There are no other speakers at this stage, and I should therefore now like to make a statement in my capacity as representative of the UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS.

126. Israel's acts of aggression against Lebanon have been discussed on several occasions in the Security Council. In

resolution 425 (1978), in regard to Israeli aggression in Southern Lebanon, the Council called upon Israel to respect strictly the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon and immediately to cease its military action against Lebanon and to withdraw its forces from all Lebanese territory. In January this year [resolution 444 (1979)], the Council deplored the lack of co-operation by Israel with the United Nations Force to enable it fully to implement its mandate; it deplored Israel's assistance to irregular armed groups in Southern Lebanon. On 26 April [2141st meeting], in a statement by the President of the Council on behalf of its members, the need for the full implementation of resolution 425 (1978) was re-emphasized, and it was pointed out that if appropriate measures were not taken and, particularly, if further serious incidents were to occur, it would be necessary for the Council to meet without delay to consider the situation.

127. But all these demands and warnings by the Security Council were disregarded by Israel. Recently the world has been witnessing further, unceasing armed acts of provocation by Israel against Lebanon. As we read in a memorandum of 30 May by the Lebanese delegation [S/13361], Israel has been pursuing an unprecedented policy of State terrorism against Lebanon. It is perpetrating continuous acts of aggression against the urban and rural population of Lebanon and against the Palestinian refugee camps. This has resulted in many casualties among innocent civilians, in particular. The armed attacks by Israel have brought further misery to the Lebanese people and the Palestinian refugees. Enormous material damage has been done. Hundreds of buildings have been destroyed. To escape shelling and bombing, tens of thousands of Lebanese people have been compelled to leave their homes.

128. Notwithstanding Security Council resolutions, Israel continues to maintain its military presence in Southern Lebanon and thus makes it impossible for the United Nations Force to discharge the mandate entrusted to it. As is reaffirmed by the Secretary-General in his reports, the Israeli military clique is continuing to operate actively in Lebanon.

129. As a weapon in its aggressive policy in Lebanon, Israel is actively using the anti-Government armed units led by the notorious Haddad, who is attempting to foster the implementation of Tel Aviv's age-old plan to annex part of Lebanese territory. It is not merely by chance that in Israel people are saying openly that Israel will not abandon its ally, and that the so-called "Christian enclave" in Southern Lebanon is of "basic importance to Israel's own security". It is well known that precisely by invoking its own security interests, Israel is attempting to justify its occupation of the Golan Heights, the West Bank and Gaza.

130. Israel's acts of aggression against Lebanon are being perpetrated both directly by the Israeli armed forces and with the assistance of Haddad's units. These are being used to prevent the establishment of control by the United Nations Force and the Lebanese army over the border areas between Israel and Lebanon. Armed provocation is organized against the Force, and this has resulted in casualties among its personnel.

131. The dangerous situation which has resulted from Israeli provocation obtains to this very day. Recently, Israel has continued to perpetrate ever-new acts of aggression against Lebanon, in flagrant violation of the sovereignty of Lebanon and in open defiance of the Security Council and the United Nations as a whole.

132. As I noted in the letter of the representative of Lebanon dated 11 June [S/13387], since the last cease-fire declared on 31 May, Israel has perpetrated many new acts of aggression against Lebanon. That letter quite rightly points out that Israel's policy is aimed at increasing tension and preventing the restoration of peaceful conditions in Lebanon.

133. Israel has dealt blow upon blow to Lebanon, resorting to tactics of blackmail and military provocation against that Arab country. Israel's actions are directed not only against the Lebanese people but against the Palestinian people as well. They obviously intend, by any means, including the physical annihilation of the Palestinians living in Lebanon, to prevent the Palestinian people from achieving their aspirations to national rebirth and the creation of their own State.

134. The Israeli leaders cynically state that they intend to use further armed force against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon. They arrogate to themselves the right to teach lessons in the future as well to those who stand in the way of their expansionist policy. Attempts to elevate international tyranny and lawlessness to the status of State policy have, as members know, been condemned by all peace-loving countries.

135. The Israeli aggressors do not relent. It is noteworthy that Israel's armed provocation against Lebanon has become particularly defiant since the signing of the separate treaty between Israel and Egypt.

136. The Soviet Union, in accordance with United Nations decisions, has always stressed that a just and lasting peace in the Middle East can be attained only by a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict on the basis of a complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories which were occupied in 1967, the implementation of the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to create an independent State, and the ensuring of peace and security for all countries in that region. Events which are taking place now in the Middle East prove the truth of the repeated warnings issued by the Soviet Union that the path of separate deals not only does not and cannot lead to a just and lasting peace in the region but also creates the threat of even further complications and encourages Israel to launch new military adventures and attempts to entrench their occupation of Arab lands and further expansion.

137. Having gained a free hand in Sinai, Israel is stepping up its machinations against other Arab countries and peoples. Direct responsibility for that is borne by those who virtually connive at Israel's aggressive policy and, in particular, by certain United States interests. An entirely inadmissible situation is apparent. Israel not only does not show any intention of complying with the repeated decisions and

resolutions of the Security Council regarding strict observance of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon, but perpetrates ever more numerous acts of aggression.

138. But, instead of subjecting Israel to decisive censure for those actions, certain persons would have us believe that "diplomatic efforts" can lead to greater flexibility on the part of Israel and can make it co-operate with the United Nations. We have heard those appeals many times in the Council. It is quite obvious now that those "diplomatic efforts" have not led to any practical results. In the memorandum of the delegation of Lebanon dated 30 May, it is noted quite correctly that:

"As there are no visible signs of any Israeli compliance with the Security Council's consensus, Lebanon can only express regret that precious time was lost, and so was hope and confidence in the ability of Israel's friends to flex her determination to kill, destroy, and arrogantly disrupt every effort at establishing international law and order." [S/13361, annex, para. 3.]

139. The renewed armed acts of provocation by Israel against Lebanon patently show us that all attempts to placate the Israeli aggressor only lead to an increase in the aggressive expansionist trend of Israeli policy.

140. Obviously, if those countries which are able effectively to influence Israel were to do so, then the Israeli aggressors could not be so defiant and obstinate in their refusal to abide by Security Council resolutions. The Security Council cannot and indeed should not accept this inadmissible situation in which Israel openly sabotages Council decisions regarding the immediate cessation of Israeli aggression against Lebanon, and the demand in those resolutions for strict respect for the sovereign rights of that country. The Council should not disregard the appeal made by the Lebanese Government contained in the memorandum:

"Given the very serious, tragic and persistent acts of aggression perpetrated by Israel, the Lebanese Government considers that the Council must now be called upon to take a most drastic attitude, in full cognizance of the facts." [Ibid.]

141. The Soviet delegation supports that just demand of Lebanon and considers that the Council should vehemently condemn the recent acts of aggression against Lebanon and take effective steps to halt them. The need to adopt such measures is a direct result of resolution 444 (1979) in which the Council states that it is resolved

"to examine practical ways and means in accordance with relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations to secure the full implementation of resolution 425 (1978)".

142. The Soviet delegation considers that it is high time to adopt decisive measures in the Council to put an end to the gross, cynical contempt shown by Israel for its resolutions and to obtain the cessation of Israel's acts of aggression against Lebanon.

143. The Soviet delegation will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document S/13392, in accordance with the position of the Soviet Union regarding the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. That position has been set forth several times in the past. The Soviet delegation reaffirms that position, including its position on questions concerning the direction of UNIFIL by the Security Council, the principles according to which national contingents are recruited and also the method of financing the Force. We should like to reaffirm that all expenditure incurred as a result of Israel's aggression against Lebanon should be borne by the aggressor.

144. The Soviet delegation expresses its regret that the draft resolution does not contain a more vehement condemnation of Israel for its unceasing acts of aggression against Lebanon and for its sabotage of Security Council resolutions.

145. Moreover, we consider it necessary to note that the draft resolution of the Council quite definitively voices indignation at the acts of violence perpetrated by Israel against Lebanon which have led to the displacement of civilians, including Palestinians, causing destruction and the loss of completely innocent lives. The Council directly demands that Israel cease forthwith its actions against the territorial integrity, unity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon, in particular, its incursions into Lebanon and the assistance it continues to lend to the anti-Government units of Haddad.

146. In accordance with the resolution to be adopted by the Security Council, it is important that those countries which are able to bring their influence to bear on Israel should do their utmost to fulfil all Council demands. If Israel persists in its aggression, the Council will be forced very shortly to take appropriate measures in accordance with the Charter to ensure the full implementation of resolution 425 (1978).

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

148. The Council will now proceed to vote on the draft resolution before us [S/13392].

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.⁵ One member (China) did not participate in the voting.

⁵ See resolution 450 (1979).

149. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): A number of delegations have asked to be allowed to make statements after the vote. I shall now call on them.

150. Mr. ÅLGÅRD (Norway): Sir, allow me first to extend to you my warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency for the month of June. We feel confident that your experience and diplomatic skill will facilitate the work of the Council during this busy month. I should also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, the representative of Portugal, for the persistent efforts undertaken by him and for the eminent way he conducted the presidency during the month of May.

151. The Norwegian Government joined in the Council decision to extend the mandate of UNIFIL for another period of six months. We would, however, have preferred a more balanced formulation of paragraph 1 of the resolution directed against all forms of violence. We supported the extension of the UNIFIL mandate because we share the Secretary-General's view that UNIFIL is performing an indispensable function in bringing calm to Southern Lebanon, stabilizing the area and reducing the active threat to international peace and security. It is also for those reasons that my Government has decided to continue its participation in UNIFIL.

152. Although we support the extension of the mandate, I must express our deep concern over the great obstacles that continue to face UNIFIL. The Secretary-General's report provides an account of a number of serious incidents in the area, some of which have led to the loss of lives of UNIFIL personnel. That situation is clearly unacceptable. The continued presence of UNIFIL is dependent upon the co-operation of all parties. We demand a stop to the harassment and infiltration attempts.

153. We regret that, in spite of the persistent efforts of the Secretary-General, Presidents of the Security Council and a number of Governments, it has not yet been possible to achieve a complete cessation of the harassment or the establishment of an adequate security zone around UNIFIL headquarters at Naqoura. Those are matters of the highest urgency for the continued functioning of UNIFIL. We therefore urge the parties concerned to extend their co-operation towards that end.

154. UNIFIL was established in March 1978. It is regrettable that more than one year later UNIFIL is still prevented from fulfilling all the tasks assigned to it by the Security Council.

155. Since our debate in January, some progress has been made towards the restoration of the Lebanese Government's authority and sovereignty in Southern Lebanon. The Norwegian Government welcomes the steps taken by the Lebanese Government in that respect. If those efforts are to succeed, full respect for the territorial integrity, unity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries is required.

156. In his statement to the Council on Tuesday [2147th meeting], the Secretary-General listed several conditions

that must be met if UNIFIL is to complete its mandate. All parties would do well to reflect on the serious warning voiced by the Secretary-General that it might well become necessary to envisage the withdrawal of the Force before the completion of its mandate unless there is significant progress towards the fulfilment of that mandate.

157. Further deployment of UNIFIL is now a matter of high priority. We fully support the efforts of the Secretary-General to achieve through diplomatic channels the further deployment of UNIFIL. We hope that in the months to come all the parties concerned will extend their co-operation towards the full implementation of the mandate of UNIFIL.

158. In conclusion, I should like to pay a tribute to Major-General Erskine and his staff, as well as to the officers and men of the various contingents of UNIFIL serving under extremely difficult conditions. I should also like to reiterate to the Secretary-General my Government's support for his efforts to implement the decisions of the Council. I should further like to underline the Secretary-General's appeal to all Member States that urgent measures be taken to solve the serious financial problems UNIFIL is faced with. The financing of peace-keeping operations must be the collective responsibility of all States. It is unacceptable that the troop-contributing countries should have to carry a disproportionate burden of the finances involved and it may jeopardize the whole operation if that becomes the case.

159. Mr. PALACIOS de VIZZIO (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I wish formally to convey to you and the other members of the Council my appreciation for the kind words of welcome addressed to me.

160. As this is my first formal statement in the Security Council, I shall begin by fulfilling a pleasant duty, that of congratulating you on behalf of my delegation, on the dynamic and efficient manner in which you are exercising the functions of the presidency of the Council for the month of June.

161. I also wish to express my delegation's appreciation for the competent and able leadership of your predecessor, Ambassador Futscher Pereira of Portugal.

162. Once again my delegation wishes to express its deep concern over the most recent developments in Lebanon. They are but a part of the over-all problem of the Middle East, which, as has been repeatedly pointed out by my delegation, requires a coherent and comprehensive solution.

163. In the report dated 8 June submitted to the Council by the Secretary-General and in his statement of 12 June [2147th meeting], special emphasis is placed on the difficult conditions in which UNIFIL has been fulfilling its specific functions as established in resolution 425 (1978). They are the safeguarding of the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon.

164. Bolivia, as one of the countries in the Western hemisphere most seriously affected by international aggression,

as a result of which it has been deprived of all its sea-coast, cannot under any circumstances fail in a clear and well-defined manner to state its position on anything which might conspire against the territorial integrity of a State. That position, which is embodied in paragraph 4 of Article 2 of the Charter, is one of the basic principles of the civilized community of nations.

165. The new crisis in the Middle East, which has now taken on a more distressing aspect, owing to the deprivation and suffering inflicted not only upon the civilian population but also upon the United Nations forces, makes the Secretary-General's report acutely relevant. This is so, for the non-compliance with the measures proposed in the report would endanger the very capacity of the interim Force to fulfil its mission, something which, in my delegation's view, is an extremely serious precedent in terms of the authority and prestige of the Security Council, which is primarily responsible for maintaining international peace and security.

166. Bolivia recognizes the essential function which UNIFIL must fulfil. That is why we voted in favour of the resolution, just as we shall decisively support any step aimed at restoring the necessary authority of UNIFIL, as a first measure leading to the full implementation of resolutions 425 (1978) and 444 (1979).

167. In conclusion, permit me to express to the Secretary-General my delegation's appreciation for his accomplishments in regard to this difficult problem and also our admiration for the selflessness and sacrifice with which the Force has been fulfilling its delicate task. My delegation wishes to pay a special tribute to the memory of those soldiers who have fallen in the cause of one of the noblest objectives of the Organization—peace on our planet.

168. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): I should have liked at this stage to confine my remarks to explaining the vote of my delegation but, having listened with great interest to the well-orchestrated statements of the representative of Israel, I must say that when we were kids in Kuwait we learned one thing from our teachers, that is, that linguistic tantrums never change the truth, which always remains the finest art of logic.

169. My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document S/13392 solely because the Government of Lebanon wanted the Council to adopt it. It contains elements which are satisfactory and others which are not. But it is the result of compromise and, therefore, my delegation supported it. The resolution just adopted should have contained a condemnation of Israel for its persistent policy of obstruction.

170. Members of the Council undoubtedly had in mind the four conditions for the success of the mandate of UNIFIL which were set out by the Secretary-General two days ago [2147th meeting]. He mentioned the necessity for the co-operation of the PLO. That is a legitimate demand, and that co-operation has already been exhibited in the past 15 months since the arrival of the Force in Lebanon. It has also been reinforced by the recent steps taken by the PLO.

171. Compliance with three other conditions, none of which has been met, are expected from Israel. The first is a change of attitude by Israel towards UNIFIL. From all signs given by Israel and the statements of its leaders, that condition remains in the realm of hope, a hope with a flimsy chance of fulfilment. Israel is not going to change its attitude to UNIFIL, as it believes that the presence of United Nations forces on its borders threatens its security. Israel challenges the injunctions, resolutions and decisions of the Council simply because it can get away with the challenge and at the same time obtain what it wants.

172. How can the Council force Israel to abide by its resolutions? As we see it, the impossibility of applying sanctions against Israel encourages it to take the law into its own hands and do what it likes without being deterred by the Council. In the absence of the possibility of the application of sanctions, only diplomatic efforts, either bilaterally or through the good offices of the Secretary-General, are left. But the Secretary-General cannot on his own produce miracles. The United States is the only country able to put pressure on Israel. But, again, the United States has its own priorities and UNIFIL is not at the top of the list.

173. UNIFIL is no doubt the victim of a situation which none of us foresaw. The Secretary-General mentioned that the co-operation of the *de facto* forces in the south of Lebanon is necessary for the fulfilment of the UNIFIL mandate. Those forces are controlled, manipulated and managed by Israel. A change in their position depends entirely on the attitude of the Government of Israel. It is futile to expect a change of heart from the bride when the mother-in-law is not in a position to compromise.

174. The fourth condition is the co-operation of the forces in control to enable UNIFIL to have freedom of movement and access to the south. The militia group is not a master of its decisions and, since Israel has control over that group, in the light of Israeli known policy one should not expect the attainment of a climate conducive to success.

175. The future of UNIFIL is not bright because its options are limited and because it has found itself a prisoner of an abnormal situation.

176. Israeli spokesmen talk about their country's continued co-operation with UNIFIL. They talk of that co-operation, I must say, tongue in cheek, in an attempt to deceive world public opinion rather than as a sincere expression of policy.

177. On the other hand, we appreciate the efforts of the Lebanese Government to restore its authority in the south. We encourage those efforts and hope that Lebanon will succeed in extending its authority over all parts of its territory in the south.

178. The renewal of the UNIFIL mandate should not become a semi-annual ritual that the Council is expected to perform. UNIFIL is an interim force sent to Lebanon to assist in carrying out a definite mandate. Its renewal should not be taken for granted, and the Force cannot be a substitute for an effective Lebanese presence in the south. There is no doubt an inherent danger in showing a tendency towards

an automatic approval of requests for renewal of the mandate. In this respect, we note with appreciation Lebanon's eagerness to assert its authority in the south and not to rely indefinitely on the UNIFIL presence.

179. Finally, my delegation would like again to place on record its appreciation to the Secretary-General, his staff in New York, General Erskine and the officers and soldiers of UNIFIL for their efforts in the search for the attainment of a noble goal.

180. We pray that this will be the last time the Council will perform the semi-annual ritual of renewal.

181. Let us help Lebanon to stand on its feet in its own territory in the south, unmolested and unharassed in the search for a constructive future.

182. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Israel has asked to be allowed to speak. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

183. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Israel welcomes the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. At the same time, Israel categorically rejects the political elements attached to the resolution just adopted. Those elements have resulted in a biased and unbalanced formula which contains outright distortions and is marked by grave acts of omission.

184. In paragraph 1, the resolution ignores the loss of innocent Israeli lives, including those of women and children who have been murdered by PLO terrorists operating from Lebanese territory. Israel strongly deplores the blatant bias manifest in that paragraph, a bias which has regrettably characterized Security Council resolutions in the past and has contributed to a decline in the Council's prestige, resonance and effectiveness. The conscious omission of any reference to acts of violence against Israeli civilians may be viewed as an indirect encouragement to the terrorists against whom Israel has been forced to act in order to protect its own population. Indeed, the resolution is deliberately devoid of whatever criticism was voiced by the Secretary-General in his report concerning the increased incidence of terrorism and acts of provocation directed by the PLO against the men of UNIFIL within the UNIFIL area of operation.

185. With reference to paragraph 2, Israel rejects the unfounded implication that it is Israel which has endangered the territorial integrity of Lebanon. The integrity, unity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon have been progressively undermined for the past several years by the terrorist PLO and by the Syrian army of occupation to which the resolution contains no reference. The Council may close its eyes to those facts, but world public opinion is not so blinkered.

186. Finally, Israel rejects the meaningless reference to the 1949 Armistice Agreement contained in paragraph 6. As I have already pointed out in the course of the present debate, it was Lebanon which abrogated that agreement by its declarations and actions, both in 1967 and since. In the

present circumstances, the reference to the defunct Armistice Agreement is patently illogical and untenable. Israel has made that clear on several occasions in recent years and now reaffirms that it will not be a party to such a warped and fictitious concept.

187. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization has asked to be allowed 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.

188. Mr. ABDEL RAHMAN (Palestine Liberation Organization): If there were a prize to be awarded for lying, distortion and falsification, I am sure that the representative of the Government of Menachem Begin would be the winner. He has made a mockery of international law, misused and adapted it for his own benefit. International law cannot ignore the right of people who have been expelled from their home and property, who have been under military occupation for the past 12 years and who have been denied their very basic human rights to self-determination and national independence, to struggle for the achievement of those rights.

189. The Government of Israel, based on an obsolete ideology, that contradicts history, a racist ideology—the Zionist ideology—has conducted a war of genocide against the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories and in refugee camps in Lebanon, as well as against the innocent Lebanese people.

190. I think the international community is aware of who is the terrorist. Is it those who have converted a whole nation into a homeless people? Is it those who have committed massacres of the Palestinian people from 1948 until now, massacres such as that committed against the villagers of Deir Yassin by the notorious terrorist Menachem Begin; is it those who fly jet warplanes and drop cluster bombs, delayed action bombs and 1,000 pound bombs on Palestinians and Lebanese in Lebanon? Or those who struggle in self-defence and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and all the resolutions of the United Nations that allow people under military occupation to defend their basic human and national rights? I think that the international community is aware of who is the terrorist.

191. I should like to respond to the statement made by the representative of the United States, a statement that is typical of that Government. It is characterized by hypocrisy and imbalance and probably positions that are out of step with history. I would have expected the United States to condemn Israel for its genocidal war against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples. I would have expected the United States to condemn Israel for stealing Palestinian land from Palestinian peasants. I would have expected the United States to declare that it is halting its supply to Israel of cluster and delayed-action bombs. I would have expected the United States to stop supporting Israel with weapons and aircraft. I would have expected the United States to condemn Israel for closing universities and schools and rounding up civilians. I would have expected the United States to declare that it opposes and condemns vigilante activities against Palestinians in the occupied territories. I

would have expected the United States, which considers itself the godfather of peace, to declare its recognition of the national rights of the Palestinian people. I would have expected the United States to recognize the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. Instead, the representative of the United States has quoted Menachem Begin's statement before the Knesset rather than his statement made yesterday in which he declared that the West Bank and the Gaza Strip are integral parts of Israel. Where else can we find a more biased position than that?

192. The challenge for peace is still there. As I declared before in this body, we the Palestinian people are struggling for peace. We want peace, but peace that is based on a recognition of our national rights—our right to self-determination, our right to establish our own independent State and the right of our refugees to be repatriated in accordance with the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations.

193. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Lebanon has asked to be allowed to make a statement and I now call on him.

194. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon): This has been a very difficult day. To me and to my country it has been an historic day, and we hope, Mr. President, that it is a good omen that resolution 450 (1979) should have been adopted under your presidency. I realize that it is difficult to maintain one's serenity after such a debate. I shall.

195. In my opening remarks I asked the Council that we all be pragmatic in our approach to the problem and I promised and undertook to be so. I think we have been so, despite "lessons" in law and "lessons" in history, and I shall not satiate the Council with a response to any of those.

196. We are not dealing here with words; we are dealing with human lives, we are dealing with the future of a country, we are dealing with a solid land which we love and to which we are attached, and I need not remind the Council or any of the members or speakers that it was the security of Lebanon that we were debating, not the security of Israel nor the solution of the Palestinian problem.

197. I think that I may be allowed to say that after five years of prejudice we have earned the right to seek for Lebanon a Lebanese peace. We have earned the right to ask the world, through this body, that our land be given back to us, that peace in Lebanon be peace for the Lebanese and that Lebanon be for the Lebanese to live in, in peace and security.

198. I think that from the present debate there has emerged a consensus that UNIFIL has probably been overstretched and that we have arrived at a point where some basic and historic decisions must be taken. My colleague and dear friend from Kuwait said that none of us should take UNIFIL for granted nor the renewal of its mandate as being automatic. I tend to agree with him, and I think we should be called upon in the forthcoming six months to proceed to refocus on UNIFIL, and I am glad that Commander Erskine is here, because the real spirit in which the Force should proceed in the forthcoming months has been

expressed in this Council, and I need not go into it any further.

199. I should like to conclude by saying merely this. We are thankful to those who have addressed words of friendship and of pity, as well as to those who have spoken out against my country. I think one should know how to draw lessons from such tragic and historic moments and that nothing emphasizes this tragedy more than the fact that

soldiers from Fiji and Norway, from lands far away from my own land, have come to die for the cause of peace in my country. That to us is more than a challenge. We too, will be prepared to die to safeguard Lebanon and to preserve it in such a manner that we will one day be enabled, again in prosperity and strength, to express in this world body the full gratitude that we owe.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

如何获取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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