

THE WHITE HOUSE
CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING WORKSHEET

CO 001-07

INCOMING

DATE RECEIVED: FEBRUARY 07, 1989

NAME OF CORRESPONDENT: THE MOST REV. BERNARD CARDINAL LAW

SUBJECT: FOLLOWS UP ON A MATTER SPOKEN OF PREVIOUSLY
"MIDDLE EAST ISSUES"

		ACTION		DISPOSITION	
ROUTE TO:		ACT	DATE	TYPE	C COMPLETED
OFFICE/AGENCY	(STAFF NAME)	CODE	YY/MM/DD	RESP	D YY/MM/DD
JOHN SUNUNU		ORG	89/02/07		C 89/02/14 TR
REFERRAL NOTE:					
REFERRAL NOTE:					
REFERRAL NOTE:					
REFERRAL NOTE:					
REFERRAL NOTE:					

COMMENTS:

No response necessary. Governor spoke on phone. TR

ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENTS: MEDIA:L INDIVIDUAL CODES: _____

CS MAIL USER CODES: (A) _____ (B) _____ (C) _____

*ACTION CODES:	*DISPOSITION	*OUTGOING	*
*	*	*CORRESPONDENCE:	*
*A-APPROPRIATE ACTION	*A-ANSWERED	*TYPE RESP=INITIALS	*
*C-COMMENT/RECOM	*B-NON-SPEC-REFERRAL	*OF SIGNER	*
*D-DRAFT RESPONSE	*C-COMPLETED	*CODE = A	*
*F-FURNISH FACT SHEET	*S-SUSPENDED	*COMPLETED = DATE OF	*
I-INFO COPY/NO ACT NEC		*OUTGOING	*
*R-DIRECT REPLY W/COPY *			*
*S-FOR-SIGNATURE *			*
*X-INTERIM REPLY *			*

REFER QUESTIONS AND ROUTING UPDATES TO CENTRAL REFERENCE
(ROOM 75, OEOB) EXT-2590
KEEP THIS WORKSHEET ATTACHED TO THE ORIGINAL INCOMING
LETTER AT ALL TIMES AND SEND COMPLETED RECORD TO RECORDS
MANAGEMENT.

1 9 Day delay? 1

7.

#4759



CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE

2101 COMMONWEALTH AVENUE
BRIGHTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02135

January 30, 1989

Gov.

Mr. John Sununu
Chief of Staff
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear John:

This is the matter that I spoke to you about. I send it simply for your information.

I spoke with Frank McNamara this morning and he told me that later today he is announcing that he will offer his resignation. I think this is good for all concerned. At the same time, I am not at all convinced that there has not been an effort to do him in that may need to be looked at carefully.

With warm personal regards and asking God to bless you, I am

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Cardinal Law
Archbishop of Boston

BCL/ac



JESUIT COMMUNITY BOSTON COLLEGE CHESTNUT HILL MASSACHUSETTS 02167

MEMO: Ray Helmick, S.J. to Cardinal Law -- January 16, 1989
On letter from Raymond Eddé.

Yesterday I received the attached letter from Mr. Raymond Eddé, the man who would apparently be the choice of the great majority of the Lebanese legislature if they were allowed freely to elect the next President of Lebanon. It is occasioned by the letter on the Lebanese presidential election that I sent late last year to Dr. Joseph LeBaron of the U.S. State Department, who has the Lebanese desk in Mr. Richard Murphy's section. Copies of that letter went to you, Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop Laghi, Maronite Patriarch Sfeir, and Father Moubarak, the assistant to Patriarch Sfeir who is Secretary General to the Maronite Bishops' Conference and to the Conference of Catholic Patriarchs and Bishops in the Middle East.

Mr. Eddé's letter is important, as he takes several quite distinct stands, and evidently trusts that the content of this letter will be communicated to the new U.S. administration. I have questions about the judiciousness of some of these stands, and need some advice on how to judge and present them, as well as some help in communicating them. I've done a typed transcription of the handwritten letter and a translation, so it would be easier to assess.

You recall that, in my letter to Dr. LeBaron, I mentioned that the position Mr. Eddé was reported to have taken, that he would not accept the office of President without a prior withdrawal of Syrian troops from Lebanon, was so unrealistic that it would disqualify him if he insisted on it. It is very striking that Mr. Eddé's letter drops that position entirely. But he does take the position that a withdrawal of Israeli troops from the South of Lebanon is a requirement before he would take up the office of President. My principal question about the judiciousness of his stand is on this point, and I'd like to expand on it a bit.

I've already learned, and had it confirmed by many competent observers of the Lebanese scene, that the presence of the Israeli occupying army in the South, what they call their "Security Zone," is massively destabilizing to any Lebanese government. No President of Lebanon can ever have credibility with his people so long as that army is in place, nor can the Lebanese Army. I have even discussed this with an Israeli General who had a large degree of responsibility for the occupying army in the "Security Zone," heard from him very feeble denials of the interpretation that the army's presence was that destabilizing, and eventually his statement that there was nothing the Lebanese could do to dislodge them, so they could like it or lump it.

The Israelis have, of course, their reasons for being there, which our U.S. officials have interpreted as a right of self-defense, to protect the upper Galilee from attack from Lebanon. There is good reason to doubt the proportionality of the threat they see to Galilee settlements to the fundamental harm being done to the Lebanese state. Mr. Eddé makes a comparison of the small number of Israeli casualties in Galilee over the last 20 years with the enormous damage to Lebanon in the two Israeli invasions (1978 and 1982) and the 30,000 Lebanese killed. But I would think the more realistic measure, in terms of present damage, is in the destabilisation I refer to, which makes the settlement of Lebanon's troubles truly

impossible so long as this Israeli occupation lasts.

My question was of the judiciousness of Mr. Eddé's setting this condition for his acceptance of the presidency (which it seems still clear that a large majority of the authorised electors -- members of the legislature -- of all the Lebanese confessional groups, want him to have), at a time when Syria and the United States are still exercising a veto over his getting it. He asks the U.S. to persuade its ally, Israel, to get out of his country when the U.S. still has its doubts about him. I tend to conclude that he does make a fair proposition.

The questions that need resolving are: 1) whether Israel would in fact be endangered by withdrawing its occupying troops from Lebanon; and 2) who would be the true winners and losers in such a development.

As for danger to Israel, that would follow only if Israel actually came under attack from Lebanon, even pin-prick attack. The forces from which Israel could expect that are the Palestinians in Lebanon and the Hezbollah (Party of God) Shi'ites. But the Palestinians under Chairman Arafat's control have been quite faithful to the renunciation of terrorism made repeatedly recently. Even Israeli General Shomron has acknowledged that they have made no attacks on Israeli or the Israeli Army since November. (Prime Minister Shamir was rather indignant at Shomron's having acknowledged that, but had no argument that his assessment was untrue.) The anti-Arafat "rejectionist" Palestinian groups are a far more manageable problem, especially if Lebanese government forces and the UNIFIL troops were enabled to act against them, as they are not able to do while the Israelis are there in Southern Lebanon. As for those Lebanese, mainly Shi'ites of either the Hezbollah faction or the more moderate Amal movement, there is plenty of motivation for them to attack Israelis or their surrogate Lebanese force (the South Lebanon Army) so long as they are in occupation of Lebanese territory, but little or no inclination to attack across the Israeli border. Withdrawal of the Israeli troops from Lebanon would make attack on Israeli territory by these factions even less likely, and again controllable by Lebanese government forces, who would be quite determined to prevent such incursions, and UNIFIL. Hence I would judge that danger of attack on Galilee from Lebanon would be really illusory if the Israelis ended their occupation.

As for winners and losers, it should be clear that a new Lebanese President who had brought about the withdrawal of the Israelis from the South would have a tremendous welcome from his people, and the real winners would be Lebanese of all the confessional groups who would be helped, by this fact, to achieve practical consensus for the reordering of their national life. The losers would be the Hezbollah faction. They would be discredited and would lose out definitively in their competition with Amal for the approval of the Shi'ite community. Hezbollah's loss should be a real inducement to our U.S. government and to the Israelis to look favorably on Mr. Eddé's demand. The Israelis would have, in fact, genuine security and stability on their Northern border. That should be welcome and a real inducement to them unless what they really want is in fact the destabilisation of Lebanon, and in that case they should receive no encouragement from the United States.

Mr. Eddé not only makes his demand for Israeli withdrawal, but he also wants to set up the means of dramatising his demand if he is elected. That is the point of the two conditions he attaches to his candidacy (p. 4 of his hand-written text). Many of his supporters have in fact urged him to return to Lebanon to seek his election. He makes it clear that his remaining in Paris is calculated so that, if elected while there, he can refuse to go to Lebanon to take up the post until the

Israelis withdraw (and until the U.S. government does whatever is necessary to bring the Israelis to that point, which, as he observes, the U.S. can readily do). It seems to me that this means of dramatisation is a separate issue from the substance of the demand for withdrawal. It is not at all a wicked thing for Mr. Eddé to envision. But if the U.S. government made the judgment, to my mind the right one, that the Israelis should be induced to withdraw (a thing that would be to their own benefit), it could arrange these matters without having to suffer the indignities that Mr. Eddé's dramatisation would bring on both Israel and the U.S. I would think that assurances could be made that this would be brought about, and Mr. Eddé induced to relinquish this bit of theater.

Mr. Eddé believes that the Israelis refuse to end their occupation for a different reason: not any real fear for the security of Galilee, but instead an intention to divert the water of Southern Lebanon to Israel's own use and perhaps eventually the intention of annexing the territory South of the Litani river and expelling its inhabitants. I know that there are a number of signs that the Lebanese (not Mr. Eddé alone but a vast number of Lebanese) take as indicating such an intention. I see this suspicion as unproven, really unlikely under present circumstances, and rather paranoid. That does not detract at all from the observation that the Israeli occupation is dreadfully destabilising to the Lebanese state. But since the suspicions are so widely believed in Lebanon, I would think it appropriate for the U.S. government to treat them as things that call for serious and genuine refutation, so that these anxieties, however paranoid, will be put to rest. There should be real assurances that no such thing will happen.

It may be expected that the Israelis, when this matter is brought up, will want to make their withdrawal, if it is to be discussed at all, contingent on a prior Syrian withdrawal. That is the route the U.S. went in the negotiations of 1983, compounding the error at that time by forcing Lebanon into an agreement with Israel to that effect without even consulting the Syrians themselves. That experience ought to have shown the U.S. government that such a policy goes nowhere. Israeli withdrawal should be an acceptance of legality, as well as a recognition of Israel's own true interest, not a quid pro quo.

Mr. Eddé points out, in this connection, Security Council resolutions 509 and 625, which demand the withdrawal of Israeli occupying troops from South Lebanon. I would note the inconsistency at the top of p. 4 of his hand-written letter where, in this context, he complains that the U.S. vetoes every Security Council resolution favorable to Lebanon. Not so, of course, in the case of these resolutions, which would not exist as Security Council resolutions if the U.S. had vetoed them. But while mistaken in the supposition that the U.S. vetoes anything good for Lebanon, he is right to expect that the U.S. seek implementation of resolutions it has voted for, or has even allowed to pass by one of those abstentions that are always so telling in the case of resolutions inconvenient to Israeli policy.

I have been familiar for some years with Mr. Eddé's position that the legal situation in force between Lebanon and Israel is defined by the 1949 armistice agreement, which he sees as violated by the Israeli invasions of 1978 and 1982, as well as by the continued occupation ever since 1978. The Israelis, I know, see the armistice situation as long since superceded by the attacks on Galilee across the Lebanese border, and U.S. policy has tended to support this Israeli position.

The attacks have of course been the actions of Palestinians, not of the Lebanese. The one way in which the Lebanese government has been involved has been through the 1969 Cairo agreement, brought about by the sponsorship of then Egyptian President Nasser, which the Lebanese government understood as a curb on actions of the Palestinians that they had been unable to control, and the Palestinians understood as licence for their operations against Israel. It should be understood that the Cairo Agreement is now long since abrogated, and that Raymond Eddé, from the beginning, always regarded it as wholly illegal, and something unfairly imposed on Lebanon by yet another foreign intervention, in this case Egypt's. It should not be seen as defining the legal situation now, and certainly not in the case of an Eddé presidency. So there is good reason for the parties to agree that the armistice convention of 1949 defines the legal relation between Lebanon and Israel, until such time as a more positive relation can genuinely be created.

As for the equally necessary withdrawal of Syrian troops from Lebanon, it should be recognised by the U.S. government that achieving the withdrawal of Israeli troops would give Mr. Eddé, as a new President, tremendous leverage, especially with the diplomatic help he could expect from the U.S. and from all of the Arab world, to bring about the Syrian withdrawal as well. In this case, as in that of Israel, it could be shown conclusively to the Syrians that they would not be the losers in such a transaction.

Mr. Eddé bases his entire position on law, and on that basis finds the action of the United States, in joining with Syria to designate and proscribe candidates for the Lebanese presidency, shocking. He really is right in this, and there is no way around it. I hope that can be brought to the attention of our new President, Mr. Bush, and his Secretary of State. This whole policy toward the Lebanese presidential election is a serious aberration, discrediting to the U.S., and deserves another look by the new Administration. The excuses and rationalizations that both you and I have heard from officials of the outgoing Administration, and the claims that the policy is something other than it really is, just don't hold up under examination. And I don't at all see that this has contributed to the interest of the U.S.

I found as I read through Mr. Eddé's letter that I was finding the expression often grandiloquent and a bit alienating to me as an American reader. When I reflected on this, I found that my reaction was unjust, because Mr. Eddé was thinking and expressing himself in terms of a language culture that is not in fact French but Arabic, and his expression is true to that culture. Underlying it, I find, is an honesty that deserves to be communicated to the highest officials of our U.S. government. I am anxious that this should happen.

I will send along a copy of this memo to Archbishop Laghi, as I feel I need his counsel in this whole matter.

RAYMOND EDDÉ

Paris le 10 janvier 1989

Reverent Père

Raymond G. Helmick

Monsieur

Notre ami, Le baron Houborok, qui
m'a remis, il y a quelques jours, copie
de votre rapport au S. Joseph
Le Baron, vient de se rendre au Liban
pour prendre possession de son poste
de secrétaire général de l'assemblée
des Patriarches et Evêques Catholiques.

Je suis sûr qu'il rendra d'éminents services.
Je voudrais, de prime abord, vous dire que
je n'ai jamais lu un rapport aussi clair
et précis, sur la situation actuelle au
Liban, que le vôtre.

Permettez-moi, toutefois, de vous faire
un reproche: il est trop élogieux à mon
égar. Je n'ai pas toutes les qualités et
le pouvoir que vous voulez bien m'attribuer.
Je reconnais, néanmoins, une seule qualité
me

RAYMOND EDDÉ

dont je n'ai d'ailleurs pas l'exclusivité:
je suis un patriote convaincu dont la
seule ambition est de libérer le
territoire de son pays.

Je ne suis ni un libano-syrien, ni un
libano-israélien. Je suis, tout simplement,
un libanais-libanais.

On me reproche souvent d'être trop légaliste.
Je le suis. C'est peut-être dû au conseil,
que mon père, qui était un grand avocat,
m'a donné, le jour où j'ai obtenu
ma licence en droit: *Sura lex sed lex!*

Certes, pour l'homme politique que je suis
devenu, à l'âge de l'âge, le strict respect de
la loi n'était pas un très bon conseil.

Mon légalisme m'a valu de nombreux
ennemis.

Mais l'essentiel, surtout pour un élève
des Pères jésuites, n'est-il pas, d'avoir
la conscience tranquille?

Cela m'a permis de dire la vérité à
haute ^{voix} souvent, également, au détriment
de mes partisans.

RAYMOND EDDÉ

Ainsi, je proclame, que le Liban, qui a obtenu son autonomie sans l'empire ottoman, est un état souverain, qui n'a aucune leçon à recevoir de la Syrie, qui n'existe, comme état indépendant, que depuis 1920. La Syrie ne peut considérer le Liban, comme une province syrienne. Elle n'a pas à s'immiscer dans ses affaires intérieures.

Je proclame, aussi, que Washington n'aurait pas dû approuver la pénétration de l'armée syrienne en 1926, et s'associer dernièrement à Damas pour désigner un candidat à la présidence de la République libanaise. Pour la aide des démocrates, qui est l'Amérique, c'est un comportement choquant.

Washington devrait, par contre, exiger de son allié israélien, qui emarge, annuellement, au Gouffé américain pour plus de 3 milliards de dollars, qu'il exécute les résolutions 625 et 509

du conseil de sécurité qui exigent.
le retrait de son armée du Liban-Sat.
Malheureusement, après que le
conseil de sécurité rend une résolution
favorable au Liban, un veto, le seul,
américain, intervient.

Voilà pourquoi, j'ai estimé devoir
poser ma candidature à la présidence
en l'accompagnant de deux conditions:

- 1 - D'être élu, tout en étant à Paris,
ce que la Constitution libanaise
n'a interdit pas.
- 2 - De ne retourner au Liban, en
cas de succès, qu'après avoir
obtenu le retrait de l'armée
israélienne, que l'Amérique,
seule, peut exiger et obtenir.

Au moment où L'URSS retire son
armée d'Afghanistan et Cuba retire la
sienne d'Angola, il est incompréhensible
qu'Israël maintienne son occupation
du Liban-Sat sous prétexte qu'il doit
sauvegarder la sécurité de la Galilée.
Tout le monde sait qu'Israël a la

plus forte armée de la région,
l'aviation la mieux entraînée et
la Bombe Atomique !!

C'est le Liban, qui a été envahi, par
deux fois, par l'armée brésilienne
suivie de canons, des défilés pour des
milliers, et entraîné la mort de
plus de 30.000 Libanais

Israël pourrait-il indiquer le nombre
de victimes tombées en Galilée depuis
20 ans ?

Israël, peut-il produire une seule son
administration ne figure pas au département
qui s'occupe des eaux du fleuve Litani ?

Ne tient-il pas à exploiter les eaux
du Liban - Sud ?

Telle est la véritable raison, pour la-
quelle il maintient son armée au
Liban, en violation de la convention
d'armistice Libano-Israélienne, Toujours
en vigueur, et du droit interna-
tional.

6
RAYMOND EDDÉ

Enfin, si l'occupation du Sud-Liban
est due à la crainte de subir des
attaques venant du LIBAN, pourquoi
s'oppose-t-il à l'exécution de la
résolution qui prévoit le déploiement
de l'UNIFIL (Res. 557) jusqu'à la
frontière libano-Israélienne?

Père, excusez-moi d'avoir abusé de
votre bonté et de votre patience.

Je tiens à vous remercier de tout cœur
pour tout ce que vous faites pour
le Liban.

J'espère vous revoir à l'un de vos
séjours à Paris et vous prie d'agréer
l'expression de mon profond respect

Ray-L U19

Raymond Eddé

Paris le 10 Janvier 1989

Reverend Père
Raymond G. Helmick

Mon Père

Notre ami, le Pere Moubarak, qui m'a remis, il y a quelques jours, copie de votre rapport au Dr. Joseph LeBaron, vient de se rendre au Liban pour prendre possession de son poste de Secrétaire Général de l'assemblée des Patriarches et Eveques Catholiques. Je suis sûr qu'il rendra d'éminentes services.

Je voudrai, de prime abord, vous dire que je n'ai jamais lu un rapport aussi clair et précis, sur la situation actuelle au Liban, que le vôtre.

2 Permettez moi, toutefois, de vous faire un reproche: il est trop élogieux à mon égard. Je n'ai pas toutes les qualités et la pouvoir que vous voulez bien m'attribuer. Je me reconnais, néanmoins, une seule qualité dont je n'ai d'ailleurs pas l'exclusivité: je suis un patriote convaincu dont la seule ambition est de libérer la territoire de son pays.

Je ne suis ni un libano-Syrien, ni un libano-Israélien. Je suis, tout simplement, un libanais-libanais!

On me reproche souvent d'être trop légaliste. Je le suis. C'est peut être du au conseil, que mon père, qui était un grand avocat, m'a donné, le jour ou j'ai obtenu ma licence en droit: *Dura lex sed lex!*

Certes, pour l'homme politique que je suis devenu, à cause de lui, le strict respect de la loi n'était pas un tres bon conseil. Mon légalisme m'a valu de nombreux ennemis.

Mais l'essentiel, surtout pour un élève des Pères Jesuites, n'est-il pas, d'avoir la conscience tranquille?

Cela m'a permis de dire la verité a haute voix souvent, également, au detriment de mes partisans.

3 Ainsi, je proclame, que le Liban, qui a obtenu son autonomie sous l'empire ottoman, est un état souverain, qui n'a aucune leçon a recevoir de la Syrie, qui n'existe, comme état indépendant, que depuis 1920. La Syrie ne peut considerer le Liban comme une province Syrienne. Elle n'a pas à s'immiscer dans nos affaires interieures.

Je proclame, aussi, que Washington n'aurait pas du approuver la pénétration de l'armée Syrienne en 1976, et s'associer dernièrement à Damas pour désigner un candidat a la présidence de la Republique Libanais.

Pour la mère des démocraties qu'est l'Amerique, c'est un comportement choquant.

Washington devrait, par contre, exiger de son allié Israélien, qui émerge, annuellement, au budget américain pour plus de 3 Milliards de dollars, qu'il exécute les résolutions 625 et 509 du Conseil de Sécurité qui exigent le
4 retrait de son armée du Liban-Sud. Malheureusement, chaque fois que le Conseil de Sécurité rend une résolution favorable au Liban, un veto, le seul, américain, intervient.

Voilà pourquoi, j'ai estimé devoir poser ma candidature à la présidence en l'accompagnant de deux conditions:

- 1 - D'être élu, tout en étant à Paris, ce que la Constitution Libanaise n'interdit pas.
- 2 - De ne retourner au Liban, en cas de succès, qu'après avoir obtenu le retrait de l'armée Israélienne, que l'Amerique, seule, peut exiger et obtenir.

Au moment où l'URSS retire sa armée d'Afghanistan et Cuba retire la sienne d'Angola, il est incompréhensible qu'Israel maintienne son occupation du Liban Sud sous prétexte qu'il doit sauvegarder la sécurité de la Galilée.
5 Tout le monde sait qu'Israel a la plus forte armée de la région, l'aviation la mieux entraînée et la Bombe Atomique!!

C'est le Liban, qui a été envahi, par deux fois, par l'armée Israélienne qui a occasionné des dégâts des milliards, et entraîné la mort de plus de 30.000 Libanais.

Israel pourrait-il indiquer le nombre de victimes tombées en Galilée depuis 20 ans?

Israel, peut-il proclamer que dans son administration un figure pour un département qui s'occupe des eaux du fleuve Litani?

Ne tient-il pas à exploiter les eaux du Liban-Sud?

Telle est la véritable raison pour laquelle il maintient son armée au Liban, en violation de la convention d'armistice Libano-Israélienne, toujours en vigueur, et du droit international.

6 Enfin, si l'occupation du Sud-Liban est dû à la crainte de subir des attaques venant du Liban, pourquoi s'oppose-t-il à l'exécution de la résolution qui prévoit le déploiement de l'UNIFIL (Res. 587) jusqu'à la frontière libano-israélienne?

Père, excusez-moi d'avoir abusé de votre bonté et de votre patience. Je tiens à vous remercier de tout coeur pour tout ce que vous faites pour le Liban.

J'espère vous revoir à l'un de vos passages à Paris et vous prie d'agréer l'expression de mon profond respect.

Raymond Eddé

Raymond Eddé

Paris, January 10, 1989

Reverend Father
Raymond G. Helmick

Father

Our friend, Father Moubarak, who gave me, a few days ago, a copy of your report to Dr. Joseph LeBaron, is returning to Lebanon to take possession of his station as Secretary General of the Assembly of Catholic Patriarchs and Bishops. I am sure he will render eminent services.

I would like, from the start, to tell you that I have never read a report as clear and accurate, on the present situation in Lebanon, as yours.

Permit me, all the same, to make one criticism: it is too laudatory with regard to me. I have not all the qualities and the power that you would like to attribute to me. I acknowledge, nonetheless, a single quality to which I have, moreover, no exclusive claim: I am a convinced patriot whose sole ambition is to free the territory of his country.

I am neither a Lebanese-Syrian, nor a Lebanese-Israeli. I am, quite simply, a Lebanese-Lebanese!

People often blame me for being too legalist. That I am. It is perhaps due to the advice which my father, who was a great lawyer, gave me, the day that I received my licentiate in law: *Dura lex sed lex!*

Surely, for the political man that I have become, because of him, strict respect for the law was not very good advice. My legalism has won me numerous enemies.

But the essential, above all for a student of the Jesuit Fathers, is it not to have a tranquil conscience?

That has permitted me to speak the truth, often in a loud voice, even when it was to the detriment of my partisans.

3 Thus, I declare, that Lebanon, which obtained its autonomy under the Ottoman Empire, is a sovereign state, which has no lesson to learn from Syria, which has not existed as an independent state except since 1920. Syria may not consider Lebanon as a Syrian province. It has not to involve itself in our internal affairs.

I declare, also, that Washington ought not to have approved the penetration of the Syrian army in 1976, and to have associated itself recently with Damascus in designating a candidate for the presidency of the Republic of Lebanon.

For the mother of democracies, which America is, this is shocking behavior.

4 Washington ought, on the contrary, to have demanded from its Israeli ally, which draws, annually, on the American budget for more than 3 billion dollars, that it execute resolution 625 and 509 of the Security Council, which demand the withdrawal of their army from South Lebanon. Unfortunately, every time that the Security Council passes a resolution favorable to Lebanon, a veto, the only one, American, intervenes.

Here you see why I have judged that I should present my candidacy for the presidency, accompanying it with two conditions:

- 1 - To be elected even though I am in Paris, which the Lebanese Constitution does not forbid.
- 2 - That I not return to Lebanon, in the event of success, until after having obtained the withdrawal of the Israeli army, which America alone can demand and obtain.

5 At the moment when the USSR withdraws its army from Afghanistan and Cuba withdraws hers from Angola, it is incomprehensible that Israel should maintain its occupation of South Lebanon, on the pretext that it must safeguard the security of the Galilee. The whole world knows that Israel has the strongest army in the region, the best equipped air force, and the Atomic Bomb!!

It is Lebanon which has been invaded, twice, by the Israeli army, which has occasioned damages measured in billions, et entailed the death of more than 30,000 Lebanese.

Can Israel tell us the number of victims fallen in Galilee over the last 20 years?

Can Israel declare a figure for the department in its administration which has used the waters of the Litani river? (This sentence unclear.)

Does it not intend to exploit the waters of South Lebanon?

That is the real reason for which it keeps its army in Lebanon, in violation of the Lebanese-Israeli Armistice Convention, always in force, and of international law.

6 Finally, if the occupation of South Lebanon is due to fear of suffering attacks which would come from Lebanon, why does it oppose the execution of the resolution which provides for the deployment of UNIFIL (Res. 587) right up to the Lebanese-Israeli border?

Father, excuse me for having abused your kindness and your patience. I would like to thank you with all my heart for all that you have done for Lebanon.

I hope to see you again on one of your trips through Paris, and ask that you accept the expression of my profound respect.

Raymond Eddé

ARABIES N° 25 janvier 1989
Revue Mensuelle du monde arabe et de la Francophonie
- PARIS -

de sécurité - et a toujours refusé, depuis plus de dix ans, d'appliquer la résolution 425 de l'ONU demandant son retrait du Sud-Liban. En cas d'annexion du Sud, les réactions internationales seront aussi timides et inopérantes que lors de l'annexion de Jérusalem et du Golan syrien », précise Raymond Eddé, qui conclut : « Si la paix venait toutefois à être signée entre les Palestiniens et Israël, l'avantage qu'en retirerait le Liban serait de voir les Palestiniens se transformer de réfugiés en ressortissants d'un Etat reconnu, ayant les mêmes droits et obligations que tout étranger se trouvant sur le territoire libanais. »

RAYMOND EDDÉ, député et ancien ministre, que de nombreux Libanais de toutes confessions persistent à considérer comme le seul présidentiable susceptible de rétablir l'unité nationale et la souveraineté de leur pays, demeure pessimiste au lendemain de la décision de Washington « d'engager un dialogue substantiel avec l'OLP ». Raymond Eddé estime que « la Conférence internationale ne pourra se tenir tant qu'Israël s'y opposera. Or je ne vois pas Israël accepter la nouvelle approche américaine à l'égard de l'OLP ». Le leader libanais affirme à Arabies que dans le contexte d'une récupération par les Palestiniens de leurs droits nationaux dans les territoires occupés, « l'Etat hébreu pourrait procéder à une nouvelle invasion du Sud-Liban, jusqu'au fleuve Litani, en prétextant des "droits historiques" (le Sud-Liban était autrefois rattaché à la Galilée) et des "besoins hydrauliques" ». Les quelque 250 000 Libanais de confession chiite habitant cette région seraient alors repoussés au-delà du Litani, et la zone conquise serait annexée. C'est, ajoute Raymond Eddé, dans une telle perspective que l'Etat hébreu a toujours refusé le déploiement le long de la frontière israélo-libanaise des casques bleus de la FINUL -- comme l'exige la résolution 587 du Conseil

Raymond Eddé, member of Parliament and former Minister, whom many Lebanese of all confessions persist in regarding as the only candidate for President capable of reestablishing national unity and the sovereignty of their country, remains pessimistic after the decision of Washington "to enter into a substantial dialogue with the P.L.O." Raymond Eddé believes that "the International Conference cannot be held if Israel opposes it. But I don't see Israel accepting the new American approach to the P.L.O." The Lebanese leader tells Arabies that, in the context of the recovery by the Palestinians of their national rights in the occupied territories, "the Hebrew state could proceed to a new invasion of South Lebanon, up to the Litani river, on the pretext of 'historic right' (South Lebanon was once attached to the Galilee) and of 'hydraulic needs'. The some 250,000 Lebanese of Shi'ite confession living in that region would then be driven beyond the Litani, and the conquered zone would be annexed. It is," adds Raymond Eddé, "within such a perspective that the Hebrew state has always refused the deployment all along the Israeli-Lebanese border of the blue helmets of UNIFIL -- as resolution 587 of the Security Council demands -- and has always refused, for more than ten years, to apply resolution 425 of the U.N. demanding its withdrawal from South Lebanon. In the event of an annexation of the South, international reactions would be as timid and inoperative as in the case of the annexation of Jerusalem and the Syrian Golan," asserts Raymond Eddé, who concludes: "If peace would be signed once and for all between the Palestinians and Israel, the advantage which Lebanon would draw from it would be to see the Palestinians transformed from refugees into nationals of a recognised State, having the same rights and obligations as every stranger finding himself on Lebanese territory."

(This piece from the French-language monthly Arabies was enclosed in Raymond Edde's letter, with his notation of its source. I clarify somewhat his thinking on Israeli intentions toward South Lebanon, with which I have disagreed in my memo. But more interesting is the opening passage, identifying Mr. Edde, which is another independent testimony to the breadth of Mr. Edde's appeal, as candidate, to Lebanese of all confessions.)