



# Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2640  
13 January 1986

ENGLISH

JAN 15 1986

## PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND FORTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Monday, 13 January 1986, at 11 a.m.

President: Mr. LI Luye

(China)

Members: Australia  
Bulgaria  
Congo  
Denmark  
France  
Ghana  
Madagascar  
Thailand  
Trinidad and Tobago  
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics  
United Arab Emirates  
United Kingdom of Great Britain and  
Northern Ireland  
United States of America  
Venezuela

Mr. WOOLCOTT  
Mr. TSVETKOV  
Mr. ADOUKI  
Mr. BIERRING  
Mr. de KEMOULARIA  
Mr. SIMPSON  
Mr. RABETAFIKA  
Mr. KASEMSRI  
Mr. ALLEYNE  
Mr. SAFRONCHUK  
Mr. AL-SHAALI  
  
Sir John THOMSON  
Mr. OKUN  
Mr. SUCRE-FIGARELLA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 11.35 a.m.

OPENING STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): As this is the first meeting of the Security Council to be held in the new year, I should like to extend greetings to all assembled here today. It is a particular pleasure to welcome the newly-elected non-permanent members of the Security Council - the Permanent Representatives of Bulgaria, Congo, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela. We look forward with confidence to their participation in the work of the Security Council, which will be of invaluable assistance in the search for a solution of the complex issues that the Council confronts in its important role.

I wish also to express, on behalf of the Council, our gratitude to the outgoing non-permanent members for their important and invaluable contributions to our work. The representatives of Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Peru and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic won our esteem and friendship and contributed their talents in immeasurable ways to the work of the Council; I am sure we will continue our fruitful co-operation in the future.

Before concluding, I wish also to pay a well-deserved tribute to the outgoing President of the Security Council, Ambasssador Leandre Bassole of Burkina Faso, who conducted the work of the Council in December with great skill and distinction. His experience and the personal qualities that we all admire have won our respect and admiration, and I am sure I speak on behalf of all present and outgoing members of the Security Council when I express our gratitude for the opportunity to work together with Ambassador Bassole and our best wishes for his future success.

## ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

## THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

LETTER DATED 6 JANUARY 1986 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF LEBANON TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/17717)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Israel, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Syrian Arab Republic in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Fakhoury (Lebanon) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Netanyahu (Israel), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) and Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting today in response to the request contained in the letter dated 6 January 1986 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17717).

The first speaker is the representative of Lebanon, on whom I now call.

Mr. FAKHOURY (Lebanon) (interpretation from Arabic): I am pleased to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the current month and to reaffirm our full confidence in your ability and wisdom to guide the proceedings of this Council and steer us in the proper direction.

I am pleased also to extend thanks and appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Leandre Bassole, the Permanent Representative of Burkina Faso, on the occasion of his assumption of the presidency of the Council during the past month and for his wise and skillful guidance of the work of the Council.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the five new non-permanent member States in the Council - Bulgaria, Congo, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela. I wish them success in their mission and in their participation in the achievement of the objectives of the Council, which is mandated to preserve international peace and security.

The last letter which I sent to the Secretary-General and which was distributed as an official document of the General Assembly and the Security Council (A/40/986 and S/17669), dated 5 December 1985, included a list of Israeli acts of aggression against Lebanese territory in the wake of the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the city of Sidon to south of the Litani River. It also included additional information: a list of Israeli acts of aggression that have taken place in the southern region between 28 November and 4 December 1985. In that letter I pointed out the fact that Israel's constant aggressive policy and arbitrary practices are exacerbating the situation in southern Lebanon in particular and in Lebanon in general. Their effects may even transcend that country and impede the peace endeavours; indeed, they could precipitate eruptions of violence that could threaten international peace and security, both regionally and internationally.

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

I went on to draw attention to the inherent danger in the gravity of Israeli practices against Lebanon and their possible consequences. I reserved the right of the Lebanese Government to call for a Security Council meeting in the event those practices and acts of aggression should continue.

On 16 December 1985, the Secretary-General presented an interim report to the Security Council (S/17684) in which he explained the current situation in the area of the deployment of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), as a result of continued Israeli practices; the possibilities of a deterioration of the situation, and the positions of the opposing parties, especially after the announcement of the Israeli Government that it would continue to rely on a "security zone" to safeguard its northern settlements and Israel's refusal to allow UNIFIL to deploy to the borders. Finally, he stated:

"I hope, however, that the members of the Council will consider carefully the present situation in southern Lebanon and ponder on what action might be taken by its members, either individually or collectively, to further the implementation of its resolutions on UNIFIL and to bring about peace and normality in southern Lebanon, an objective which all parties share."

(S/17684, para. 14)

What we have repeatedly warned against has unfortunately taken place. The fears of the Secretary-General have also come true, for after only two weeks following the submission of his report, Israel has escalated its acts of aggression, its attacks and its practices in the Lebanese south. This was done either directly through the Israeli defence forces, the IDA, or indirectly through puppet illegal forces, and the so-called South Lebanon Army, the SLA, or the Lahd Army.

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

On a number of occasions this involved Israeli participation. The Secretary-General referred to this escalation and explained it in his statement before the Council last Friday and listed a number of acts of aggression, attacks and Israeli practices.

In view of the continuation of this situation and the deliberate escalation of attacks and Israeli practices, the Lebanese Government has decided to call upon the Council to convene in order to assume its responsibilities and to fulfil its mandate in its capacity as the primary and essential authority charged with preserving international peace and security.

An account of some of the acts that have been undertaken by Israel between 29 December 1985 and 7 January 1986 clearly illustrates this deliberate escalation. On 29 December 1985 there was artillery shelling of the towns of Ghaba, Bsalim, Kafr-Roumman, Haddathah and Haris.

This was followed by artillery and tank-fire shelling, in addition to sniper activities. All of these acts led to the destruction of 16 houses and the wounding of 6 persons. On 30 December 1985, a joint force composed of the Lahd Army and the Israeli Army entered the town of Kunin, where it destroyed nine houses, two commercial stores, burned 16 vehicles and robbed some houses. It ordered the citizens to evacuate the town, resulting in the displacement of approximately 700 people. The Lahd forces and the Israeli forces detained and searched 30 persons. There were a number of deaths, which could not be counted because of the presence till now of the so-called Lahd Army in the town. So even now there is an unknown number.

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

A number of civilians in Beit Yahun were also expelled. On the same day, the towns of Jabaa, Jebb Juhab, Salim, Kafr Roummane, Habboush and Bint Jubayl were exposed to artillery shelling.

On 31 December 1985, there was artillery and tank fire shelling against the towns of Jabaa, Jarjouaa, Aarab Salim, Kafr Roummane and Habboush.

On 1 January 1986, there was artillery shelling of the town of Tennin, resulting in damages to seven houses, artillery shelling against the town of Aita Al-Jabal, resulting in damages to three houses and the town school, artillery shelling against the town of Haddathah, with the destruction of two houses.

On 2 January 1986, there was artillery shelling against the town of Tennin, with damage to two houses, and shelling of the towns of Shukr and Majdal Salim; the city of Sidon was also exposed to shelling.

On 3 January 1986, there was shelling of Majdal Salim, using tanks, with resulting damages to several houses. A Nabatieh town was also shelled.

On 4 and 5 January 1986, there was renewed shelling of the city of Sidon and its suburbs. In addition, since 31 December 1985, there has been a manifest and stepped-up escalation on the front of Kfar Falous, where clashes and shelling has continued to this day.

On 7 January 1986, there was artillery shelling against the towns of Aarab Salim, Jarjouaa, Habboush, Kafr Roumanne, Kafra, Haddathah and Yatar.

A preliminary count, to 3 January 1986, indicates the following: death toll, eight; wounded, 35; the destruction of and damages to dozens of houses and vehicles; the displacement of approximately 720 persons from their towns. The total death toll in the south during the past eight months has reached 173 persons, most of whom are civilians.

In addition to the foregoing, the Israeli air force daily violates Lebanese airspace. The Israeli air force has been carrying out mock and real raids. Their

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

planes break the sound barrier over various regions, including the capital, Beirut. The Israeli fleet daily violates the integrity of Lebanese territorial waters; it stops vessels and blockades ports. It is worth pointing out that the Israeli escalation preceded the launching of two Katyusha rockets on Qiryat Shemona, in upper Galilee, and coincided with the signing of the agreement between the Lebanese factions to restore Lebanon to normalcy. All that indicates Israel's premeditated intention to impede the peace process in Lebanon and its endeavours to maintain the status quo in Lebanon and in the region.

Israel's rejection of the implementation of Security Council resolutions calling for complete withdrawal from Lebanon and of the deployment of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) to internationally recognized borders, its insistence on a "security belt" within Lebanese territory and its support for puppet illegal forces and utilization of these forces to support its own armed forces as an instrument to perpetrate attacks and inhuman arbitrary practices - all constitutes the direct and main cause for the deteriorating situation in southern Lebanon and indicates the dangers threatening the region and Lebanon as a whole. Should this escalation continue, it will transcend the borders of Lebanon and threaten peace and security in the Middle East and the world.

The policy of rejection adopted by Israel cannot be passed over in silence. The Secretary-General's continued endeavours and those of his assistants that are based on his directives, together with their repeated visits to the region in order to convince Israel to implement the Council's resolutions and withdraw from the security belt, have not yielded results.

Lebanon's Prime Minister has recently asked one of the Secretary-General's aides upon his return from Israel if he had any views or ideas. The answer was that he had met with Mr. Rabin, who told him that the situation in the south had been calm and resistance waning. Hence Israel does not perceive any need to



(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

withdraw from Lebanon. One can conclude that when Israel finds itself in a comfortable position it declares that it will remain in the south, and when it meets with resistance it claims that that resistance is made up of terrorists and says that it must be ruthlessly suppressed and subjected to all forms of hatred.

The party bearing the brunt of these arrogant Israeli policies involving its attacks and arbitrary practices and inhumane measures is the civilian population in the south who, with patience, valour and faith, understands the consequences of the siege and the shelling of villages, the plunder and the destruction of houses, the killing and kidnapping of friends and relatives, the plundering of agricultural crops and personal property and all similar inhumane arbitrary practices in which the Israeli forces and their agents have become so adept.

The courage, patience and belief of the population of the south, represented in their resistance against the occupying aggressor, will ultimately win victory. Resisting against the aggressor is a right of peoples that is enshrined in international norms and General Assembly resolutions. All States that suffered occupation exercised this right and cherished it. Such rights figure very prominently in the history of such peoples and States. We in Lebanon are proud of our national resistance and we cherish it. Without it, Israel would not have been forced to withdraw from a major part of Lebanese territory as a result of its losses in equipment and in lives.

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

Israel's withdrawal was not in implementation of this Council's resolutions; its non-compliance with those resolutions persists.

The aim of our request for the convening of the Security Council is to inform the Council of the serious situation in southern Lebanon, a situation that continues to deteriorate. The aim is the achievement of a unanimous resolution by which the Council could prove that it takes an active interest in and is concerned about the peace, security and stability of a cherished part of Lebanese territory; a unanimous resolution by which the Council could demonstrate its real desire to deter the occupying aggressor and its firm support for its previous unanimously adopted resolutions; a unanimous resolution by which the Council could confirm the need for the implementation of those resolutions in order to preserve its prestige and to attain the objectives of international peace and security.

Lebanon's requests are just. Lebanon is entitled to request these rights from the Council. They may be summarized as follows. First, there must be a condemnation of Israel's acts of aggression and inhuman, arbitrary practices, which constitute a violation of international law and of the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention, of 1949. Secondly, there must be a reaffirmation of the necessity for the implementation of previous Security Council resolutions, particularly resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) and resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), which call upon Israel to withdraw completely from Lebanese territory and which provide for the deployment of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) along the internationally recognized boundaries. Thirdly, Israel must be called upon to cease immediately its arbitrary practices against the civilian population of southern Lebanon, practices which impede the restoration of normalcy in the region as well as all the efforts to achieve national reconciliation for the restoration of peace and security in Lebanon.

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

Those requests are based on a manifestly clear Lebanese position, which we have repeatedly set forth in this Council. It may be summarized in the following points: first, insistence on the implementation of this Council's resolutions on Lebanon, especially resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) and resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982); secondly, insistence on complete Israeli withdrawal from Lebanese territory, without any restrictions or conditions; thirdly, rejection of any direct or indirect Israeli presence on Lebanese territory, and, hence, rejection of any "security zone" or "security belt" and non-recognition of any illegal or illegitimate forces - especially the so-called South Lebanese Army (SLA) or the Lahad Army; fourthly, insistence on the deployment of UNIFIL in Lebanon along the internationally recognized boundaries; fifthly, insistence on these forces being allowed to fulfil their mandate of assisting the State of Lebanon to extend its sovereignty over all Lebanese territory and ensuring that the southern part of the country is an area of peace and security.

I should like to make one additional comment. We hope that the discussion in the Council will be commensurate with the tragedy afflicting the population of southern Lebanon. We hope that the debate will be limited to this particular item and that the Council's attention will not be diverted to other matters that do not directly or indirectly affect this complaint.

I again express our confidence in the Security Council. If we did not have this confidence, we would not have come to the Council. The situation in southern Lebanon is dangerous. The responsibility of this Council is paramount. We hope that this time it will live up to its responsibilities. We hope that it will act, within its mandate and competence, to implement its resolutions and to achieve the objectives for which it was established, as well as to fulfil the hopes and aspirations of the peoples and to deserve their confidence. Otherwise, the

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

Council's inability to act will be used as a direct reason by Israel for continuing to ignore the Council and its resolutions and for persisting in its policy of intransigence and its occupation of part of Lebanese territory. It will be able to continue its acts of aggression and its practices directed against the population of southern Lebanon and all the people of Lebanon, without any authority's being able to deter it.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): I thank the representative of Lebanon for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): Allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council and on the wise stewardship that you have already shown and will obviously continue to show to the end of your tenure. I wish to extend our congratulations also to your predecessor, the Ambassador of Burkina Faso, for his equally fine performance.

I take this occasion also to congratulate the new members of the Security Council and to extend our congratulations to the outgoing members on their fine performance during their tenure.

We have just heard the representative of Lebanon accuse Israel of various crimes - for example, the crime of aggression - in South Lebanon. He has just offered us some points in a paper that he has read out to the Council. I have a modest proposal in order to set the record straight: wherever the word "Israel" appears, substitute the word "Syria" or the words "the Syrian-controlled Government of Lebanon".

For what has been happening in Lebanon in recent months has not been merely a continuation of the reign of terror throughout the country. That implies only a

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

state of chaos, where the Government of Lebanon has lost effective control over the internal situation everywhere in the country. Now, that certainly describes part of the picture, and I should like to dwell on that for a moment.

I was struck by the fact that the representative of Lebanon asked us to confine the discussion to the South. I am happy to discuss the situation in the South, and shall do so in a minute. But the representative of Lebanon did not follow his own rule. He in fact said that the Israeli policy exacerbates the situation in Lebanon in general, is a threat to broader international peace, and so on.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

So we do have to discuss, not only, as a matter of logic and common sense, the broader context but also, by the representative of Lebanon's own injunction, what is the situation in Lebanon, in order for us to understand what is happening in the south.

What is happening in Lebanon is best illustrated by what is happening right now in the capital of Lebanon, in Beirut. I am holding a dispatch from Reuters this morning by John Fullerton. He describes machine-gun fire and blasts from anti-tank grenades rocking the Beirut neighbourhoods, the shutting of schools, all depots being set ablaze. He quotes one Beiruti as saying, "There is a real war going on here. It is very heavy fighting, and they are using all sorts of weapons."

But that too does not, I think, really illustrate the full picture. So here, for example, is how a recent dispatch by Reuters, this time of 1 January, summed up the outgoing year - just the past year - based on official Lebanese reports:

"The death toll of 3,675 was nearly 60 per cent up over the previous year's figure of 2,161.

"Car bombs set off in several towns, including Beirut, killed 313 people; 371 others died in clashes between leftist militias and the Lebanese army on Beirut's greenline battlefront and the mountains overlooking the capital.

"Pitched battles between Syrian-backed leftist parties and Moslem Sunni fundamentalists erupted in the northern town of Tripoli in September, killing 581.

"Another 632 people died in clashes between Palestinians and Shiite Moslem militiamen in Beirut in May, June and September.

"127 people died in Beirut when fighters of the Druze-led PSP and the Shiite Amal militia fought running battles with the leftist Nasserite movement, Murabitoun, in March and April.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

"Foreigners killed in Lebanon included US navy diver Robert Stethem, a passenger from a TWA plane hijacked from Athens to Beirut on 14 June.

"Five French observers monitoring buffer zones between rival Lebanese militias died in separate incidents during the year, while the body of kidnapped British teacher Denis Hill was found in Beirut on 25 May.

"Soviet Embassy official Arkady Katkov, one of four Soviet Embassy workers kidnapped on 30 September, was found dead in Beirut two days after he was seized.

That is the end of the quote; there is more, by the way, and I should be happy to provide it.

In other words, in Lebanon today terror and violence run rampant: faction against faction, tribe against tribe, militia against militia. Lebanese and non-Lebanese are slaughtered and terrorized. But one class of Lebanese citizens, one class you do not hear about, is particularly vulnerable: the tiny, ancient Jewish community of Lebanon, peaceful and law-abiding, abstaining from any political activity whatsoever. They have become, in the classic pattern of anti-Semitism, the preferred victims of all fanatics.

In recent months seven Lebanese Jews have been kidnapped. Among them are Isaac Sasson, 65, Chairman of Lebanon's Jewish community; Dr. Eli Halik, 55, Deputy Chairman of the Jewish community; Salim Jamous, 45, born in Beirut, former executive secretary of the Jewish community; and Eli Sarour, 50, and Joseph Benisti, 35, both born in Beirut. These people are not fighters, they are not part of any militias. They are decent, law-abiding people.

Did we hear a word uttered from the Lebanese representative about their fate? Or does his Government not consider its Jewish citizens worthy even of the most elementary humanitarian concern?

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

Worse, did we hear from Lebanon even a murmur when two other hostages, Haim Cohen Hallala and Isaac Tarrab, were brutally murdered and their bodies tossed to rot in the refuse in the streets of Beirut?

Let me tell the Council about Isaac Tarrab - Professor Isaac Tarrab. He was 70 years old. He taught students at the American University of Beirut. He had nothing to do with the carnage in Lebanon. He was, in short, murdered simply because he was guilty of being a Jew. Well, for those who murder Jews simply because they are Jews I have a brief message: the days when Jews could be killed with impunity simply because they were Jews are over.

The kidnappings and murders I have described were perpetrated by agents of Syria and Iran. Why does not Lebanon request the convening of an urgent meeting of the Security Council to condemn this atrocity against its citizens? The answer is very simple. The Government of Lebanon - not only in this case, but in every other thing described in the Reuters dispatch; and I could give members Associated Press dispatches, and they could give me their own correspondents' dispatches - has long ago ceased to govern Lebanon. It is totally incapable of providing any check on the murder and pillage of its citizens by the forces of terror. This is true even in its own backyard in Beirut, as it is true in other parts of the country.

What we have discussed up till now is grave enough in itself. But it is not the full picture. For, as I have just indicated in the example I have cited, much of the terrorism that is emanating today from Lebanon is not merely the growth of wild terrorist weeds. Much of it is nurtured and cultivated and controlled by Governments that funnel into Lebanon money, weapons and agents for this purpose, and those Governments are Libya and Iran, but above all the overseer and occupier of Lebanon - Syria.



(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

In the same manner that Syria controls the drug traffic in the Bekaa Valley, it controls the terror traffic. And the victims of this Syrian-sheltered terrorism have not only been Lebanese. Terrorists from all over the world train today in the Syria-controlled Bekaa Valley. The Abu Nidal gang, for example, trained there before launching the recent massacres in the Rome and Vienna airports. The killers departed on their horrific mission from Damascus. Even the master terrorist Yasser Arafat, a recognized expert in these matters, has acknowledged in a recent interview in the Washington Post that Syrian and Libyan intelligence were behind Abu Nidal.

So what do we have here? Lebanon has become Syria's terrorism colony in which terror factories produce and spread the deadly virus in all directions. If in the 1970s Lebanon had become a terrorist State under the PLO, in the 1980s it has become a terrorist haven under Syria.

But here is where the problem "exacerbates", to use a word that has been mentioned here, because Syria wishes to go further. In the agreement that it had rubber-stamped in Damascus on 28 December, it has formalized its control over Lebanon, what it calls the integration of Lebanon with Syria. It has formally enshrined in that agreement the continuing Syrian military occupation of Lebanon - that is in the document - and it rejects any security arrangements in the south of Lebanon, calling for continuing conflict there.

It does not make any difference to Syria or to those who signed the agreement; they do not particularly care about the consequences for Lebanon's citizens in the south. We heard about Lebanon's citizens in the south and their suffering. One of them I wish to quote here is Mahmoud Fakiah. He is one of the Amal leaders and very unfriendly towards Israel. Recently he condemned the "spectacular acts of resistance in the south, which hurt the residents of the south much more than they do Israel".

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

Now, the representative of Lebanon has cited figures for casualties. What he neglected to state was what Mahmoud Fakiah knows very well: that 90 per cent of the casualties resulting from acts such as those involving car bombs are Lebanese. They kill not Israelis but Lebanese citizens. And these car bombs are sent either with the encouragement of Nabih Berri and the rest of the Lebanese Government or by Syria and its operatives.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

In other words, Syria is dictating to Lebanon - as is plainly evident from the things said here, the agreements and other expressions - to reject any security arrangement with Israel. One can compare anything that was said here with these figures and numbers. I myself would be happy to dispute them. But one can even take them as they are and compare them with that tally from Reuters. I did not give the Associated Press report which is significantly higher; I took the lower figures. South Lebanon, which is relatively the most tranquil part of the country, is to be turned into another Bekka, another Beirut, another Tripoli. It is, in short, to be used as a launching ground for Syrian-directed terrorism against Israel.

That begins to explain what is happening today in the South; it also explains the background for the recent incident at the village of Kunin which was mentioned here. On 24 December we began to see that escalation of Syrian-directed terrorism under this impending agreement. On 24 December two Katyusha rockets were fired at Kibbutz Manor; on 26 December Katyushas were fired on the villages of Shomera and Manor; on 25 December on the village of Even Menahem - of course all of them in Israel. On 20 December the villages of Manor, Goren and Zarit were shelled; on 31 December Katyushas were fired against Kibbutz Eilon. Incidentally, on that day the Israel Defence Forces (IDF) foiled another such attack. On 2 January two Katyushas were fired against Kiryat Shemona and several Katyushas were sighted in Har Rahav.

Who, then, should ask for the convening of this Council, Israel or Lebanon? Who is the victim and who is the aggressor?

As for the matter of Kunin, it is a classic example of the problem that we are discussing. Kunin, like the rest of South Lebanon, is being forcibly turned into a battle zone by the terrorists. And those who dare resist this aggression are the first to be attacked. On 30 December an South Lebanon Army (SLA) patrol composed

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

of villagers in that area - they were not imported; we did not bring them into that area from Israel or the north of Lebanon: these are people who want to live in peace and do not want to see terrorism and cross-border attacks launched from their villages and towns, jeopardizing their women and children - was ambushed near Kunin and two of its members were killed. The tracks led to the village of Kunin. The entry of the force following the tracks was delayed for approximately 30 minutes because of a land-mine explosion on the road leading to the village. During the delay the men of the village fled. They fled because, as is the custom in Lebanon, they feared they would be held responsible for the killings. Not one of them was expelled, not one of them was hurt, not one of them was killed. They are, of course, free to return to the village any time they wish. The reports that have been circulating here to the effect that the IDF or the SLA expelled those villagers are an utter fabrication; they are completely false.

We have, I believe, ample reason - real reasons - to convene the Council today: the unrelenting blood-letting throughout Lebanon, the kidnap and murder of innocents, the use of the Bekka as a base for Syrian and other State-sponsored terrorism and, of course, Syria's attempt to use South Lebanon to launch terrorist attacks against the towns and villages of northern Israel.

But is that the purpose of this meeting? Of course not. We are here not to focus attention on the true state of affairs in Lebanon, but to divert it. In fact, high Lebanese Government sources are reported in the Lebanese press as saying that in their meeting in Damascus a few days ago Assad simply ordered Amin Gemayel to request this "urgent" meeting of the Council.

The Security Council is too important a body to be so manipulated. It should reserve its time and efforts for the burning issues of the day - and they are legion. Rather than collaborating in a transparent diversion, the Government of Lebanon should fulfil its responsibility and begin to act as a sovereign State -

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

that means controlling its own territory and preventing the use of its territory, in this case the south of Lebanon, as a base of aggression against a neighbouring State, Israel. Preventing the use of the South as a base for attacks against Israel remains Israel's interest - its sole interest - with regard to South Lebanon.

What is needed here is a serious dialogue between the parties to enable the people on both sides of the border to live in peace. We offer Lebanon a simple policy: live and let live. Until such time as Lebanon adopts a similar policy and frees itself from Syrian shackles, I am afraid we shall continue to do what is necessary to protect our security and the lives of our citizens.

Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): It gives me great pleasure to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I am confident that under your wise leadership the deliberations of the Council will ensure justice to the peoples suffering from aggression, persecution, terrorism and the suppression of world-wide imperialist practices that seriously threaten international peace and security.

I also take this opportunity to express our deep appreciation to the outgoing President, Ambassador Bassole, the Permanent Representative of Burkina Faso, who conducted the Council's work with acumen, objectivity and full observance of the principles of the United Nations and the rules of the Charter.

I express to the new members of the Council - Bulgaria, the Congo, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela - our congratulations for undertaking their responsibilities in the Security Council and wish them every success.

The complaint by Lebanon today is not the first of its kind to be considered by the Security Council; it is one of many submitted by the representative of that fraternal country since Israel proclaimed its deceitful plan, claiming it to be

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

for a step-by-step withdrawal from Lebanon. However, the whole world knows that the unilateral plan announced by Israel was only a plan of retreat dictated by the Lebanese national resistance against the occupying Israeli army, thanks to a legitimate armed struggle that has won the esteem and admiration of the whole world, which recognizes its heroic nature.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian  
Arab Republic)

Since the beginning of the Israeli invasion, the Lebanese fighters were able to make the south of Lebanon a hell for the Zionist invaders. They vanquished the fourth biggest army in the world and undermined its morale. This popular national victory led to another victory against world imperialism and Israel when the people of Lebanon rejected the agreement of 17 May 1983, which some attempted to impose by force of arms. Since Israel announced its plan for withdrawal, it kept the subject of withdrawal to internationally recognized borders as a card in its hand to wrench whatever it could at the expense of the unity, territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon. It has redeployed its forces in the south in order to increase its benefits and decrease its casualties in personnel, equipment and expenditure. It used a handful of hirelings, mercenaries and traitors as a spearhead in order to perpetrate its abusive acts of aggression. These elements were trained and directed by Israel openly.

We all recall the Lebanese complaints during 1984 and 1985 that exposed to the world the dimensions of the plight of the people of Lebanon, who had in fact suffered two comprehensive invasions by Israel. The first began on 6 June 1982 and the second when the Israeli forces of occupation started to withdraw to the south, destroying all that stood in their way, sowing fear among the children, women and the elderly and arresting scores of men, especially young men, holding them in detention camps located either outside the internationally recognized borders or inside the occupied area. This evoked the indignation of the world against the brutality and inhumanity of Israel and its flagrant violation of international law. Israel has permitted itself to determine the geographical limits of its withdrawal. Its officials have repeatedly declared that they will not withdraw from all Lebanese territories, on the one hand, and that Israel will return any

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian  
Arab Republic)

area it chooses in the south of Lebanon according to its aggressive plans and intentions.

Since then, Israel has been perpetrating one act of aggression after another against the cities and villages of the south of Lebanon, inside and outside of what it calls the "security area". It escalates its aggressive practices as long as it deems that this serves its interest in destabilizing Lebanon, which is moving with confidence to its national reconciliation, putting an end to its civil war and starting the process of national reconstruction.

Thus the recent aggressive operations against Lebanon, particularly against the areas located between Saïda and the international borders, have a particular significance. They have coincided with the signing of the Damascus agreement of 28 December 1985, an agreement which contains a draft national solution for the Lebanese crisis and is based on the hopes and aspirations of the Lebanese people for the liberation of their land from the Israeli occupation and for the restoration of peace and security to their land after the eradication of all obstacles created by the Israeli conspiracies during the past few years.

Israel regarded that agreement as a great defeat because it undermined a basic principle of the policy of Israel designed to continue the fragmentation of Lebanon through fanning the flames of the civil war. It has artificially created crises throughout the country and escalated its aggressive military operations in the south in order to prevent the Lebanese from devoting themselves to saving their country from Israeli ambitions.

Israel has also intensified its acts of aggression in Lebanese airspace and against the Bekaa. On the first day of the new year, the Israelis mounted wide-scale military attacks against villages and cities in the south inside and



(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian  
Arab Republic)

outside of the occupied area. Among the most brutal of these operations were those undertaken by the Israeli occupying forces in order to evacuate the population of the villages, blow up the houses and damage the farms and crops.

Despite a news black-out in the United States, The New York Times on 1 January 1986 stated that the Israeli forces undertook a surprise attack against Kunin village under Israeli occupation after having besieged it and after Israel had ordered the inhabitants to stand in the main square and had detained the young men of the village. After forcing the remaining people to flee, it blew up their homes. The number of displaced people amounted to 600 - elderly persons, women and children. The savage military operation against Kunin village is but a link in the chain of Israeli terrorist acts designed to evacuate the population of the occupied part of Lebanon and to intimidate Lebanon in general.

Israel has also mounted similar operations against other villages, such as Tennine and Haddathah. It deported the majority of the innocent population. The Israeli occupation authorities also mounted military attacks against Kafra and Yatar. The news agencies on 4 January reported that the terrorist Israeli attacks led to the mass evacuation of the population of the villages close to the Lebanese territories occupied by Israel. All this indicates that the strategy of Israel is still based on the evacuation of the inhabitants of the land and on forcing them to leave their homes. It is also based on extending the geographic depth of the occupied territories. Israel is trying to create in the south of Lebanon another West Bank in order to pursue its expansionist policies in this area after evacuating its population in order to implement its plans to occupy the south of Lebanon, to put this fraternal country under its control and to create the small sectarian states which have been the dream of Israel since 1954. This is in

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian  
Arab Republic)

area it chooses in the south of Lebanon according to its aggressive plans and intentions.

Since then, Israel has been perpetrating one act of aggression after another against the cities and villages of the south of Lebanon, inside and outside of what it calls the "security area". It escalates its aggressive practices as long as it deems that this serves its interest in destabilizing Lebanon, which is moving with confidence to its national reconciliation, putting an end to its civil war and starting the process of national reconstruction.

Thus the recent aggressive operations against Lebanon, particularly against the areas located between Saida and the international borders, have a particular significance. They have coincided with the signing of the Damascus agreement of 28 December 1985, an agreement which contains a draft national solution for the Lebanese crisis and is based on the hopes and aspirations of the Lebanese people for the liberation of their land from the Israeli occupation and for the restoration of peace and security to their land after the eradication of all obstacles created by the Israeli conspiracies during the past few years.

Israel regarded that agreement as a great defeat because it undermined a basic principle of the policy of Israel designed to continue the fragmentation of Lebanon through fanning the flames of the civil war. It has artificially created crises throughout the country and escalated its aggressive military operations in the south in order to prevent the Lebanese from devoting themselves to saving their country from Israeli ambitions.

Israel has also intensified its acts of aggression in Lebanese airspace and against the Beka'a. On the first day of the new year, the Israelis mounted wide-scale military attacks against villages and cities in the south inside and

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian  
Arab Republic)

outside of the occupied area. Among the most brutal of these operations were those undertaken by the Israeli occupying forces in order to evacuate the population of the villages, blow up the houses and damage the farms and crops.

Despite a news black-out in the United States, The New York Times on 1 January 1986 stated that the Israeli forces undertook a surprise attack against Kunin village under Israeli occupation after having besieged it and after Israel had ordered the inhabitants to stand in the main square and had detained the young men of the village. After forcing the remaining people to flee, it blew up their homes. The number of displaced people amounted to 600 - elderly persons, women and children. The savage military operation against Kunin village is but a link in the chain of Israeli terrorist acts designed to evacuate the population of the occupied part of Lebanon and to intimidate Lebanon in general.

Israel has also mounted similar operations against other villages, such as Tennine and Haddathah. It deported the majority of the innocent population. The Israeli occupation authorities also mounted military attacks against Kafra and Yatar. The news agencies on 4 January reported that the terrorist Israeli attacks led to the mass evacuation of the population of the villages close to the Lebanese territories occupied by Israel. All this indicates that the strategy of Israel is still based on the evacuation of the inhabitants of the land and on forcing them to leave their homes. It is also based on extending the geographic depth of the occupied territories. Israel is trying to create in the south of Lebanon another West Bank in order to pursue its expansionist policies in this area after evacuating its population in order to implement its plans to occupy the south of Lebanon, to put this fraternal country under its control and to create the small sectarian states which have been the dream of Israel since 1954. This is in

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian  
Arab Republic)

addition to implementing its plan to lay its hands on the waters of the south of Lebanon and divert them for the use of the colonialist Israeli settlements.

A cursory glance at the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) (S/17557), as well as the interim report in document S/17684 of 16 December 1985, clearly indicates that Israel will not withdraw to the internationally recognized borders, as falsely claimed by its representative in the Council. It tries to entrench and perpetuate its military presence. The myth of the security belt was only a means to increase tension in Lebanon in general and in the south in particular.

On the one hand, Israel did not enable UNIFIL to discharge its task and prevented it by force from undertaking the deployment requested by the Council. On the other hand the report describes the atrocities perpetrated by the occupying army of Israel in the security belt and the daily oppressive measures it inflicts on the inhabitants of the area. In addition to that, the report shows that Israel has extended its shellings to the area of deployment of UNIFIL. The report also indicates that Israel did not hesitate even to kidnap members of the United Nations Force. It abducted 23 persons from the Finnish contingent, which prompted the Secretary-General to negotiate with the Israeli authorities to obtain their release.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab  
Republic)

The aim behind those Israeli acts was only to intimidate UNIFIL and to prevent it from undertaking its tasks as set forth in Security Council resolutions. The Secretary-General has clearly blamed Israel as the occupying authority for the deteriorating situation south of the Litani. He also warned against the consequences of those acts. Indeed, in paragraph 33 of document S/17557, he stated:

"However, in my view the current situation in Lebanon south of the Litani is not only unsatisfactory but also dangerous. ... Moreover, I have little doubt that, if the Israel presence in the 'security zone' is to continue for long, violence will inevitably escalate and spread. In such an event UNIFIL's situation would become even more difficult." (S/17557, para. 33)

Israeli defiance of the United Nations, a defiance aimed at preventing UNIFIL from deployment along the internationally recognized border, has reached a level where Itzak Rabin, the Minister of War of Israel announced, as reported in an Israeli broadcast of 11 December 1985 that:

"Israel is carrying out endeavours to evacuate the UNIFIL forces from the Lebanese south."

No one can interpret this inherent hostility to UNIFIL, except in the light of Israel's insistence on using occupied Lebanese territory as a springboard for intensification of its aggressive operations against Lebanon and the usurpation of that country which has suffered so deeply and which is trying with all its might to recover.

As for the Secretary-General's interim report, it reflects his despair over Israel's continued occupation. He says of the occupation:

"I feel it is my duty to bring this matter to the attention of the Security Council. ... Obviously, the most effective means of doing this would be a change in the Israeli position. Failing that, the alternatives are not promising." (S/17684, para. 12)

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

We, and members of the Council, are now accustomed to the tactics of the representative of international Zionism. Whenever the Council discusses the crimes and acts of Israel, the representative attempts to reverse the roles. The aggressor becomes the complaining victim, and the complaining victim becomes the aggressor. Anyone who sides with the complaining victim or anyone who defends its cause becomes the object of the hatred of the Israeli representative and the terrorist Zionist institution which he represents.

Through the misleading feverish rhetoric and the insults cast by the Zionist representative in a melodramatic fashion, all members of the Council know very well that Israel is attempting to export its crises and its terrorist aggressive nature and to pin those policies on others. At the same time, it tries to appear as the oppressed before the world to acquire even more assistance and aid. Begging is one of the well-known features of Zionism. But the world at large knows that Israel is in reality an expansionist, racist entity that occupies Palestine, the Golan and parts of southern Lebanon; an entity that daily perpetuates war crimes against our Arab people. Among those crimes I cite mass displacement, the destruction of houses, forcible annexation of territories, aggression against Christian and Moslem sacred places, the murder of children, women and the elderly, and the arbitrary shelling of cities and villages.

Israel has inflicted upon our nation and our region tragedies all too reminiscent of Nazi war crimes - crimes against which all the peoples of the free world have united: to suppress those crimes completely and to prevent their recurrence. Perhaps the representative of Israel believes that his attitude or method is valid and that his manoeuvres and political word-twisting are capable of depicting Israel in a manner contrary to reality and to what the world knows of its intransigence and its thirst for blood and war.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab  
Republic)

The representative of Israel addresses members of the United States Congress, groups of Israel sympathizers in the United States, and agents and spies of Israel in the United States Administration. In so doing, he deliberately ignores the fact that the Security Council has repeatedly condemned Israel for its acts and its practices.

The Israeli representative has no match except in the representative of South Africa, who comes to this Council shamelessly saying that the system of apartheid is a blessing from God to our brethren in Africa and that apartheid represents the supreme achievement of white colonialist theories: to serve the interests of blacks and whites alike.

As for the representative of Israel, he always portrays Zionism and its despicable colonial acts as the extension of Western civilization - as an asset and a gain for civilization - as if the world did not know full well that Zionism is but an outgrowth of colonial, capitalistic civilization - merely the other side of the racist coin. Still, it is a gain, because it protects United States interests, interests harnessed by Israel. Israel controls the United States, and the United States in turn controls Israel, in order to bring our Arab nation, from the Gulf to the sea, to its knees.

But no matter how far the Israeli representative may go, no matter how much he tries to export the crisis of his terrorist entity to the outside world and to flout the functions of this Council, the majority of States continue to reaffirm that Israel, through assistance from Washington, is working to undermine the structure of the international community - a structure based on international rules and norms which Israel does not recognize in the first place. Among those norms and rules are the inadmissibility of the use of force, the prohibition of aggression and preventing the aggressor from reaping the fruit of his aggression, no matter how long the occupation may last.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab  
Republic)

We all know that the United States harnesses all its capabilities - military, diplomatic, economic and informational - to acquit Israel of its sins, which have now become very clear, threatening to make the fate of all nations a cataclysmic one.

The threats menacing the world today emanate from the Israeli acts of aggression - aggression which has been escalating since 1948. The United States has been increasing its support by all means, overt and covert. The Middle East crisis is no longer a regional crisis. The United States has wanted this crisis to become an international one to keep it in proportion with the policy of force that it pursues in all parts of the world, thus threatening the future of mankind.



(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian  
Arab Republic)

The Israeli-American "strategic alliance" has acquired dimensions that threaten the peace and security of the peoples of the world. We Arabs cannot but hold the United States of America responsible for the deteriorating situation resulting from its total commitment to the expansionist objective of Israel, which now encompasses great parts of our world. The United States supplies this alliance with money and arms from seemingly undepletable resources. The United States does not stop with financing Israel's acts of aggression against Lebanon but has in fact doubled its assistance and aid so as to enable its ally in the region to weaken Arab capability and potential and deeply to entrench Israel's occupation of Palestine, the Golan Heights and Lebanon.

We cite as an example the volume of United States official aid to Israel which allows the latter to carry out its policy of settlement and occupation and to perpetrate acts of aggression. The Washington Post of 12 December 1985 carried an editorial by William Claiborne in which he said,

(spoke in English)

"This year the United States is giving Israel \$1.2 billion in economic aid and \$1.8 billion in military aid, plus \$750 million in emergency supplemental economic aid, for a total of \$3.75 billion already paid in outright grants. Additionally, Congress has approved \$750 million more in emergency economic assistance that is still to be paid."

(continued in Arabic)

It is ironic, as was pointed out by the writer, that the request for this massive material aid paid for by the American taxpayer was presented to Mr. Thomas Pickering, the United States Ambassador in Israel, before the arrival in Israel of the United States mission to investigate the espionage operations carried out by Jonathan Pollard on behalf of Israel at the expense of the American people.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian  
Arab Republic)

All this generous assistance, which exceeds any assistance provided by the United States to any other country, has been given at a time when the Israeli threats against Syria and Lebanon were escalating and Israel military aircraft was violating Syrian and Lebanese airspace, as if Washington were telling Tel Aviv, "You did well by spying on us; carry on doing this. Carry on threatening with our funds and weapons those you choose to threaten in whatever way you wish." In fact, Israel did escalate its policies of aggression and suppression against the population of the occupied Arab territories, especially in Palestine and Lebanon. Let the United States be sure that the Syrian Arab Republic is not going to be intimidated, no matter how much force is used and no matter how many attempts at distorting realities are carried out.

The Security Council must counter Israel in order to put an end to the suffering of the Lebanese people. It has to adopt the necessary measures for implementing Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982). Resolution 509 (1982) must be implemented immediately, according to the Security Council's authority, to secure Israel's withdrawal forthwith and unconditionally from the occupied Lebanese territories. By the authority vested in the Security Council and as part of its mandate, it can impose sanctions against the Zionist terrorist entity in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. The Security Council's task, in view of the tension in the region caused by Israel of which we can find evidence in statements by the Secretary-General, on the one hand, and the Ambassador of Lebanon, on the other, is to adopt a firm stance that will force Israel to withdraw forthwith and completely from Lebanon. We are confident that the United States of America, if it truly wishes Lebanon well, can compel its agent in the region to withdraw immediately. If there is a role for United Nations forces - the role specified by the Security Council - it could be summed up in assisting the extension of Lebanese sovereignty up to the international borders. As long as this

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian  
Arab Republic)

does not take place, the people of Lebanon, which Syria firmly supports, like any other people has no choice but to carry on its valiant struggle against foreign occupation by every means available.

This valiant Arab people has proved its vitality and valour in a way that has surprised the world. It has displayed fortitude and determination to fight Israeli occupation wherever it takes place. In becoming martyrs on the battlefield, Arabs can achieve freedom and liberate their land. For our part, the Syrian Arab Republic will continue to support Lebanon and Lebanese resistance until its land is liberated. We will always be at the side of our brothers in Lebanon and support them and will assist them in implementing the Damascus agreement signed on 28 December 1985, which would bring about security in the region and restore normalcy to Lebanon, a country that is entitled to enjoy national peace, security and integrity.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): I thank the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic for the kind words he addressed to me.

There are no further speakers for this meeting. The next meeting of the Security Council will be held at 3.30 this afternoon to continue its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.