



## Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2641

13 January 1986

ENGLISH

JAN 15 1986

### PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Monday, 13 January 1986, at 3.30 p.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. KASEMSARN  
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 4 p.m.

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): In accordance with the decisions taken at the 2640th meeting, I invite the representative of Lebanon to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Israel, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Syrian Arab Republic to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

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): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Qatar and Saudi Arabia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar) and Mr. Shihabi (Saudi Arabia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

Members of the Council have before them the text of a draft resolution sponsored by Lebanon and contained in document S/17730.

The first speaker is the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. AZZAROUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): First, it is a pleasure for me to extend to you, Sir, our best wishes on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. We have every confidence that, because of your well-known wisdom, your proven statesmanship and your long experience, you will successfully conduct the business of the Council. Furthermore, we are pleased to see the presidential Chair occupied by a State that is friendly to the Jamahiriya and the Arab nation, a State that is bound to us by ties of friendship, understanding and mutual respect. We take this opportunity to express our appreciation and gratitude for the positions that your friendly country has taken in regard to the just causes of our Arab nation and its legitimate struggle for freedom.

I wish also to express our appreciation to your predecessor in the Chair, Ambassador Bassole of Burkina Faso, a friendly State, for the exemplary manner in which he conducted the work of the Council last month.

I cannot but take this occasion to express congratulations to the representatives of the fraternal and friendly countries that have just joined the family of this Council, and to wish them every success. I extend our thanks and appreciation to the outgoing countries, which made useful and fruitful contributions during their membership of the Council, thereby facilitating the Council's task and increasing its effectiveness.

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

Despite the appeal made by the representative of Lebanon in his statement this morning to the Security Council, the representative of the Zionist entity departed, as usual, from the subject of the complaint before the Council, in a blatant, transparent attempt to divert the attention of members of the Council from the shelling by Zionist forces and tanks of Lebanese villages and cities in southern Lebanon, the killing and maiming of innocent Lebanese citizens, the demolition of their houses, the burning of their cars, the looting of their homes and the displacement and expulsion of their families from their villages and cities. In that context, the Zionist representative used my country's name in connection with what he called support for terrorism and terrorists, whereas he knows better than anyone else that my country has constantly condemned all acts that jeopardize the safety and security of innocent citizens.

We listened with great attention to the statement made by Ambassador Rachid Fakhoury, who informed us today that the Zionist occupation forces have continued to displace the people of southern Lebanon from their villages and to expel them from their homes, to arrest them, to detain them and to imprison them in concentration camps.

The question before the Security Council today is not new. Zionist acts of aggression against Lebanon and the Arab nation - and there is a long series of them - have never ceased. The Zionist occupation of the Arab territories continues, as do its acts of aggression. That occupation and those acts of aggression are part and parcel of the expansionist, aggressive, racist nature of the Zionist entity, which has constantly sought to strip fraternal Lebanon of its Arab character and to force it to abandon all its Arab commitments. But Lebanon has resisted, with great sacrifice and courage, all the Zionist attempts to limit its freedom or compromise its sovereignty. That is why Lebanon, with resolute

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

determination, stood up to the attempt by the Zionist entity to impose an agreement on it by force of arms. The people of Lebanon was thereby able to scuttle that agreement and to declare publicly its categorical rejection of the Zionist military occupation. That people - quietly but at great sacrifice - took up the struggle to liberate its land and to regain its freedom and sovereignty.

Internally, within Lebanon, the Lebanese parties concerned achieved the national comprehensive reconciliation that could restore to Lebanon the desired peace and stability. All the political parties in Lebanon welcomed this agreement and all of them felt optimistic about it.

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan  
Arab Jamahiriya)

This was not to the liking of the Zionist occupation in southern Lebanon, which made up its mind to take revenge on the people of Lebanon for its rejection of the Zionist agreement and its determination to resist occupation. That vengeful desire was one of the foremost reasons that prompted the Zionist entity to insist on occupation of southern Lebanon, to reinforce its military positions and to establish Lebanese militias subservient to it to be used to destabilize Lebanon and to foment sedition.

Hence we were not surprised that the Zionist entity depopulated an entire village and expelled its population from their homes and farms. In accordance with a premeditated policy, the Zionist entity, in the midst of the joy of the Lebanese people, which welcomed the new reconciliation that promised the return of real peace and stability, had to stop the return of peace and stability to Lebanon after a decade of instability, destruction and devastation.

Thus today, as in the past, we find that entity committing aggression against Lebanese villages in the south, displacing their populations, demolishing their houses and burning their farms in a premeditated attempt to foment sedition and to precipitate clashes among members of the same people to impede the comprehensive national reconciliation achieved by the parties concerned in Lebanon.

In view of those expansionist and aggressive schemes, Lebanon had to resort to the Council to put before it the tragedy of the people of the south. If Lebanon has no right to resort to the Council, then who has? And if the Council is not in duty-bound to listen to the Lebanese complaint, then what are its duties and functions?

For a decade the forces of Zionist occupation have been storming cities and villages, violating homes and schools in southern Lebanon. The Zionist authorities have continuously arrested Lebanese citizens at random, not discriminating between young men, old men, women and children. They have even arrested clerics and

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan  
Arab Jamahiriya)

children, some of whom have been considered hostages by the occupation authorities. Those authorities have systematically closed shops, imposed curfews, put up roadblocks between villages, destroyed crops, bulldozed orchards and forced the population to reap the harvests prematurely. These Zionist practices run counter to all international instruments and conventions, especially the Fourth Geneva Convention, of 1949, and the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the principles of international law.

The population of southern Lebanon has been suffering under the yoke of Zionist occupation for 10 years, since the occupation forces separated the south from the rest of the motherland, carrying out the most heinous practices and thus defying United Nations principles and international law.

The Fourth Geneva Convention provides explicitly for the right of the people of southern Lebanon to protection against the transgressions of the Israeli occupation authorities, but the Zionist entity has continuously disregarded the international community, the United Nations Charter and the rules of international law.

The entire international community rejects these Zionist practices and condemns the Zionist entity for its disregard of international laws and regulations that are accepted by the civilized world. These Zionist practices are being engaged in while the international community is celebrating the International Year of Peace, during which it is expressing its hope that it can protect posterity from the scourge of war, protect rights and prohibit the use or the threat of force.

For all those reasons, fraternal Lebanon has resorted to the Council to translate those principles into a resolution condemning aggression and denouncing the violation of international laws and principles. We have participated in this debate to express our full support for the demands of fraternal Lebanon, although

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan  
Arab Jamahiriya)

we know full well in advance that a certain hand will be raised to scuttle this draft resolution, just as it has scuttled similar resolutions. The Zionist entity will continue to commit acts of aggression and to disregard the principles of the United Nations Charter as long it enjoys such protection inside the Council, which has consistently been prevented from condemning it and denouncing its practices, which run counter to all laws and rules. That protection will encourage the entity to disregard the Security Council and its resolutions and cynically to trample underfoot the prestige of the international Organization.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): I thank the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for the kind words he addressed to me and to my country.

Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): At the outset I am pleased to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. Your diplomatic experience and your personal qualities, as well as the stance of your Government on causes of justice and peace, are all positive elements that ensure that you will be successful in guiding the work of the Council.

I should also like to pay a tribute to the Permanent Representative of Burkina Faso for his presidency of the Council last month.

While we appreciated the kind words that you, Sir, addressed to our delegation on the occasion of our joining the Security Council, we should like to stress to you and the other members of the Council that we always stand ready and sincerely hope to co-operate with all parties to ensure the success of the Council's work, to achieve its noble goals and to carry out the important duties of the Council in terms of maintaining international peace and security and doing justice to the oppressed nations and peoples.



(Mr. Al-Shaali, United  
Arab Emirates)

The first question that occurs to one at this meeting is to what degree it is coincidental that the Security Council concluded its work for 1985 by discussing an act of aggression by South Africa against Lesotho and opened its work for 1986 by discussing the aggression by Israel against villages in southern Lebanon.

The Lebanese people and the land of Lebanon have been victimized by Israeli armed forces since the Israeli aggression of March 1978, which culminated in Israel's invasion of most of Lebanese territory in June 1982. The consequences of that aggression were very tragic, but it is not our intention to discuss them here. However, we are totally convinced that to a great extent the internal Lebanese problem is indeed the result of Israeli practices and policies and its aggression against Lebanon.

The current developments substantiate that. On 28 December last a pact was signed in Damascus between various Lebanese parties to analyse the internal Lebanese situation and to reach a final settlement of the conflict. The signing of that pact raised the hopes of many people inside Lebanon and outside it, since it represented the beginning of the end of the Lebanese crisis.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

But it seems that Israel, in pursuit of its former policies, was hatching another scheme, since its response to that pact was not late in coming. On the following day, 29 December, its forces attacked some Lebanese villages in the south, especially Kunin, expelled its inhabitants, destroyed their homes and properties and shelled other villages in co-operation with the puppet forces in southern Lebanon.

According to the information received, more than 1,000 Lebanese nationals have been forced to leave their villages and others have been imprisoned because they were accused of co-operating with the Lebanese national resistance forces. We also have information of clashes between Israel's proxy forces and the national forces that spread to the outskirts of the city of Sidon, in the south. In addition, the Israeli Air Force has mounted several sorties in Lebanese airspace breaking the sound barrier over Beirut and some Israeli naval units have laid siege to the Port of Tyre, in the south.

I do not intend to dwell at length on those issues, since they have been covered by the Permanent Representative of Lebanon. The important matter is the political significance of those incidents. Through such practices, Israel would like to invalidate the internal Lebanese accord in order to maintain the current state of conflict and foster dissension among the Lebanese by means of subtle schemes of polarization and pitting one faction against another with the aim of keeping the upper hand inside Lebanon.

The discovery of the Israeli spy network on 21 December 1985 was a very clear example of that. It became clear that that network had carried out a series of terrorist acts, especially by exploding booby-trapped cars. Those terrorist acts resulted in the death of 121 persons and injury to 473 Lebanese. The detainees have acknowledged that they were Israeli spy agents, as reported in the Washington Post on 22 December 1985.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

While other reports indicate an increasing Israeli military build-up within what is called the border strip, on 3 January David Levy, the Israeli Deputy Prime Minister, indicated his support for the Israeli Defence Forces expanding the security zone under their control in southern Lebanon. Also, General Rafael Eitan, Member of the Israeli Knesset and former Israeli Chief of Staff, has expressed his conviction that the Israeli Defence Forces should expand their deployment in southern Lebanon up to the Litani River and make preparations in the Beka'a Valley as well. The Israeli puppet Antoine Lahd has, of course, supported that idea.

If we try to establish a connection between all those developments, practices and declarations we can see a clear picture of the gravity of the situation in southern Lebanon and its adverse implications for the overall Lebanese situation.

Lebanon, by virtue of its geography and political and economic composition, is extremely sensitive to developments in all its areas. The gravity of the situation has been emphasized in the Secretary-General's report in document S/17684 of 16 December 1985, in which are indicated the obstacles created by Israel in the way of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), obstructing it from functioning in some of the areas under its control. In paragraph 12 of that report it is indicated that the best means of minimizing the risks of that situation would be a change in the Israeli position - and that is the crux of the matter.

The truth is that Israel continues to occupy part of Lebanese territory in violation of Security Council resolutions, especially resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), which demand that Israel withdraw all its forces from all Lebanese territory.

The second fact is that Israel practises various forms of terrorism and torture against the inhabitants of the area under its control to force them to leave their villages and lands - an established practice pursued by Israel since its creation so as to depopulate the areas in preparation for their annexation.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

The third fact is that Israel has created proxy militias - such as the South Lebanon Army (SLA) - which implement Israeli schemes in other parts of southern Lebanon from which Israel had to withdraw under the pressure of the Lebanese national resistance forces. The Israeli forces provide military cover for, and train and finance, those forces to implement Israeli schemes by creating chaos and sowing terror in the villages and towns of the south, bringing pressure to bear against Lebanon to accept interference by Israel in its internal affairs and to keep Lebanese territorial waters and airspace open for Israel to pursue its terrorist practices and commit acts of aggression against neighbouring countries.

There are fourth, fifth and sixth facts, but they all remain behind the great lie, called the "security of Israel", the significance and limits of which no one now understands. Behind that lie Israel has practised and continues to practise all forms of aggression, occupation and terrorism against the people of Palestine and other Arab States. Under the same pretext Israel has rejected and continues to reject the implementation of the Council's resolution.

Lebanon, a founding Member of the United Nations, has been coming to the Council seeking justice, because it believes that the fate of small nations is tied to seeking help from the international community to protect their sovereignty and peoples. On some occasions the Council has succeeded in adopting resolutions but failed on others. However, it invariably fails to implement the resolutions it adopts to ensure the withdrawal of forces of aggression from Lebanese territory and put an end to Israeli interference in Lebanon's internal affairs. Therefore, Lebanon finds itself forced to seek the application of international justice, just like scores of other States that might be victims of aggression, since they do not have a navy or an army to ensure self-defence. But they have the force of right and the will to live, and they rely on law and justice as embodied in this Organization.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

The Council might now succeed in shouldering its responsibility and adopt a resolution. If so, then the Council should ensure the implementation of that resolution and other resolutions as well, since its responsibility does not end with adopting resolutions but goes beyond that to implementing their provisions.

But the Council might fail - as happened last March - in which case it must bear responsibility for the consequent deterioration in the situation in Lebanon, as cautioned by the Secretary-General in the aforementioned report.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab  
Emirates)

We all know from past experience that peoples can be oppressed militarily, but they cannot be oppressed for ever. We sincerely believe that it is not in the interest of peace and security in the area to obstruct attempts by the Council to shoulder its responsibilities; it is not in the interest of the international community that the situation should continue to deteriorate in Lebanon; and it is in the interest of no one that people should be driven to despair.

The representative of Israel stressed this morning that his country would continue to take what he called "necessary" measures. We all know the significance of that; it is a threat. Therefore the Security Council should once again emphasize the need for Israeli's withdrawal from Lebanese territory and for an end to be put to interference in the internal affairs of Lebanon, in order that the Council not send the wrong signal to Israel that it is endorsing its practices.

Moreover, the Council should help Lebanon to emerge from its internal plight. We believe that the best way for doing that is to adopt the draft resolution now before the Council.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): I thank the representative of the United Arab Emirates for the kind words he addressed to me and to my country.

Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First of all, allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council for the month of January. We are certain that your lofty professional qualities and your authority will enable you to carry out successfully the responsibilities you have in guiding the activities of the Security Council in solving the problems facing it.

Taking this opportunity, we should like also to express our gratitude to your predecessor, the representative of Burkina Faso, for the skilful and competent guidance he gave to the Security Council during the month of December.

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

Since this is the first meeting of the Security Council in the new year, we congratulate the five newly elected members of the Security Council: Bulgaria, the Congo, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela and their Permanent Representatives. We think that they will make worthy contributions to meeting the responsibilities entrusted to this body by the Charter of the United Nations.

At the same time we express our gratitude to the Permanent Representatives of Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Peru and the Ukrainian SSR, who completed their two-year mandate here in the Council and we wish them success in their future activities.

The Soviet delegation listened carefully to the statement of the representative of Lebanon and we feel that his Government's appeal to the Security Council is fully justified. It has long been ripe for consideration. Indeed, there is hardly anyone who would take it upon himself to deny the fact that the main cause for the continuing tension in southern Lebanon, which has a negative impact on the general situation in that country, is the policy of Israel: its stubborn refusal to withdraw its forces from Lebanese territory and to end its uncereceremonious interference in the internal affairs of Lebanon, as demanded unambiguously by the relevant resolutions of the Security Council. One year ago Tel Aviv pompously announced its decision to withdraw its forces from Lebanon but, as we ought to have expected, that turned out to be yet another propaganda bluff. In fact, having withdrawn from some regions of the country under the pressure of the national patriotic struggle of the Lebanese, the Israeli occupiers continue to hold on to a significant part of Lebanese territory.

Having created the so-called "security zone", where there continues to be a direct, armed Israeli presence, Israel has set up in that area its own paid puppets

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

in the form of the mercenary South Lebanese Army and, clearly, they hope to give some local colour to the occupation.

It goes without saying that the new facade has not in the least changed the essence of the Israeli occupation. Everyone remembers full well the policy of the "iron fist" which was announced officially by Israel in March of last year and which has turned into a systematic mass repression of the civilian population of southern Lebanon. This was talked about in detail at the meeting of the Security Council which was called by Lebanon. Today this cynical policy has been further developed. Now, in Tel Aviv, they publicly make statements in which they threaten to turn southern Lebanon into a lifeless desert and to make the existence of the local inhabitants there unbearable. There is the continuing criminal practice of punitive operations and collective punishments carried out against the Lebanese population. With a view to the future, they are working out the tactic of mass deportation of the Lebanese from the regions where they live. Clearly it is difficult to find a provision or a norm of international law of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 which has not been systematically and consciously violated by the Israeli occupying forces in Lebanon.

We should especially point out the fact of the provocative attitude of Israel with regard to units of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) located in that area. Those forces are not only subjected to systematic armed provocations; they are not only meeting attempts by Israel and its agents to prevent them from carrying out the tasks given to them by the Security Council; but at the same time the UNIFIL forces recently have become the object of a vicious campaign, the purpose of which is to disorganize the activities of the United Nations forces and to compel them to leave the territory of Lebanon. Things have reached a state where the Minister of Defence of Israel publicly says that the



(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

United Nations forces should "leave Lebanon and go home". Clearly the Israeli leaders think that by getting rid of witnesses it will be easier for them to carry out their unseemly actions in Lebanon.

The danger of the situation which has arisen in southern Lebanon, including the situation regarding the United Nations forces, was pointed out by the Secretary-General in his recent report to the Security Council. Quite rightly he emphasized that the main condition for normalizing the situation in this region is a change in Israel's position. That is precisely the heart of the matter.

The example of Lebanon has clearly laid bare the policy of State terrorism carried out by Israel against the Arab States and peoples. Here is precisely where we find the roots of the fact that the Middle East is constantly in a state of military fever, and this is the very reason why the conflict in this region has turned into a chronic hotbed of international tension posing a real threat to the peace of our planet.

It goes without saying that Israel could not carry out such a policy for such a long time acting on its own. The danger of Israel's aggressive policy is vastly increased by the fact that behind Israel stand those who preach a philosophy of force and who are trying to impose that policy as a norm of inter-State relations. They clearly do not like the fact that Lebanon has refused to become an Israeli protectorate and is seeking its own independent course of development. Therefore, resolutions of the Security Council demanding the withdrawal of Israel from Lebanon are categorically classified as being out of place, while Israel itself regularly hides behind the shield of the United States veto in the Security Council.

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya just talked about that very fact here. By the way, that same aggressive policy is being carried out in aggressive imperialist circles in the United States with regard to other sovereign States that refuse to submit to its diktat. They do not like the fact, for example, that the people of Nicaragua are striving to build their own future as they feel necessary and not as Washington suggests. Therefore, a genuine undeclared war has been launched against Nicaragua, with the purpose of overthrowing its legitimate government.

Finally, they are irritated by the fact that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is carrying out an independent course in its foreign policy affairs and does not seek overseas approval for that policy. Under trumped-up pretexts a whole package of "coercive measures" has been put into operation, ranging from economic sanctions to threats of direct armed intervention. The campaign of blackmail and threats against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya by the United States has in recent days taken on an especially broad and provocative character. It has led to a serious worsening of the situation in the Mediterranean, where there is a significant build-up of United States naval forces.

In all of those situations we have practical manifestation of the theory of a "new globalism" Washington has invented in order to justify its hegemonistic policy. As was pointed out the other day by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Shevardnaze:

"The new globalism is not an abstract theory. In practice, it is turning into an attempt to impose one's own will upon other peoples. Those who carry out this policy are wilfully trying to punish those countries which displease them. They always have a whip in hand with which to frighten those who will not submit."

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

Clearly, we have a definite parallel between the situation in Lebanon and the situation which has arisen recently in the Mediterranean. In both instances we are talking about attempts, in clear violation of the Charter and ignoring elementary norms of international law, to impose one's own will on sovereign States and peoples.

As was pointed out in this connection in the statement by Tass, published on 9 January, that in the Soviet Union, they expect

"that in the United States a healthy understanding will prevail of the existing realities and that the United States will seriously weigh the dangerous consequences which might arise if they were to carry out the policy they have embarked upon. We expect not only that they themselves will show the restraint which the people of the world expect, but that they also will restrain their unbridled partner, Israel."

With regard to Lebanon, the Soviet Union expresses its solidarity with the legitimate struggle of the Lebanese people against Israeli occupation and their struggle to maintain the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

It is the duty of the Security Council to adopt effective measures in order to ensure the unswerving implementation of the decisions taken by the Security Council demanding the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli occupation forces from the territory of Lebanon. This is the only true key to the solution of Lebanese problems. In this connection the Soviet delegation is prepared to support the draft resolution that has been introduced in document S/17730, although in our view it does not go far enough in terms of putting pressure on Israel. In particular, it does not provide for the sanctions called for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): I thank the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. ADOUKI (Congo) (interpretation from French): Since the Council is holding its first meetings of 1986, I should like on behalf of my country to congratulate you, Sir, first of all in your capacity as the representative of China - a country friendly to the Congo - and also, for your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of January, which begins the International Year of Peace.

I am convinced that you will place at the service of the Security Council and at the service of the International Year of Peace your experience, your talents as a diplomat and your widely recognized wisdom.

I should like to pay tribute to His Excellency Ambassador Bassole of Burkina Faso, your predecessor in the presidency, for the particularly skilful way in which he led the work of the Council last December. Our best wishes go with him since his term of office in the Security Council came to an end on 31 December 1985.

Mr. President, you have had kind words for the Congo and the other newly elected members of the Council, and I should like to thank you most sincerely.

The unstable and explosive situation in Lebanon constitutes for many reasons one of the biggest and most unusual challenges still confronting the international community. The diversity of the factors that must be brought out in public debate is striking.

It is common knowledge that Lebanon has undergone, contrary to the recognized principles of international law, repeated violations by a regular army, both of its southern border and of its air and maritime borders. The peace-keeping force dispatched by the United Nations, the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), is facing difficulties, and it will be noted that in its brief history in the country that peace-keeping force has suffered sizeable losses.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

The weak intellectual base of the strategic model proposed to meet the Middle East challenge explains why some main parties to the dispute have considered and still consider their status called into question. This approach remains distressing in a developing region characterized above all, as far as its security is concerned, by the human tragedy of a people seeking to have its identity and its existence as a nation recognized.

The civilian populations in southern Lebanon, those in the areas occupied and directly affected by Israel's illegal acts, by the incessant conduct of military operations, are living in total disarray. Thus the importance, the very seriousness of these few brief considerations should give the international community a keener understanding of the importance of using the Security Council for the maintenance of peace.

The Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations, Ambassador Rachid Fakhoury, has supplied information describing villages recently bombed, and schools, homes, stores and vehicles destroyed in various parts of southern Lebanon - in Jabaa, Haddathah, Aita, El Jabal, Kfar and so forth.

The seriousness of the incidents described, which tend to repeat themselves and unfortunately seem to become commonplace, seem to have reached their peak in the village of Kunin, which has now been evacuated by its sorely tried inhabitants.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

This tragedy of Kunin, which adds so much to the suffering of the already much tried population, is due to a combined military operation of the Israeli armed forces and so-called South Lebanon Army. The representative of Israel in his statement this morning before the Security Council mentioned these incidents among others, except that he gave them a different interpretation. Last Friday, in his report to the Security Council, the Secretary-General of the United Nations confirmed those same regrettable incidents.

These acts of aggression, need we stress, violate the principles enshrined, in particular in the United Nations Charter, in the provisions of international conventions dedicated to humanitarian rights in wartime, in particular the Fourth Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949 relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War.

The acts thus described and attributable to Israel represent obstacles to peace. They contribute to the worsening of the already considerable tense situation prevailing not only in southern Lebanon but also in the entire Middle East region. The international community is in duty bound to give due attention to this in order that peace may be achieved.

To that end and in order to reduce the existing tension, the Security Council must adopt a firm position, the only possible position compatible with strict respect for the sovereignty, integrity and unity of the people of Lebanon.

Inspired by that well-founded hope, the Congo is participating in this debate. We wish at the same time to affirm our solidarity with the people of Lebanon.

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

Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): It is gratifying for me to tell you, Sir, how much my delegation appreciates the fact that the presidency of the Council this month falls to the representative of the country with which the Democratic Republic of Madagascar has continuous trusting and special relations. We congratulate you, Mr. President, and assure you of our constant availability. We are convinced that the Council will be able to benefit from your outstanding qualities, just as we benefitted from the presidency last month of Mr. Leandre Bassole, the Permanent Representative of Burkina Faso, to whom we repeat our fraternal thanks for his dedication and unending availability.

Through you, Mr. President, my delegation wishes to pay tribute to the decisive contribution made by the delegations of Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Peru and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic to the work of the Security Council during their terms of office.

Although it is a matter of regret for us that we shall no longer be able to benefit from the sage advice of our former colleagues, it is a pleasure for us to welcome the delegations of Bulgaria, the Congo, Ghana, Venezuela, and the United Arab Emirates with which we have co-operated closely in other bodies for the promotion of peace, security and social progress. It is good to know that this co-operation will continue in the Security Council, and my delegation is committed to developing that co-operation under the best possible conditions.

The Council is meeting today once again to study the situation in southern Lebanon which continues to be subjected to Israeli occupation in spite of numerous United Nations resolutions.

The Permanent Representative of Lebanon gave us at this morning's meeting a detailed account of recent acts of extortion by the Israeli army against the

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

civilian populations of the region, ranging from destruction of individual or collective property and forced displacement of the population to attempts against the physical integrity of Lebanese citizens.

I would like briefly to come back to the facts for which Israel is being held responsible. Since 29 December 1985, Israel artillery and that of the forces it controls bombed villages in southern Lebanon causing destruction of several homes in the localities of Jbaa, Bsalim, Kfar-Rumman, Haddathah, Haris, Habbouch, Shaqra, Nabathieh, Aita-al-Jabal, Madjel Saida and Tebrin, to mention just a few.

At Kunin, the Israeli army and its accolytes blew up several homes and stores after having set fire to vehicles and other property. Subsequently the inhabitants were forced to leave the village. In the same area the Israeli army also arrested several people after having expelled others from Beit Yahun.

The provisional tally sheet of these Israeli operations as of 3 January 1986 comes to eight people killed, 35 wounded, 700 displaced persons and dozens of homes and automobiles destroyed on Lebanese territory.

The occupation of a part of Lebanese territory by Israel constitutes in itself an act which is as illegal with regard to international law as it is contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter which in particular ask Member States to abstain in their international relations from resorting to the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. The numerous Security Council resolutions in this regard speak eloquently for themselves. I would merely cite resolutions 425 (1978), 501 (1982), 509 (1982), 520 (1982), 561 (1985) and 575 (1985). Without exception those resolutions ask Israel to respect Lebanon's territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence within internationally recognized boundaries.



(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

Furthermore, Israel has violated - and continues to violate openly and with impunity - the standards established by international humanitarian law, in particular the Fourth Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949, which in its article 27 prohibits attacks on the physical and moral integrity of civilians in occupied territories. In its article 53 it prohibits the destruction of goods and property of private individuals or juridical entities; and in its article 33 it prohibits collective punishment and intimidation measures against the population of an occupied territory.

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

The Israeli authorities have made numerous statements in an attempt to justify their state terrorism: that they were operations directed against individuals or groups of individuals accused of having recently bombed certain places in the northern part of Israel; that these actions were intended to safeguard the security of Israeli territory. However, such arguments cannot withstand serious analysis: indeed, it is difficult to believe that the 700 displaced persons and the inhabitants of numerous villages mentioned earlier could have been able to participate collectively in the bombardment of Israeli areas and thus justify such a punitive reaction.

Furthermore, this argument flagrantly contradicts the reasons invoked by Israel for occupying southern Lebanon: that the strategic occupation of that area would enable Israel to ensure the security of its territory. It has been demonstrated today, as the present situation attests, that the Israeli presence in southern Lebanon does not in any way ensure its security, since the attacks are carried out from a region which Israel stubbornly occupies and claims to control. In international law the defence of the security of a State must be carried out from its own territory and within its own boundaries.

What then is the true reason for the presence of Israeli forces in southern Lebanon?

We are inclined to believe that it comes within the framework of Israel's regional strategy of intimidation, occupation and division. Israel is in fact pursuing a precise goal: the destabilization and permanent weakening of the Lebanese State. Indeed, it is no accident that Israel, at a time when all Lebanese parties are moving towards national reconciliation, has decided to fan the flames of tension in southern Lebanon and to support an element of agitation and disturbance intended to thwart re-establishment of the Lebanese State

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

in its full sovereignty, cohesion and unity. Obviously, a Lebanon caught up in factions and dissensions would be more satisfactory to Israel than a strong and united Lebanon.

It is clear, consequently, that one of the means for Israel to maintain the status quo would be to maintain the insecurity in southern Lebanon. Israel's goals are all too clear. It is up to us as members of the Council to oppose them by demanding once again that Israel fully respect the Fourth Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949 and that it consequently cease its acts of aggression, as well as all practices and abusive, arbitrary measures against the civilian population of southern Lebanon which would prevent the restoration of normal conditions in the region through national reconciliation. In keeping with its relevant resolutions, the Council should also demand the complete and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from southern Lebanon.

Finally, we should ask States capable of exerting decisive influence on Israel to make Israel respect the foundations of international relations between States, if only so that the notion of regional or international peace and security may still have some kind of meaning.

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

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

Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. President, I thank you and the members of this Council for giving me this opportunity to address the Council. I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month, as you represent a great country, China, which has a glorious civilization and history.

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

My thanks go also to the Permanent Representative of Burkina Faso for the skill and tact he demonstrated during his presidency of the Council last month.

I congratulate the representatives of Bulgaria, Congo, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela on their election as new members of the Security Council and I wish them every success.

Once again the Security Council convenes to consider the Israeli practices in southern Lebanon. If Israel had complied with the previous Council resolutions in this field, shown respect for international law and renounced its practices, which run counter to every law and norm, and withdrawn its forces from all of Lebanese territory, the Council would not have had to convene such a meeting and would have been able to devote its valuable time to the consideration of other, more important or urgent issues than that of southern Lebanon.

The crux of the issue of Israeli practices, of which Lebanon is complaining, is the unlawful Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon. As long as such occupation continues, then a new wave of oppression and of suppression of the occupation forces may be expected. One may also expect a continuation of the resistance to such occupation.

The Council has heard the Permanent Representative of Lebanon, who reminded the Council of the deteriorating situation in southern Lebanon, warned of the serious consequences of a continuation of Israel's brutal oppressive practices and called upon the Council to take decisive action that would reflect the will and determination of the international community to deter the aggressor and to end the illegitimate occupation.

The Lebanese people, like all other peoples, is eager to ensure its freedom and territorial integrity. But as long as any part of Lebanese territory remains under foreign occupation, it is the right of the Lebanese people to resist that

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

occupation by all means. The Israeli forces have no legitimate status. In fact, their mere existence is a flagrant violation of the principles of international law and the right of States to sovereignty and territorial integrity and therefore the right to resist an occupation, which is still recognized for all peoples in all parts of the world.

Thus, resistance is honoured in the annals in the history of nations; it is a source of glory and pride, as well as an inspiration to new generations to preserve the freedom of the homeland, to defend that homeland and to expel the foreign occupier.

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

It is meaningless to describe acts of resistance as terrorism. That is a cliché that we have heard time and again from representatives of Israel and other representatives who speak on Israel's behalf. It is they, and they alone, who believe this. As a matter of fact, they themselves do not really believe that resistance and terrorism are one and the same thing. Indeed, the use of massive violence against innocent persons who could not expect to be victims of terrorism - and that is the real definition of terrorism - is completely different from the resistance of citizens to foreign military occupation forces that maintain their occupation by brutal force and therefore should expect legitimate resistance by citizens determined to defend the freedom, dignity and territorial integrity of their homelands.

Despite the clear distinction between resistance and terrorism, Israel continues to describe Lebanese resistance as terrorism. It also describes as terrorism the courageous Palestinian resistance in the occupied territories. If there were any validity to that distorted reasoning, then the European resistance to the Nazi occupation forces during the Second World War would have been terrorism. Indeed, the Nazis claimed that it was terrorism. But that description did not deceive anyone and in no way affected the respect, appreciation and admiration felt by the world for the national resistance to brutal foreign occupation. On the contrary, that resistance is a source of pride to those peoples that engaged in it; they regard that resistance as a glorious chapter of their history, a legacy to succeeding generations.

During the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, several speakers referred to the credibility of the world Organization and the crisis it faces in regard to its credibility among the peoples of the world. They referred to the need to restore confidence in the United Nations. In my opinion, the loss of credibility in the Organization can be largely attributed to the

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

failure to implement the resolutions adopted by various bodies of the Organization. The first step to take towards restoring confidence in the Organization and reaffirming its credibility is to ensure implementation of its resolutions by all Member States, whether or not they find those resolutions to their liking.

What Lebanon is calling for from this Council can be summarized in three points: first, to condemn the Israeli acts of aggression and practices, which contravene international law and treaties; secondly, to reaffirm the need for the implementation of previous Security Council resolutions demanding that Israel withdraw completely from Lebanese territory; and, thirdly, to call upon Israel to cease its violent practices against the civilian population of southern Lebanon. Those are extremely modest requests; indeed, they are fundamental points which could not be challenged by anyone. In fact, they merely reaffirm former Security Council resolutions and provisions of international law. We hope that the Council will respond unanimously to those requests and will include in its resolution new elements that would ensure that the resolution would be effective - which has not been true of previous resolutions.

If the situation in Lebanon continues to deteriorate, the security of the region and perhaps of the world could be jeopardized.

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

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

Mr. SHIHABI (Saudi Arabia) (interpretation from Arabic): I am very pleased to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. The strong positions taken by your country

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

as well as my personal knowledge of you and of your skill and wide experience lead me to expect the Security Council, under your presidency, to take the well-founded and correct positions called for by the circumstances of the present complaint and the sound principles at the basis of the international community's survival.

I express our appreciation also to your predecessor in the Chair for the competence with which he conducted the Council's proceedings last month.

I wish, too, to congratulate the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Congo, Ghana and Bulgaria - the new members of the Council - on the confidence shown in them by the international community, and to wish them success.

Lebanon has come to the Security Council to complain of direct aggression and continuous intimidation by Israel and of Israeli practices against Lebanon and the Lebanese people that endanger their security and safety, challenge their independence and constitute aggression against the sovereignty of their country.

The representative who have already spoken here have set forth the details of the acts of terrorism carried out by the Israeli authorities in southern Lebanon. I shall not repeat those details. They amount to a long list of atrocious acts of piracy on land, at sea and in the air, committed by a Member of the United Nations before the very eyes of this Council, while, at the very same time, that Member is denouncing acts of violence and terrorism not committed by it.

Even worse: Israel claims that, by its invasion of the Lebanese homeland, its occupation of Lebanon and its perpetration of the most heinous crimes against Lebanon's territory and population, it is simply protecting itself against terrorism and aggression. I would ask this question: Could there be any stronger motive for vengeance and terrorism, any greater encouragement to commit acts of violence, any better way to arouse the feelings of peoples, any greater defiance of the dignity and human rights of those peoples, than the acts committed by Israel and called for by its leaders against Lebanon now, and on other occasions



(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

against other Arab countries, beginning with Palestine? Do the Zionist invaders really expect that the orphans will forget the crimes against human beings and property committed recently in Sabra and Shatila and formerly in Deir Yassin and Qibia, the rest of Palestine and the Golan Heights? Can those orphans be expected to forget these crimes, which continue to this very day? Would not the international community expect the victims of Zionist terrorism to demand that the norms and principles of international law be complied with - norms and principles that have been violated by the Zionists ever since they invaded Palestine and escalated their acts of aggression against Arabs and Moslems everywhere?

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

The Zionists invaded Lebanon in contravention of every norm and instrument. They said, "We want to get the Palestinians in southern Lebanon." Well, why did the Palestinians go to southern Lebanon to begin with, having been expelled from their country by Zionist terrorism?

The Zionists and their supporters do not want to ask why. But why are the Palestinians pursued today by the Zionists in southern Lebanon? Why has terrorism against Lebanon and southern Lebanon continued to this very day? The practices of the Zionist entity, that great hotbed of terrorism, give logical reason for hatred on the part of those whose rights have been violated by Zionist terrorism, which threatens their very right to life. The Zionist entity still occupies part of Lebanon, where it is pursuing all its methods and tactics to threaten the security and stability of that country.

I should like members to ask themselves if there can be any possibility of stability while Israel continues to escalate its terrorism and expand its scope, using different tactics day in and day out. The United Nations has denounced terrorism, as does every responsible State. But we must come to understand the reasons for it, and anticipate it; we must read between the lines. Had there been no Israeli terrorism - terrorism that displaced millions from their homes through bloodshed and force of arms and continues to do so - would there have been any of the acts of violence of which the Israelis speak?

The Israelis continue their terrorist practices against Lebanon and other countries, claiming that we are seeking instability. Many positions have been taken in support of the rights of Lebanon; there have been many resolutions confirming them, denouncing Israel's practices and actions in Lebanon and calling upon the Zionist authorities to desist from their crimes. There have been 19 resolutions and declarations adopted by the Security Council: the first was

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

resolution 501 (1982), and subsequent resolutions were adopted in 1982, 1983 and 1985 - 19 in all, ending with Security Council resolution 564 (1985). Those resolutions of the Security Council were followed by a number of resolutions of the General Assembly; similar resolutions adopted by international and regional organizations of every kind, covering all aspects of the situation, are to be found in documents and archives.

Does Israel feel any shame? Does it fear the law? No, it feels no shame, and it has no fear of the law. It certainly pays no heed to the lessons of history. Could there be any aggression more heinous than that practised by Israel in southern Lebanon: a military invasion and the establishment of a puppet army in defiance of the authority and sovereignty of the Lebanese State - terrorism directed against human dignity and the Lebanese population and all their vital interests and human feelings? Yet, all this is followed by an escalation of defiance, and this aggression will continue because Israel wants to protect itself in southern Lebanon. To protect itself against whom? Is there a force capable of committing aggression in southern Lebanon other than Israel and its puppets?

Lebanon is calling upon the Council today, as it has done in the past, to acknowledge the facts and to take a position that will command the respect of the world for you - as States, as the Security Council, and as Members of the United Nations. This position is based on a self-evident truth, a truth denied not even by the perpetrators of Zionist crimes in southern Lebanon: Israel's challenge to Lebanese values and rights and to security and stability in southern Lebanon. It is a challenge made in the full view of the world, before the very eyes of the members of the Council; it is a challenge to the Security Council, to the United Nations and, at the same time, to all the positions and valuable statements we continue to hear in the Security Council about aggression and aggressors, about the

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

rights of peoples, the rule of law and commitment to international norms. If we review the positions of the States represented here and the statements of their foreign ministers and representatives denouncing aggression and aggressors, we will see the position Israel should occupy if they are truly concerned about truth and justice. Only then will they enjoy the credibility they must have as Members of the United Nations.

Council members, you should take a position in consonance with the principles you espouse and the commitments you champion. Lebanon calls upon you to do what you call upon the other States of the world to do: to comply with the principles you reassert on every occasion. Lebanon is today the victim of an aggression that is not even denied by the aggressor. That aggression leaves in its wake all the effects of the crime for everyone to see.

The draft resolution before the Council represents the minimum called for by the situation, and less than the minimum called for in the light of the commitments we have all assumed and the positions we all reiterate. We hope that the Council's stand will now conform to those positions.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, strongly supporting Lebanon and demanding respect for its full sovereignty and territorial integrity, unreservedly stands at its side, unhesitatingly denounces the aggression against it, and calls upon the international community to take against the aggressor the same stand it would take if any of its Member States fell victim to aggression and were in Lebanon's present position.

Are we going to be true to ourselves today in the Security Council?

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

Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria): Speaking for the first time as a member of the Security Council, let me convey to you, Sir, my sincerest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of January 1986 and wish you success in carrying out this difficult yet noble task. In view of your rich diplomatic experience and political wisdom, I am convinced that under your guidance the Council will fruitfully carry out its responsibilities during this month.

I should also like to congratulate the representative of Burkina Faso for his able guidance of the Council in December 1985.

Also, I join in conveying greetings to the delegations of the Congo, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela on their election as non-permanent members of the Security Council. I wish them successful work and assure them of our wholehearted co-operation.

At the same time, I express my gratitude to the representatives of Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Peru and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, whose terms expired a few days ago, for the devotion and competence with which they have fulfilled their responsibilities.

My delegation is particularly grateful to you, Mr. President, and all delegations which were so kind as to congratulate us on our election as a non-permanent member of the Security Council. For the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria it is a great honour to serve in the Security Council. We are fully aware of the high responsibilities vested in us through our membership. I would like to assure the Council that my delegation will do its best to carry out all our obligations. It will co-operate most closely with all members of the Council for the successful discharge of its responsible tasks in accordance with the spirit, lofty ideals and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

The situation in southern Lebanon is once again under consideration in the Security Council. We note with regret that the conclusion drawn by the Secretary-General three months ago in his report on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) - namely, that the current situation in Lebanon south of the Litani is not only unsatisfactory but also dangerous - is still valid today.

Proceeding from that conclusion and mindful of the deep concern of the international community, the Bulgarian delegation has supported Lebanon's request for an urgent meeting of the Security Council. The convincing and informative statement of the representative of Lebanon containing ample factual material is eloquent testimony to the explosive situation in that part of the world brought about by Israel's continuing acts of aggression, violence and terror against the local civilian population.

As is known, six months ago Israel announced that it was withdrawing its troops from Lebanon, but events since then have shown otherwise. As a matter of fact, Israel has maintained its control over a large part of Lebanon's territory under the pretext of establishing a "security zone" in southern Lebanon, where strong Israeli forces are deployed.

Israel's violations against Lebanon's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity have continued unabated. Using the so-called security zone as a springboard for aggression inside Lebanon, the Israeli troops and their puppets continue to subject the local population to terror and violence. The number of innocent victims is growing. Daily reports flow from Lebanon describing escalating crimes by the Israeli occupying forces, violence against the local population, reprisal raids deep inside the country, and repeated shelling and bombing of civilian targets; Israeli gunboats and warplanes violate Lebanon's territorial waters and airspace.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

It is obvious that Israel has not abandoned its expansionist schemes against Lebanon. Relying on some new tactical devices, Israel's rulers are trying to recoup the failure of their large-scale aggression against their northern neighbour. They are using the occupation of part of Lebanon's territory to exert pressure against the Lebanese Government and to disrupt the process of normalization in that country, in whose instability Israel is obviously interested. It is noteworthy that Israel's provocations and terrorist acts have increased at this particular time when hopes are raised that order and tranquillity can be restored to Lebanon.

All those acts are continuing, in spite of the numerous categorical decisions of the United Nations and in violation of the elementary norms of international law and the conventions in force, in particular the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. There can be no doubt that those actions in the occupied Lebanese territory are a most flagrant violation of the purposes and principles laid down in the Charter of the United Nations.

In our view, the Security Council is in duty bound to call upon Israel to cease forthwith its repressive policy in southern Lebanon, which cannot be described other than as a policy of State terrorism. It is high time that Israel was compelled to comply with the decisions of the Security Council which it has only defied so far.

The reasons for that defiance are well known. Owing to the all-round support provided to Israel by its senior strategic ally and in particular to the systematic use of its veto power in the Security Council, all opportunities for taking effective measures against the aggressor have been blocked so far. This state of affairs is intolerable. It undermines the prestige and effectiveness of the Security Council as the principal organ of the United Nations responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security and the very foundation of the world Organization.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

The People's Republic of Bulgaria condemns most categorically the continuing occupation by Israel of Lebanese lands, its interference in the internal affairs of Lebanon and its attempts at dismembering the territory of that country. I should like to express our full support for, and solidarity with, the just and heroic struggle of the Lebanese national resistance against Israeli aggression and occupation. There is only one road to the achievement of peace in that long-suffering country. It has been outlined clearly and unequivocally in Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), which demand that Israel withdraw its forces immediately and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon. The solution of Lebanon's problems is possible only on the basis of maintaining and respecting the unity, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

It is perfectly clear that the situation in southern Lebanon is just one aspect of the Middle East conflict. A comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of this conflict could be attained only by an international conference on the Middle East with the participation on an equal footing of all the parties concerned.

Obviously this is needed even more now, when the situation in that part of the world has dramatically deteriorated as a result of new adventurist schemes, open threats of military action, intervention and other acts of State terrorism, as well as the imposition of economic and political sanctions against independent and sovereign States of the region.

In view of the foregoing, my delegation supports the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Lebanon.

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

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



Mr. FAKHOURY (Lebanon) (interpretation from Arabic): There are some points in the statement of the representative of Israel to which I must respond. But before doing so, I should like to pay a tribute to the members and non-members of the Council who spoke in favour of bringing back to the Council the issue that is the core of the Lebanese complaint.

No doubt it has been noticed that the representative of Israel has deliberately, as usual, tried to divert attention from that fact because it affects his country directly and fundamentally. Therefore, he opted to avoid discussing it in an attempt to escape responsibility and to evade the implementation of the resolutions of the Council. On the other hand, I do not think that anyone present here has been convinced by the arguments advanced by the Israeli representative, who reversed the situation. Thus, Lebanon has been portrayed as the aggressor against Israel and Israel has been depicted as the victim. It would have been better for him to declare the intention of his country to implement the Security Council resolutions and to withdraw from Lebanese territory rather than insisting on staying in the south and persisting in its acts of aggression and the practices of his State. He wanted to portray Israel as a peaceful State, innocent of the blood shed by it in Lebanon and in other places. He spoke about my country and about the situation in my country but chose not to mention that the cause of the Lebanese crisis is Israel, its aggression and its practices. If indeed he is anxious about the welfare of Lebanon, I should like to assure him that the situation has returned to normal in Beirut and, if he showed a cablegram from Reuters News Agency, I have several cables from Agence France Presse in that regard. The meeting was held at the Ministry of Defence building in Lebanon and it is the best example of the fact that there is a Government in Lebanon and that the rule of law obtains in Lebanon and is effective.

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

Then the representative of Israel spoke in detail and at length about terrorism inside Lebanon. Who among us is not against terrorism? Who does not deplore and condemn terrorism and call for its eradication, whether it be terrorism perpetrated by an individual, a group or a State? I should like to pose but one single question, in order to be brief: Is not what is being practised by the State of Israel in southern Lebanon terrorism? We must put an end to this farce - pretending to combat terrorism in words while practising it in deeds and accusing others of practising it. The most important thing is to eradicate terrorism, and such eradication will not be possible except by knowing the underlying reasons for it and to address them in a spirit of objectivity, justice and fairness.

The Israeli representative also spoke about the Syrian presence in Lebanon. I do not need to defend Syria here. Its Permanent Representative is in a better position to do this. But the Israeli representative, and all of the members of the Council know, that the Syrian presence in Lebanon is in response to the legitimate request of Lebanon. We cannot compare Syria with Israel. Israel seeks to destroy Lebanon and to dismantle its democratic system, which represents a challenge to its racist régime, whereas Syria stands by Lebanon to help to put an end to the Lebanese crisis.

We should address the question of southern Lebanon in order to put an end to the aggression and to call upon that aggressor to withdraw from the Lebanese territories it occupies, so that we would remove the occupation and put an end to the aggression in the south and the abusive practices against the people of the south.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): The representative of the United States has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on him.

Mr. OKUN (United States of America): I will be brief, for the hour is late. The Council's time is valuable and too much of it has already been taken up with rhetoric far removed from reality. But I cannot let pass references to my country and to the policy of my Government which bear no relation to fact.

I want to emphasize anew that my Government is committed to the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon.

(Mr. Okun, United States)

We may have and do have differences with some other Members of this Organization over how best to bring about those goals. But instead of seeking to find common ground, some speakers, regrettably, have chosen the destructive course of questioning our motives - indeed concocting motives. The Council has been subjected to statements to the effect that not only America but American policy is allegedly controlled by Israel, or worse yet, by the agents of Israel.

In our innocence and naivety, my delegation had thought the Council was convened to discuss a serious situation in Lebanon. Instead, we heard some fictional remarks about American foreign policy, remarks which wandered all over the globe in search of a new American globalism.

All such assertions are false. They are totally without foundation and devoid of any content. Such assertions, of course, cannot harm the United States. They only bring those who make them into disrepute and harm the important work of this Council.

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

Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): First, some observations on some of the statements we heard today. The representative of Syria talks about the people of Lebanon rejecting a solution imposed by force of arms. I recall that the 17 May agreement, approved overwhelmingly by the Lebanese Parliament, was broken, literally broken, by Syrian shelling of the Lebanese capital, and I am sure that the Council remembers that. Since then the pattern of Syria's brotherly and fraternal upholding of Lebanese democracy, as I just heard from the representative of Lebanon, is taking the form of brutal assassinations, first and foremost directed at Lebanese editors and newspapermen who disagree with Syria's usurpation of Lebanese independence. They simply cut them down. In one noted case of an

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

editor, his body was literally sliced up to make him an example for anyone else who would not only dare act but dare speak or think of having a truly independent Lebanon.

In a similar vein, the Soviet Union's discussions of puppets, occupations, the condemnation of punitive occupations or punitive actions, and of collective punishments and mass deportations, are very fitting. They apply to Afghanistan, as is clear to everyone here.

The Soviet representative says that Lebanon has refused to become an Israeli protectorate. I think he should apply that to Afghanistan as well. I was also struck by his concern for the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) and the integrity of UNIFIL, when the Soviet Union has refused, reneged, to pay even a penny, or a rouble, for UNIFIL and is building up an extraordinary backlog of debt. This is the same UNIFIL for which it has also refused to vote positively.

Libya's talking about the trampling underfoot of international law is too preposterous to respond to, as is Bulgaria's discussion of State terrorism - a practice which extends to many parts of Europe, from London to Rome and other areas which I will not go into in detail.

I will not reply to the others. I will say, however, that the accusations that were raised here about Israeli practices, as it is put, in the south, are false. We have not shelled villages. The Israeli Defence Forces (IDF) has not shelled villages. The IDF has not destroyed buildings in the villages described. It has not conducted, as I said, any deportations. The accusation of expulsions in Kunin are totally without foundation. The IDF is not acting in any capacity except to protect the north of Israel, which, as I said, is our interest.

That brings me to my final point. What is the real problem we are discussing here? We are discussing here a problem where there is a neighbour to the north of Israel in which there is no Government. It may have a representative here, but it

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

does not govern. That same Government is today in the bunkers in Beirut. It may be sitting in the palace, but it is in the basement. It is in the basement for the same reason that it had to go to Damascus to sign its own agreement. What kind of independent Government has to go outside its own border, not to conduct an international agreement, but to conduct a national internal reconciliation. That says as much about the true state of affairs of Lebanon as the television reports that, if we are very brief, members of the Council will be able to see tonight about the fire-fights in Beirut itself.

This has effectively been the situation in Lebanon over the last decade. In fact, it is the same situation that allowed Lebanon to be used as a base by the PLO for attacks against Israel. This is what prompted our action in 1982, and this is exactly the situation in which Lebanon finds itself today, without any ability to control, I am afraid to say, even an inch of its territory.

Now what is the proper mode of operation for a country that is assaulted by a neighbouring State. If that State has a Government, which I submit to you Lebanon does not have in practice, then one deals with that Government. One tells it that this will not be tolerated and that the necessary action will be taken. By the way, I hear here an extraordinary notion that such action is supposed to be limited to a kind of antiseptic stand on one side of the border. This is obviously not only contrary to the common experience of all nations which have been aggressed against, but against common sense and the precepts of international law.

Of course, Israel has to take action to defend itself. But we would much prefer to deal with a Government in Lebanon. In the absence of that Government, we have a situation which is not parallel to what we have in Syria. In the case of Syria, we do not have a country. I mean no disrespect to the representative of Syria, but his country is by no means friendly to Israel, as the Council heard today. And yet we do not have cross-border violence there. We have a Government

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

of Syria and a Government of Israel. They have agreed to interpose a buffer force, a trip wire, to ensure the tranquillity of that border. The function of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) is not to ensure the protection of that border. I was just there. I visited UNDOF. It has no power whatsoever to do that. Its function is simply to sign on the field, so to speak, an accord reached by the two Governments.

Not that we would have the inclinations of Syria vis-à-vis Israel enshrined in Lebanon - as Syria is attempting - but I wish we had a Government, any Government, able to control its territory in Lebanon, because we would be able to reach a real agreement with it one way or the other. That is not based on inclinations, it is based on the realities of life, and the realities of the balance of forces on either side.

The tragedy of Lebanon internally is not our concern. It is a tragedy. We do not care how Lebanon resolves it. We do not even care if Lebanon is subordinated to Syria, as it appears to be. What we care about is that no one there is able to control that cross-border violence that is launched at us and has been launched against us for over a decade. That is our concern. That is the motivation of our action and that is why, regrettably, the solutions that have been offered here - I am talking about those solutions that have been raised in this Chamber, not necessarily today, in good faith - will not apply in Lebanon unless and until there emerges a truly independent Government in Lebanon, free from the domination of Syria.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): There are no further speakers.

The Security Council will hold its next meeting at 11 a.m. on 14 January to continue its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.