



Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2783
18 January 1988

UN LIBRARY

ENGLISH

20 1988
UN/SA COLLECTION

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
SEVEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 18 January 1988, at 11.30 a.m.

President: Sir Crispin TICKELL

(United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland)

Members: Algeria
Argentina
Brazil
China
France
Germany, Federal Republic of
Italy
Japan
Nepal
Senegal
Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics
United States of America
Yugoslavia
Zambia

Mr. DJOUDI
Mr. DELPECH
Mr. NOGUEIRA-BATISTA
Mr. YU Meng Jia
Mr. BROCHAND
Mr. VERGAU
Mr. BUCCI
Mr. TANIGUCHI
Mr. JOSSE
Mr. SARRE

Mr. BELONOGOV
Mr. WALTERS
Mr. PEJIC
Mr. MFULA

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 11.40 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

LETTER DATED 7 JANUARY 1988 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF LEBANON TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/19415)

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the 2782nd meeting, I invite the representative of Lebanon to take a seat at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Israel, Jordan and the Syrian Arab Republic to take the seats 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. Salah (Jordan) and Mr. Al-Masri (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Kuwait, Morocco 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. Abulhasan (Kuwait), Mr. Bennouna Louridi (Morocco) and Mr. Shihabi (Saudi Arabia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should also like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 15 January 1988 from the Permanent Representative of Algeria to the United Nations, which reads as follows:

(The President)

"I have the honour to request that the Security Council extend an invitation to Mr. Zehdi Labib Terzi, Permanent Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations, in accordance with the Council's past practice, in connection with the Council's consideration of the item 'The situation in the Middle East'."

That letter has been circulated as document S/19433.

The proposal by Algeria is not made pursuant to rule 37 or rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, but if approved by the Council the invitation to participate in the debate would confer on the Palestine Liberation Organization the same rights of participation as those conferred on Member States when invited to participate pursuant to rule 37.

Does any member of the Council wish to speak on this proposal?

Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): Once again I must restate the position of the United States on this matter. The United States has consistently taken the position that under the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council the only legal basis on which the Council may grant a hearing to persons speaking on behalf of non-governmental entities is rule 39. For four decades the United States has supported a generous interpretation of rule 39 and would certainly not object had this matter been raised under that rule. We are, however, opposed to ad hoc special departures from orderly procedure.

The United States consequently opposes extending to the Palestine Liberation Organization the same rights to participate in the proceedings of the Security Council as if that Organization represented a Member State of the United Nations. We certainly believe in listening to all points of view, but not if that requires violating the rules. In particular, the United States does not agree with the recent practice of the Security Council which appears selectively to try to enhance

(Mr. Walters, United States)

the prestige of those who wish to speak in the Council through a departure from the rules of procedure. We consider this special practice to be without legal foundation and to constitute an abuse of the rules.

For those reasons, the United States requests that the terms of the proposed invitation be put to the vote. Of course, the United States will vote against the proposal.

The PRESIDENT: If no other member of the Council wishes to speak, I shall take it that the Council is ready to vote on the proposal by Algeria.

It is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, China, Japan, Nepal, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: France, Germany, Federal Republic of of, Italy, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows: 10 in favour, 1 against and 4 abstentions. The proposal has been adopted.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda. The first speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): Allow me at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, upon your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I should also like to take this opportunity to express to His Excellency Ambassador Belonogov, Permanent

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations, whose country is closely linked to mine by relations of friendship and co-operation, my delegation's and my own personal appreciation for the able manner in which he presided over the Council's deliberations last month.

I should also like to congratulate the new members of the Security Council. I wish them all success in their mission. I would also thank those members whose terms of office have expired for the valuable contribution they made to the success of the Council's deliberations.

In a period of less than 20 days the Security Council has met on three occasions to consider the serious, deteriorating situation in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories resulting from the continuing occupation by the invading Zionist forces and from the barbaric oppressive practices of the Israeli occupation forces against defenceless civilians, including indiscriminate firing upon those people and premeditated killings, especially of women, children and youths.

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

The Security Council has adopted important resolutions in this context, condemning Israel for its policies and practices, which are violations of the human rights of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories, and in particular for the firing by its occupation forces on demonstrators. The Security Council has called on Israel to cease deporting Palestinian civilians from the occupied territories and to ensure the safe and immediate return to the occupied Palestinian territories of those who have been deported. Further, it has called on Israel, as the occupying Power, to abide by the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention on the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War.

Prior to those meetings, the Security Council had met to consider the equally serious deteriorating situation in southern Africa due to the continuing acts of aggression perpetrated by the racist South African régime against the People's Republic of Angola, which had resulted in dreadful loss of human life and destruction of property. The Security Council expressed grave concern regarding the persistence of the racist South African régime in its acts of violation of the sovereignty of the Republic of Angola, its airspace and its territorial integrity. The Council condemned that régime for its continuing occupation of parts of that country, as well as its continuing acts of aggression, which violate Angola's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The Security Council is now meeting at the request of Lebanon. Once again it is considering the serious deteriorating situation in southern Lebanon due to the continuing acts of aggression and barbaric oppression of the Israeli occupation forces against the people of Lebanon and against Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity and the continuing occupation by the Tel Aviv racist régime of parts of Lebanon.

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

It is no coincidence that the Security Council has met to consider the tense and grave situations in southern Africa and in the Palestinian and other occupied Arab territories and southern Lebanon in a period of less than two months. It is no coincidence that it continues to consider the continuing acts of aggression of the racist Pretoria and Tel Aviv régimes and their fascist practices. It is no coincidence that it has adopted resolutions condemning both of them.

This simultaneous perpetration of acts and the concomitant policies of two outlaw fascist régimes that do not heed the rules of morality and civilized behaviour result from a common terrorist origin and a common fascist structure, as well as the total co-ordination of their acts and practices.

At the last meeting of the Security Council we heard an important statement by the Ambassador of Lebanon in which he described the tragic situation in southern Lebanon under Israeli occupation. He spoke of the continuing acts of aggression being perpetrated by the Israeli occupation forces on a daily basis against the people of Lebanon, against Lebanese sovereignty and territorial integrity. If those acts indicate anything, it is an extremist brand of fascism aimed at, among other things, creating a climate of fear and terror in order ultimately to force the Lebanese to leave their land and property. The expansionist, terrorist tendencies of Israel are no longer a secret. Its ultimate aim is to take over Lebanese territory and definitively remove it from Lebanese sovereignty.

Let us recall the resolutions adopted by different World Zionist Congresses from the beginning. Let us recall the maps they issued of what they called Israel, which very clearly reveal the real ambitions of Zionism as regards southern Lebanon and its resources. All else is false, especially its claims regarding the so-called creation of a "security zone" in Lebanese territory, which is merely the practical application and implementation of those ambitions.

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

The theory of Israeli security, which has been the source of all the acts of violence, aggression and terrorism that have been and continue to be perpetrated by Israel in the region - the theory which led to the creation of the so-called security zone inside Lebanese territory - is but a synonym for Israeli expansionist policies. It is the modern expression of the "lebensraum" theory used by Nazism to justify its expansion into the territory of other States and its occupation of those States.

Everybody knows that the tragic situation in southern Lebanon has come about because of Israel's insistence on what it calls the "security zone" inside Lebanese territory; because of Israel's rejection of Security Council resolutions calling for full and unconditional withdrawal from all Lebanese territories; and because Israel is arming mercenary elements it then uses as instruments for terror and other acts of violence against Lebanese citizens. It is, further, due to the acts of oppression and terrorism of the Israeli occupation forces, as well as Israel's refusal to let United Nations forces be deployed in the area and its hindering of their operations.

The Israeli occupation forces have turned the towns and villages of southern Lebanon into detention camps by besieging them and preventing people from entering or leaving them. Those occupation forces have turned life in those towns and villages into a hell in which Israeli occupation forces perpetrate daily acts of oppression, killing and destruction from air, land and sea.

The Security Council bears a grave responsibility to put an end to this tragic situation. One of its main duties as the highest body responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security is to take effective measures to force Israel to withdraw immediately and completely from all Lebanese territories and to refrain from any acts of aggression against Lebanon, its sovereignty and territorial integrity and its people.

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

The effectiveness and credibility of the Security Council depend essentially on its ability to carry out its mission: the maintenance of international peace and security. That ability is tested every time that the Security Council is called upon to take measures to put an end to Israeli violations. In our view, though, the Council's responsibility does not end with the adoption of a resolution, however important that may be. The Council must ensure its full and complete implementation, as well as ensuring respect for Lebanon's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

The national resistance in Lebanon, together with the brave uprisings in Gaza and the West Bank, as well as the Syrian Arab Golan, will not stop until the land and the shrines are liberated from Israeli occupation, its effects and its collaborators. The international community must stand firmly behind that brave resistance.

The barbaric Israeli aggression against Lebanon, the death of dozens of martyrs, not to mention the wounded, calls once again for effective Security Council measures, including implementation of the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter, against Israel to force it to put an end to its acts of aggression and to withdraw completely and immediately from southern Lebanon and all other occupied Arab territories.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic for his kind words about me.

The next speaker is Mr. Mansouri, Acting Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States, to whom the Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure at its 2782nd meeting. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MANSOURI (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to take this opportunity to extend to you, Sir, and, through you, to the members of the Security Council, the thanks of the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States for allowing us to participate in the Council's debate on the continued acts of aggression and arbitrary practices perpetrated by the Israeli occupation authorities in Lebanon.

It is also a pleasure, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council, which is entrusted with the all-important responsibility of maintaining international peace and security. We are confident that your diplomatic expertise and your belief in the need for enhancing the rules of international law will guarantee the objective conduct of these deliberations and lead to the adoption of resolutions to guarantee the security and territorial integrity of the Lebanese Republic.

I should also like to pay tribute to the wise leadership provided, last month, by the Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union to the work of the Council, which was crowned with success.

The Council meets for the fourth time in less than a month to discuss the continued acts of aggression perpetrated by the Israeli authorities in Lebanon, the West Bank, Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip. It has been convened to discuss Israel's continued violations of Lebanon's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. Indeed, whether directly or through its agents in the "security zone" it established in southern Lebanon, Israel is still imposing its authority.

Israel has usurped part of Lebanese territory and defied Security Council resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978), 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) - to mention but a few - which call on Israel to withdraw from all Lebanese territories. The last

(Mr. Mansouri)

link in the chain of such acts of aggression was perpetrated by the Israeli air force on 2 January 1988 against a number of peaceful civilian cities and villages and led to the death of 26 people and scores of injured. Most of the victims were children and other defenseless Lebanese and Palestinian civilians.

Last year the Lebanese Government drew the Council's attention to Israel's continued acts of aggression by air, land and sea against Lebanese territories. In his statement before the Council, and in the many letters he addressed to the Council which were distributed as official documents - 15 in 1987 - the Permanent Representative of Lebanon had detailed Israel's acts of aggression, violations and the resultant human and material losses.

Despite the Council's discussion of the details of these acts of aggression and the Council's repeated denunciation of them, Israel continues to ignore the Council and to defy its resolutions. Besides persisting in its acts of aggression, and in its defiance of the rules of international law, the most recent example of such defiance being the deportation of four Palestinian civilians by helicopter that violated Lebanese air space. They were left in Lebanese territory, despite Lebanon's official refusal to receive them, and despite Security Council resolution 607 (1988), which called upon Israel not to deport any Palestinian civilians.

The Secretary-General's report to the Council (S/19318) contains information that confirms that Israel has paved many roads within Lebanese territory and placed fences around them, thus preventing Lebanese civilians from entering their farmlands, the source of their livelihood. The report also mentions the many acts of aggression that have been aimed at annexing Lebanese territories and realigning borders as Israeli interests dictate. Israel's continued occupation of parts of southern Lebanon and its establishment of the so-called security zone is in clear

(Mr. Mansouri)

contravention of the principles of international law and Security Council decisions - in particular, resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) and subsequent resolutions, which call for Israel's complete and unconditional withdrawal from Lebanese territory.

Regarding this continued defiance, the General Secretariat of the League of Arab States believes that the time has come for the Security Council to shoulder its responsibilities fully and effectively for the maintenance of peace in the Middle East.

(Mr. Mansouri)

The Council must seriously search for ways and means to compel Israel to yield to the international community's will, to respect the resolutions of the Council and heed the principles of international law and to facilitate the deployment of the United Nations forces to Lebanon's international borders, thus making it possible for the Lebanese Government to extend its sovereignty throughout Lebanon territory.

In conclusion, we must say that what is taking place in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories is the result of the continued Israeli occupation of those territories. If the international community, and the members of the Security Council in particular, truly wish to establish peace and security in the Middle East, what must be achieved is first and foremost the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories and granting the Palestinian people its right to self-determination, in keeping with the resolutions of the United Nations on the subject.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Mr. Mansouri for his kind words about 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): Sir, it gives me pleasure to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. Your personal qualities and extensive experience and my knowledge of your competence and objectivity give me full confidence that the Council will under your presidency discharge its responsibilities in the manner we expect.

I should like to thank with appreciation your predecessor in the presidency of the council for the month of December, Ambassador Belonogov, Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, for the competence and skill with which he directed the proceedings of the Council during the past month.

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

The subject and the question under our consideration today is the Israeli aggression against Lebanon, an independent and fully sovereign State. Lebanon, a State recognized by all the world and by all the respectable States of the world, is the victim of aggression by Israel, which is not recognized by more than half of the States of the world. This is the subject of the complaint. The Permanent Representative of Lebanon has eloquently detailed the crimes and acts of aggression committed by the Israeli authorities, which threaten peace and security, challenge the international Organization and are breaches of its Charter. I shall not repeat those details.

As for the question: Does this terrorist establishment today have a peculiar status above the laws, conventions, norms, principles, ethics, obligations and rights in the field of violations of laws, crimes, terrorism and aggression that allows it to invade the countries of other peoples, to launch military attacks against States, with its army, navy, air force and tanks? It alters the boundaries of neighbouring States' frontiers and steals their waters; it attacks the Palestinians on the soil of Palestine, Lebanon and even in Tunisia, and the Lebanese in the heart of their land while remaining immune from punishment.

No matter what the Zionist spokesman says, all members know the facts: they have waged war against women and children using tanks and guns on the soil of Palestine and Lebanon. But we ask the international community - especially those who shed tears for humanitarian standards, civilized traditions and international obligations for the sake of those people, for that country or the other State - where are the Palestinian people's rights? Where are the Lebanese people's rights?

Israel, insignificant on its own, impotent by its own potential, and no doubt a failure in the end, is committing all those crimes for the eradication of which the international community declared it fought the Nazis and Fascists, and for

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

which it is now boycotting South Africa. All those régimes had their spokesmen attempting to justify their crimes, as the Zionists are doing today, all of which are being committed in front of the international community in Palestine and Lebanon. Where do you stand, distinguished members, in relation to that?

The despicable justification of Israel when it murders people and says that it is carrying out its responsibility in maintaining security for those same people is but a pretext by any invader oppressing the people by oppression and terrorism. The situation in Palestine is not a normal one in which security is being breached by a group of outlaws as commonly happens in any established, harmonious and balanced society built upon well-known measures in national and international societies. It is a terrorist network which occupied the land of a well-established people, depriving them of their means of livelihood and minimal human rights, spoiling their life, wishing to subjugate it by oppression and terror to submit it to its settler colonialism or to flee its country. The people are only resisting aggression in order to survive in their own country. Israeli invasion and settler colonialism in itself defies the norms of the twentieth century. So how can Israel claim that it is practicing normal rights to maintain the peace in occupied Palestine, on the borders of Palestine or in Lebanon? They have themselves violated the security of the Palestinian people to start with. They should be subjected to a disciplining exercise to teach them how to abide by the law and to respect the security and rights of human beings.

What has happened and is taking place today on Lebanese soil is a continuous oppression. I cannot see how the Council can delay adopting a forceful resolution in this matter. We look forward to the day when the Council, having around its table representatives of such high moral, legal and political standing and

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

responsibility, will be able to take forceful measures in accordance with the Charter - rather, demanded by the Charter obligation.

The failed attempt of Israel in trying to undermine the Lebanese social structure as a prelude to dismembering the Lebanese State is an odious crime for which the Israeli authorities bear full responsibility with all its consequences, and for which they will answer one day. Their spokesman will say that Lebanon has its internal problems. We say that each society has its problems but the Israeli invasion poses more danger than all the problems of any social circumstances.

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

I said in a speech on 2 November during the General Assembly that the Israeli authorities would see what a new Palestinian generation subjected to oppression and deprived of security could do. The Zionists will realize that all the plots they have woven in the chanceries and lobbies of world capitals will not stand in the way of Palestinians returning to Palestine. It will be of no benefit to Israel to be supported in its stand by some States which deny, negate or pretend to ignore the reality of the implications of the Palestinian cause. We see today the uprising of a new generation in its early stages. The future will be gloomier.

What goes for the Palestinian people goes also for the Lebanese people, which, God willing, has the right to absolute sovereignty over its land and to be master of its own destiny. If the Zionist authorities persist in their aggression, the day is not far off when they will beg for the peace and security the Arabs have offered; but will not be able to attain it.

The Lebanese people, whose reaction the Zionist army experienced retreating from Lebanon under the Lebanese martyrs' blows to take cover behind what it thinks to be protective frontiers, will no doubt avenge this aggression. However, this does not excuse us here when the Security Council, according to the Charter, is committed to establishing its position and to taking measures against whomsoever violates regional and international security, and it does not excuse us from taking a position that conforms with our responsibilities.

The Zionist aggression against Lebanon today is accompanied, inside Palestine itself, by a hysterical Zionist-Israeli bloodbath involving women and children. Hence what we are reviewing here is a broad picture of a criminal of increasing dimensions. Israel, its backers and those who keep silent about it will continue to be surprised, as they have been surprised by the present uprising and by what a people determined to survive can do.

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

Let no one have any illusion: the Palestine people is determined to recover its liberty on its national soil, the land of its ancestors. Suffice it to ask the Ian Smith régime in Rhodesia; suffice it to recall the imperialist generals in Algeria who revolted against their own Government in Paris to set up a settler province and what became of them at the hands of the heroes of the Algerian revolution; just let one wait see what happens to the Pretoria régime in South Africa tomorrow. History repeats itself. As we know, South Africa today supplies its ally, the Zionist authorities, with the latest techniques achieved by its specialists in fighting popular resistance and in committing acts of aggression against its neighbours. It is, as the saying goes, a case of "the blind leading the sightless".

One day not far off the Israeli citizen will realize that the Zionist machine has deceived him with glorious promises and rosy expectations and played on his religious sentiments by creating in his mind an unrealistic picture of a country in which he cannot live but by force of arms, for the Arab nation against which it is committing aggression. thereby earning its enmity, is surpassing it in numbers and in attachment to the soil which he owns. The accounting to which the Jewish people will then call the Zionist terrorist machine will be the other aspect of this tragedy.

Is this a situation that can go on? Can Zionism continue to fight the Palestinian people and the Lebanese people with every means of aggression and oppression in its possession that society, law, custom and membership of international organizations forbid? Until when can the international community overlook Israel's commission of all these crimes and keep the world conscience paralysed?

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

A final word. We are here testing our credibility in dealing with this complaint - our credibility when we define international crimes and terrorism in all its aspects, our credibility when we define the rights of peoples, our credibility when we define human rights and our self-respect when we require others to respect these values. A firm stand here will in the long run be in the interest of every one of us and what we stand for in the field of values, rights and obligations.

Lebanon will endure and its people will remain masters of their soil in spite of all sacrifices. The Palestinians will inevitably regain their rights, whatever the price. We in Saudi Arabia stand fully behind all those steadfastly resisting aggression in Lebanon and with the people of Palestine struggling in their land. They shall be victorious in the end. We salute their heroism, support their struggle and call upon this Council to take a firm stand in a resolution that conforms to its responsibilities, as well as call upon all States in the world to fulfil their obligations towards them.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Saudi Arabia for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. JOSSE (Nepal): On behalf of Ambassador Rana and my delegation, allow me, Sir, at the very outset to congratulate you most warmly on your assumption of the high office of President of the Security Council for the opening month of 1988. Aware as we are of your diplomatic skills and many personal attributes, we are convinced that you will continue to guide the work of the Council with the great competence and efficiency we have already witnessed over the past two eventful weeks.

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

I take this opportunity to express our sincere gratitude to you for your kind words of welcome expressed at an earlier meeting of the Council and also to recall that our two countries are bound by close traditional ties of friendship and understanding. As I am speaking here for the first time since Nepal's recent accession to membership of the Council, I wish to assure you, Sir, that during its two-year tenure of membership Nepal will always co-operate in any endeavour aimed at the enhancement of the prestige and effectiveness of the United Nations - and of the Security Council - in the maintenance of international peace and security.

(Mr. Josse, Nepal)

May I also take a moment to express my delegation's deep appreciation to His Excellency Ambassador Aleksandr M. Belonogov of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the exemplary manner in which he led the Council in the busy closing month of 1987.

Coming now to the issue before us, we wish first of all to put on record Nepal's deep concern at the deteriorating situation in southern Lebanon resulting from repeated acts by Israeli military forces in Lebanese territory. This concern, we believe, is reflected in the draft resolution which is now before us and sponsored by Nepal and other non-aligned members.

As a troop-contributing country to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) for the past several years, we take this opportunity to recall, in particular, Security Council resolution 425 (1978) and strongly reaffirm the need for an immediate end to Israeli attacks and all actions affecting the safety of the civilian population in southern Lebanon. For the restoration of peace and security along the Israel-Lebanon border, Nepal calls for the immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory and scrupulous respect of the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries.

We have taken note of the report of the Secretary-General, contained in document S/19318 of 4 December 1987, on border encroachments by Israel in that part of southern Lebanon in which Israeli forces remain present. We avail ourselves of this opportunity to call for an end to any such acts that violate the border, attempt to occupy or change the status of Lebanese territory or impede the return of the effective authority of the Government of Lebanon over sovereign Lebanese territory.

(Mr. Josse, Nepal)

In this context, Nepal therefore urges all parties to co-operate fully with the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, which continues to have a valuable peace-keeping role to play within its area of operation.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Nepal for the kind things he said about 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 say at the outset that I owe a debt of gratitude to the Permanent Representative of Lebanon and, indeed, to the other representatives who have spoken in this debate for highlighting the point we tried to make in earlier discussions, namely, that the Security Council is not only being abused; it is being abused by these repeated convenings to the point of irrelevance.

Of course, these proceedings have their comic relief; we have just heard some of them. For example, the Saudi Arabian representative's solemn invocation of "human rights", when he talks about the "norms of the twentieth century" and wails against dismemberment. I assume he is going to talk about changing the legal code in Saudi Arabia. When he talks about apartheid and Israel in one breath, I assume he is going to refer to United Nations reports of this year that accuse his country - not mine - of literally fuelling South Africa with a flow of oil.

There are, of course, such entertaining diversions as the Syrian representative's talk about "terrorism" and "Nazism", when his own régime - about which I asked him last time - continues to hold as its guest the most notorious wanted Nazi criminal, Alois Brunner.

Having said that, I thought the most interesting thing here is that the focus of these discussions - aside from the attempts to bring in other, extraneous, issues - is the question of Lebanon's sovereignty. We are talking about its

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

territorial integrity, the withdrawal of foreign forces from Lebanon, and the sanctity of Lebanese sovereignty. This debate - or what passes for a debate - is focusing these concerns on my country, and solely on my country.

Well, let me say a word about my country and the matter of Lebanese sovereignty; let me say a word about that first. On 17 May 1983 Israel and Lebanon signed an agreement which called for the mutual respect of each other's sovereignty; security arrangements along our borders, which were to be inviolable; and the complete withdrawal of Israeli forces, to which we agreed. That is perfectly in line with our ongoing policy vis-à-vis Lebanon which basically has three components: first, the complete lack of any territorial claim by Israel against any Lebanese territory; secondly, Israel's desire to see Lebanese sovereignty restored by a strong central Government in Lebanon over all of Lebanon; and, thirdly, security arrangements until such a Government emerges and is able to take possession, control and responsibility of that territory.

We signed that agreement. We were prepared to go ahead with it. Who abrogated that agreement? Did we abrogate that agreement? No, we did not; it was Lebanon. Why did Lebanon abrogate that agreement? Because, perhaps, of gentle moral suasion from its neighbours? No. Because its largest neighbour, Syria, lobbed artillery shells into Lebanon's capital and nearly killed the President of Lebanon in what was left of the presidential palace. And, with that kind of "gentle suasion", Lebanon was raped into abrogating that agreement.

Why did Syria violate that agreement? There are two important issues here. It violated it not only because that was a demonstration - perhaps the first demonstration in years - of an act of true independence by Lebanon, a true assertion of its desire to have some control over its destiny and its borders. It was not only that; that was the first.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

There was a second reason. That agreement, more than anything else, highlights what Syria is unprepared to do. Was Syria willing, is it willing today, to sign an agreement that respects Lebanon's sovereignty, that calls for the withdrawal of all foreign forces - today there are about 30,000 Syrian troops there - and the inviolability of borders? Syria is not willing to do that. In fact, it is not willing to recognize Lebanon. It is not willing to send an Ambassador to Lebanon. It is not willing to recognize the Lebanese-Syrian boundary. It is not willing to withdraw its forces from Lebanon. It occupies about 60 per cent of the country.

Syria's answer to that is: "We are guests. We have been invited." To paraphrase a well-known statement: with such guests, who needs enemies?

For that matter, would Syria accept an invitation to leave? There was such an invitation, issued as boldly as the President of Lebanon, Mr. Gemayel, can do so, given the fact that his brother was murdered by the Syrians. He said the following at the forty-second session of the United Nations General Assembly:

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

"Syria's military presence in Lebanon since 1976 -"

that is an important date: not since 1982, when we went into Lebanon, but since 1976 -

"has extended to over 60 per cent of our territory. This has given Syria overwhelming influence in Lebanon which has not served the better interests of either country". (A/42/PV.10, p. 17)

That was diplomatically stated, but all members, knowing the realities of Lebanon, know that that was a forceful statement from Lebanon's leader to Syria to get out. Did they get out? They have not gotten out; they have brought more troops in. They go into the capital; they go into other parts of Lebanon.

What about Lebanon's sovereignty? That is why the Council is convened. If the Council is going to discuss that, we must immediately point out that it is not only Syria that is violating Lebanon's sovereignty, because there are two others. I do not mean that they are violating it just in practice; I mean that it is part of their stated ideology, because the second factor is Iran.

Iran, in 1981, introduced into Lebanon roughly 1,000 Revolutionary Guards, Iranians imported from Tehran. Since then it has built a cadre of Hezbollah and associated people, about 3,000 of them, who receive money and instructions through the Iranian ambassadors in both Syria and Beirut. They have one function - aside from terrorizing Lebanon, planting car-bombs galore, turning the place into a living hell for the Lebanese. And that function is publicly stated both by Hezbollah and by Iran: it is to turn Lebanon into nothing short of a full-fledged Islamic republic, a second Islamic republic, an extension of Iranian sovereignty, as one may define that term. What about Lebanon's sovereignty in that case?

That is only the second affront to that "sacred sovereignty", as someone called it here. There is a third force, and that force is, of course, the PLO.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

Before I get to that I would be remiss if I did not quote Mr. Gemayel on my previous point as well, because he spoke about the Iranians as well during the forty-second session of the General Assembly. He said,

"All Iranians who are in Lebanon by virtue of Iran's self-bestowed military-ideological commitment and without the permission of the Lebanese Government should leave as soon as possible". (A/42/PV.10, p. 18-20)

That again was a pretty remarkable statement.

I mentioned the PLO. The PLO, as members know, occupied a good chunk of Lebanon, from West Beirut down to Tyre, for a full decade, from 1972 to 1982, and it installed there a reign of pillage and terror. In fact, it built an empire of terror. Now it is seeking to re-establish its terror garrisons in Lebanon.

Mr. Gemayel had something to say about that too. He said,

"In years past my country was proud to be a haven for peace ... Now it has become a haven for terror ...". (p. 21)

"Lebanon will not tolerate on its territory an armed group of any kind." (p. 18-20)

His use of the word "groups" was interesting.

What about Lebanon's sovereignty when it comes to Syria, to the PLO, to Iran, all three of which not only act but declare that they act in order completely to usurp Lebanon's territory and sovereignty for their own twisted visions of empire? They each want to - and they each do - devour a chunk of Lebanon's flesh. Like wild beasts converging on their kill, they fight one another; they are crowding one another; they jostle; they even attack one another. And they kill one another on occasion.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

But one thing they have in common, both in rhetoric and in action, and that is that, regardless of their differences over the division of the spoils, they will join in one mission: to use Lebanon's territory as a base for terrorist attacks against Israel.

If we were going to inject some context - a word I used at previous meetings of the Council this month - into these deliberations, then I would read out the whole list I have here of attacks against my country emanating from the South of Lebanon, from 16 September 1987 to 1 January this year. In that period we had 17 separate armed attacks against Israel from Lebanon, from the PLO, from the Iranian-controlled Hezbollah, and from Syrian-backed groups, attacks they "claim credit" for, to use their phrase, or take responsibility for. In fact, over this past weekend we had 122mm Katyushas fired from Lebanon into northern Israel.

If we want to demonstrate what we are really talking about, let us focus on one incident, because somebody here - I believe it was the representative of the Arab League - spoke about the "sanctity of Lebanon's airspace"; I think those were the words he used. Well, the "sanctity of Lebanon's airspace" implies that gliders with armed men can be sent out of Lebanese territory into Israeli territory - as indeed the Jibril general command group, the PFLP, did. That was on 25 November. The interesting thing about it was that, as I mentioned, there is some collusion among these predators; indeed, Mustafa Tlass, the Defence Minister of Syria, made a speech two weeks after that attack, which was a clear act of aggression: it was not aimed at the security zone; it was aimed at Israel proper. In that speech before the air force academy in Syria, Mr. Tlass said that the attack was carried out not only with Syria's full knowledge, but with its "full assistance".

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

What we have here, then, is not only a complete disavowal of Lebanon's sovereignty, but a complete disavowal in order to use it for armed attacks against a neighbouring State.

What would any Government do as a State neighbouring Lebanon, subject to those attacks? What any Government would do is take ongoing measures for self-defence, and we are doing precisely that. Those measures are restrained, they are temporary, but they are necessary. They are necessary because the terrorist headquarters, from any one of the three sources I mentioned, continue to hatch their murderous plots, continue to send their murderous killers, continue to try to take a toll of lives of Israelis across the border.

I heard some words here about "encroachments". If this debate runs on, perhaps I shall have time to take the map prepared by the Secretary-General. That map shows thin strips of provisional Israeli fences along the Israeli-Lebanese border, whose sole purpose is to protect us against these attacks; I should like to show the other encroachments - the gobs of Lebanese territory not included on the map - you would need an awfully large map to show the Bekaa valley and Beirut - the other encroachments on Lebanese territory which, of course, do not enter into things here.

The question I really have to address is: Who should be complaining here? Should it be Lebanon that is complaining, or should it be Israel that is complaining? It should be Israel, and it would be Israel, except for two things. The first thing is, to whom am I going to address these complaints?

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

Mr. Fakhoury, if I believed that anyone in your Government could seriously take responsibility for what is happening in your country and, furthermore, could even begin to redress the legitimate complaints that we have, then I would address these complaints to you first.

And to whom should we address it on the second order, Mr. President? To the Council? By adopting these draft resolutions, by having these meetings, this meeting today and other meetings, the Council is adopting a principle that I mentioned last time: condone all Arab attacks against Israel; condemn any Israeli countermeasure. So this Council is not the place for a serious discussion of the problems in south Lebanon and in Lebanon in general.

Now, in the absence of a Lebanese Government capable of assuming its responsibilities, we have no option but to take the measures necessary for our security. However, the interesting thing is the effects that that has on the condition in the south. I have heard here a lot of discussions about the terrible plight of the people in the south. I will not tell you that their life is paradise, but I would submit to you that, compared to what is happening elsewhere in Lebanon, it is a lot better, because what we see is the Lebanese people voting with their feet. They have no other way to vote. What we see is that the population in the south is steadily swelling.

Let me give two examples. There is a village called Nabatiyah - indeed, it is not a village, but a town, the largest town in the south of Lebanon. Before our action in 1982 there were 5,000 people there, mostly PLO using it as a major base for attacks against us. Today, it has 80,000. There is another village called Kunin, with the same story - not the same numbers, but the same proportions. There are many other examples. Why? Because we have a good-fence policy, because we assist in the agriculture in the south, because we allow favourable medical conditions, because there is an economy in the south that works, because there is

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

relative tranquillity, because of what is happening in the rest of Lebanon. And what is happening in the rest of Lebanon is best described, not by me, but by the Arab press reports culled last month from the Federal Broadcasting Service (FBIS) that monitors Arab broadcasts.

It would take about two hours, but I could read here everything that is going on in the rest of the Middle East. However, I think we are trying to make lunch, and I shall therefore confine myself to reading out what is going on in Lebanon - in the rest of Lebanon. On 1 December, this is what happened: Syrian intelligence agents kidnapped two Lebanese security officials in Beirut. On that same day a car bomb explodes in Bsharri - no injuries reported, happily. On 6 December there were 18 Palestinians wounded in Shatila camp in Lebanon in internecine clashes - that is the same Shatila that is invoked for other purposes. On that same day gunmen kill a Syrian soldier in West Beirut. On 11 December, "Lebanese Liberation Battalion kills one Syrian soldier in northern Lebanon". On 12 December that same organization attacked a Syrian check-point near Tripoli.

On 14 December, "Syrian forces attack residential areas in Lebanon", and 300 people are arrested. On that same day, "Clash between Nasirite Popular Organization and Lebanese Army". On 16 December a bomb blows up a military vehicle in Beirut; also on 16 December "Lebanese Liberation Organization claims to have killed Syrian intelligence agent". On 17 December, the "Ninth of February Organization" - they change their names very rapidly - "attacks Syrian soldiers in Lebanon; several killed."

On 19 December, "Lebanese Liberation kills Syrian soldier"; on 19 December "one killed in Lebanese clashes on Al-Tayyunah and Dar al-Kitab combat lines"; on 19 December "three Abu Nidal group leaders executed". On 20 December there are clashes between Phalangist and Lebanese forces in Beirut, one dead; on 20 December

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

"ten Syrian soldiers injured in Beirut explosion"; on 21 December "Amal personnel and Palestinians clash in Shatila; on 22 December "two Amal security personnel killed by Hezbollah"; on 22 December "Ninth of February Organization kills Syrian soldier in Tripoli."

On 23 December, "Two Syrian soldiers shot dead in West Beirut"; on 23 December, "Amal and Palestinians clash in Shatila"; on 24 December, "Two Syrians killed in West Beirut." And there is more.

If we want to speak about truth, this is the true picture of Lebanon. It is a country occupied by a foreign army - Syria; its capital is torn asunder; its Government is paralysed and unable to function; rival gangs control all parts of the country and war with each other and its territory is being used as a base of aggression against a neighbouring State. And here we are, convened solemnly to discuss, with a straight face, the situation along the southern border of Lebanon. It reminds me of a sick man, 60 per cent of whose body is covered by cancer, whose heart is rotting away with terrible heart disease, whose internal organs are pitted against each other, the spleen fighting the liver and the liver fighting the spleen, and that patient comes to a doctor to complain of a swollen toe, whereupon doctor and patient hover over the toe and talk about how one may perhaps cure the rest of the ills by treating the toe.

Some diagnosis! Some treatment!

The PRESIDENT: I should like, if I may, to say a brief word to members of the Council. We are discussing a subject which arouses very strong feelings. Hard words are said. I think it most important that we should not feel it necessary to reply immediately to every statement that may be made, but to try to preserve the dignity of our proceedings by looking calmly at the arguments which are deployed and giving everyone a chance to say his piece,

(The President)

For that reason I suggest that we now, before lunch, hear the next speaker on the list, the representative of Algeria, and then resume in the afternoon at a time I shall announce, and that thereafter those who wish to make statements of reply will have every opportunity to do so when our debate comes to an end. I think that that is the fairest way of proceeding, and I think that it is also the one most likely to preserve the dignity of the Council, which is, as your President, my prime concern.

Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) (interpretation from French): I should like at the outset to convey to you, Sir, the congratulations of the Algerian delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. Your long experience and your human and professional qualities, which we have already had occasion to appreciate, are a guarantee that our work will be successful. To your predecessor in that post, Ambassador Belonogov, Permanent Representative of the USSR, I should like to express my delegation's whole-hearted appreciation for the praiseworthy manner in which he directed the Council's proceedings last month.

I should also like to express to the Permanent Representatives of the Congo, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates, Bulgaria and Venezuela the Algerian delegation's gratitude for their remarkable contributions to the work of the Council and the cause of peace in the world during their terms of office.

I should also like to express to you, Mr. President, the Algerian delegation's thanks for the words of welcome you yourself, along with other members of the Council, addressed to us.

The Algerian delegation is beginning its term as a member of the Security Council at a time when the United Nations is going through a particularly delicate stage and in which the Council is facing many challenges in Africa, in the Middle East, in the Gulf, in Central America and elsewhere in the world.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

The Council's task is an immense one that requires of it determination and consistency in its efforts to promote and implement peaceful, just and definitive solutions wherever international peace and security are imperilled. Algeria, which identifies itself with the goals and principles of the Non-Aligned Movement and accepts those of the Charter, and whose regional and international activities testify to its commitment and perseverance in contributing to the edifice of peace and the establishment of just and democratic relations among the nations of the world, will spare no effort here with you, Mr. President, and with other members of the Council, to enable the Council successfully to discharge its responsibilities and the mandate entrusted to it by the Charter.

On 15 January last, on a Friday - the day of prayer and meditation for Muslims - the Al-Aqsa Mosque, the third most holy place in Islam, was the target of an act of sacreligious profanation that aroused profound resentment among a billion Muslims as an intolerable affront to their most cherished values. That deliberate act of provocation carried out by the Zionist occupation forces also aroused indignation among all whose civilized values lead them to consider places of worship inviolable. It was no longer enough for the oppressor daily to infringe all international laws, including those designed for use in time of war; in addition it needed to produce irrefutable proof of its fundamentally intolerant nature in what has always and everywhere been considered a sanctuary. Thus there was committed in broad daylight an act of barbarism whose gravity cannot escape the attention of this body.

This is the fourth time within a month that the Security Council has had to meet urgently to examine the explosive situation in the Middle East. The Council has been meeting almost constantly over the last few weeks, and on three occasions it has had to take a firm stand against repressive measures of the occupying Power in occupied Arab territories. This reveals the gravity of the events in those

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

territories and the magnitude of the legitimate censure that the Israeli brutality and repression has aroused within the international community.

It is meeting today to examine the acts of aggression that the Israeli occupation forces continue to commit in Lebanon, which confirms the dangerous deterioration of the situation in the region and the need for urgent action by the Council to call a halt to the aggression and to enable Lebanon to regain its sovereignty over all its territory.

The new year had hardly begun when barbarism once again descended on Lebanon, sowing death and destruction among people who have for so many years been exposed to almost daily attacks by the aggressive Israeli troops. Twenty-six have died, including two entire families; they must be added to the long list of dead and wounded, the victims of the 23 air raids that took place last year, the last of which alone took a toll of more than 40 deaths in the refugee camp of Ein El Heloue.

Along with the air attacks, accompanied by naval and land bombardments, the Israeli occupation army has for years now been pursuing a policy of harassment against Lebanese villages within the occupied zone and outside it, stepping up arrests and searches and dynamiting houses.

Several times the same villages have been blockaded; recently that happened to the village of Yahmour, 4,000 of whose inhabitants were for several days deprived of medicine, food and other services.

The objective of those attacks and operations of harassment is quite clear: to break the heroic resistance of the Lebanese people against the occupier and thus perpetuate the Zionist presence in southern Lebanon.

The attempt to modify the frontier line undertaken by the Israeli forces of occupation in southern Lebanon since 1980, in particular through the construction of military facilities so accurately described by the Secretary-General in his report of 4 December (S/19318), stems from the same determination to perpetuate the

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

Israeli presence in southern Lebanon, indeed to annex part of it, in which regard the Secretary-General expresses concern in his report.

Invaded in 1982 by the Israeli army of aggression, which besieged its capital, and having seen part of its territory occupied and the abominable massacres of Lebanese and Palestinian civilians before its brave sons succeeded in repelling the attack, Lebanon today continues to suffer occupation of part of its territory and to be subjected to repeated acts of aggression. The deportation last week to southern Lebanon of four Palestinian citizens who were subjected to expulsion by the Zionist régime in flagrant violation of the norms of international law and Security Council resolution 607 (1988), when Lebanon itself had officially declared that it would refuse to receive them in its territory, constitutes a new violation of Lebanese sovereignty and stems from the Zionist leaders' scorn for and defiance of the rule of law and international institutions.

In the face of this situation, in which a country's sovereignty has been so often flouted, and in which the authority of the Council is so seriously challenged, the Council must act promptly and with determination, as is dictated by the gravity of these events. It must denounce the repeated attacks of Israel against Lebanon and its attempts to modify the frontier line and demand that an end be put to them. It must also reaffirm what its previous resolutions, particularly resolution 425 (1978), have already established as a paramount obligation: strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon within its international recognized boundaries and the immediate withdrawal of Israeli occupation forces from its whole territory.

That is the objective of the draft resolution now before the Council.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Algeria for his kind words about me.

In view of the hour I intend to adjourn the meeting now. The next meeting of the Council to continue the consideration of the item on the agenda will take place at 3.30 p.m.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.