



Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2642
17 January 1986

ENGLISH

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

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 17 January 1986, at 4 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. RAESTAPIKA
Mr. KASEMSRI
Mr. ALLEYNE
Mr. TROYANOVSKY
Mr. AL-SHERALI

Sir John THOMSON
Ms. BYRNE
Mr. SUFRE 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 4.35 p.m.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): At the outset of the meeting, I wish to state that I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the members of the Security Council:

"On the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the first meeting of the Security Council and the inauguration on 1 January 1986 of the International Year of Peace, the members of the Security Council wish to reaffirm their commitment to the Charter of the United Nations, which conferred on the Council the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. At the first meeting of the Council, in London 40 years ago, its members assumed this special responsibility in the conviction that it would prove a new beginning in the continuing quest for lasting peace and security.

"Although peace has been preserved on a global basis for 40 years, conflicts and tensions persist. Over the course of 2,600 meetings the Security Council has debated the most pressing issues of peace and security. The inauguration of the International Year of Peace provides an added impetus for the members of the Council to enhance the effectiveness of the Security Council in discharging its principal role of maintaining international peace and security. They call again upon the entire membership of the United Nations to abide by their obligation under the Charter to accept and carry out decisions of the Security Council. Let us hope that 1986 and the years to come will bring the progress which is so urgently needed for the safeguarding of peace for future generations."

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 decisions taken at previous meetings on this item, I invite the representative of Lebanon to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Israel, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Qatar, Saudi Arabia 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), Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar), Mr. Shihabi (Saudi Arabia) and Mr. El-Pattal (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 a letter from the representative of Morocco in which he requests 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 that representative 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. Alsoui (Morocco) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

Members have before them the text, further revised, of the revised draft resolution sponsored by Lebanon, contained in document S/17730/Rev.2.

Mr. BIERRING (Denmark): I should like first of all, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the first month of 1986. You represent a great country with which Denmark has always had strong ties of friendship and co-operation, and your great personal and professional qualities, which you have already demonstrated, make us confident that your presidency will be a success.

I want also to pay tribute to the representative of Burkina Faso, Ambassador Bassole, no longer among us on the Council, for the excellent way in which he presided over the Security Council during the month of December.

I should like further to take this opportunity to extend a warm welcome to the new members of the Council: Bulgaria, Congo, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela. At the same time, we thank their predecessors for their co-operation and their contribution to the work of the Council.

(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

My delegation listened with particular attention to the statements made by the representatives of Lebanon and Israel at the beginning of this debate. While their accounts of the recent incidents in southern Lebanon differ, they do confirm that tension in the area is increasing.

My Government has time and again warned that the threat or use of force is bound to lead to a further deterioration of the situation. A worsened cycle of violence will add to the sufferings of innocent people. Whether it is acts of resistance against foreign occupation, counter-measures by the Israeli forces and their associates or artillery attacks across the border, innocent civilians will nearly always be victims. Furthermore, it will hamper the possibilities of restoring genuine peace and stability in the area. In our opinion this cannot be in the interest of any of the parties concerned.

Denmark therefore strongly urges all the involved parties to show the utmost restraint. What is needed now is for the parties to work seriously and constructively together towards a satisfactory arrangement for maintaining peace and security in the area and for promoting a steady return to normality.

We have consistently supported the restoration of Lebanon's full sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity and stressed the need for a total Israeli withdrawal. That remains the policy of my Government. Denmark also recognizes the legitimate right to security for the parties on each side of the Lebanese-Israeli border.

The recent developments in the area clearly demonstrate that the so-called security zone and the continued presence of Israeli Defence Forces in southern Lebanon, which are contrary to Security Council resolutions, will not provide Israel with the security it seeks for its northern settlements. In our opinion, the best option available continues to be the effective implementation of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL).

(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

We fully share the view expressed by the Secretary-General in his latest interim report on UNIFIL, of December 1985, that the most effective means of minimizing the risks of the present status quo and of preserving the credibility of UNIFIL would be a change in the Israeli position. Denmark also shares the deep concern of the UNIFIL-troop-contributing Governments at probable developments in southern Lebanon if the present basic conditions are allowed to persist.

The Secretary-General and his colleagues have since May 1985 been engaged in an effort to promote agreement on security arrangements in southern Lebanon which would be in line with the mandate entrusted to UNIFIL by the Security Council and would take into account the concerns of the Government of Lebanon for its sovereignty as well as the concerns of the Government of Israel for its security. Indeed, the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs, Mr. Brian Urquhart, is for the time being in the area for that very purpose. We strongly support these efforts and appeal to all concerned to contribute actively to their early and successful outcome.

This Council bears a heavy responsibility for the effective implementation of its peace-keeping undertakings. The Council members must - in the words of the Secretary-General - ponder on what action might be taken, individually or collectively, to further the implementation of its resolutions on UNIFIL and to bring about peace and normality in southern Lebanon, which is what all parties want. Any action by the Council must in our opinion be conducive to the achievement of those objectives.

Unfortunately, in our opinion the present draft resolution does not fully meet that requirement.

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

Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): It gives me much pleasure to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for the month of January. You have already shown your great capacity for this task, and the admirably succinct way in which you carry it out. It also gives me pleasure to recall that your Government and mine have together recently reached an agreement which in some sense might be taken as a model for the resolution of some long-standing problems.

I also express my thanks to your predecessor, the Ambassador of Burkina Faso, for the persistent and admirable way in which he got the Council to complete his work.

This being the beginning of a new year, I wish to extend a warm welcome to the five new members that have joined the Security Council. They will find that they are taking on a great deal more work than they have probably realized, but they are very welcome to share it with us. I would also thank the five members of the Council who have laid down that burden after two arduous years.

In the course of this debate we have heard a number of arguments on the subject now before us. That subject is not, of course, the situation in Lebanon, or even the region, but the Lebanese complaint concerning the Israeli occupying forces in southern Lebanon. It is a question with which the Security Council is all too sadly familiar. Barely three months ago it considered the report of the Secretary-General dated 10 October 1985 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), before renewing UNIFIL's mandate for a further period of six months. And previous to that the Council had of course considered on numerous occasions, and adopted several resolutions on, questions resulting from the Israeli occupation of Lebanon.

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

I shall summarize the problem which, as the Council knows well, lies at the heart of the situation we are now considering, and to which a full solution has not yet been found. The Government of Israel holds the view that cross-border attacks on its territory launched from Lebanon are unacceptable. No member of the Council, entrusted as we are with primary responsibility for international peace and security, can disagree with that. The Council equally cannot and does not accept, as it has demonstrated in a number of resolutions, that Israel may flout the United Nations Charter by invading and occupying another State or any part of its territory.

That is not a new or novel view of the problem. It is the underlying reality which needs constantly to be re-emphasized. My Government, it goes without saying, stands by Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and by Israel's right to exist in peace and security within recognized boundaries. By the same token, we are resolutely opposed to Israel's taking measures that have the effect of denying access to the same right to neighbouring States, such as Lebanon.

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

Israel has a legitimate concern for the safety of its citizens in northern Israel from cross-border activity. But the concern of Lebanon for the safety of its citizens in southern Lebanon from cross-border activity is equally legitimate. We remain firmly committed to the sovereignty, unity, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized borders.

These principles have been familiar to the Council since it began considering the question of Israel's violation of them from 1978 onwards, most disastrously in 1982, when Israel carried out a full-scale invasion of its neighbour. In that time the Council has sought to assist in providing a response to both the Israeli and the Lebanese concerns. A full solution will require all the statesmanship, skill and patience of which both the Council and the parties concerned are capable, but an important step in the right direction was taken almost at the outset, in 1978, when the Security Council created UNIFIL. One of the essential tasks of the Force was defined in Security Council resolution 425 (1978) as:

"restoring international peace and security and assisting the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area".

Compare this to what we heard from the Permanent Representative of Israel on Monday - and here I quote textually from his speech - that:

"the Government of Lebanon should fulfil its responsibility ... to [control] its own territory and [to prevent] the use of ... the south [for] aggression against ... Israel. ... [That] remains Israel's interest - its sole interest - with regard to South Lebanon." (S/PV.2640, p. 28)

In other words, the Security Council, Israel and, self-evidently, the Government of Lebanon all desire the same outcome - in its barest form, that is, the restoration of effective Lebanese Government authority in the South.

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

It is for this reason that the continued Israeli policy of refusal to withdraw from Lebanese territory and its continued obstruction of UNIFIL is so tragically misconceived. Just as Israel complains of instability in Lebanon, when its own actions did so much to cause that instability, so it complains that there is no effective Lebanese Government to control South Lebanon, when its own forces systematically deny that control and prevent UNIFIL from carrying out its mandate. And we should recall that UNIFIL is the instrument the Security Council has devised to assist in the restoration of Lebanese Government control.

Israel is not the only State to make it difficult for UNIFIL to function. The Soviet Union, whose Deputy Permanent Representative we heard on Monday, complains loudly of the problems UNIFIL faces but apparently finds it difficult, despite enormous economic resources, to find the money to pay its assessed contribution to the funding of UNIFIL. This is all the more surprising when small third-world countries are prepared to shoulder the burden, at great cost to themselves, of participation in the Force for the sake of international peace and security.

But let me return to the opposition of Israel to the role of UNIFIL. If I understand correctly, this opposition derives in part from doubts that UNIFIL is able to perform its task sufficiently well to prevent significant attacks on Israel from Lebanese territory. My delegation believes that these doubts are misplaced. Not only can UNIFIL provide the security Israel requires if given the chance, but conversely the presence of Israeli and Israeli-backed forces in place of UNIFIL provides a constant provocation to the Lebanese population who wish, quite understandably, to see their country free of foreign occupation.

In order to illustrate this I should like to quote from the interim report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL of 16 December, paragraph 2 of which reads as follows:

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

"The situation in the UNIFIL area of deployment has remained basically as described in my last report. That part of the UNIFIL area which the Israel forces evacuated last spring has remained quiet, and the Shiite organization, Amal, and other Lebanese resistance groups have generally co-operated with the Force in the performance of its tasks. But the other part, where Israel maintains what it calls a 'security zone' has been very tense." (S/17684, para. 2)

Paragraph 10 of the same reports states as follows:

"There is no question that, despite the difficulties encountered, UNIFIL is an important stabilizing factor in southern Lebanon, but the present situation is not acceptable and it could well deteriorate if the level both of resistance to the 'security zone' and of the reaction to such resistance increases in the coming months. I note, in this connection, that the leader of Amal has recently made a number of statements of his intention to step up activities against the 'South Lebanon army' and Israel if there is no change in the present situation by the end of the year."

Nothing could be clearer in demonstrating that the alternative to Israeli withdrawal is further conflict and the sowing of the seeds of future hostility and violence.

As I said earlier, the achievement of a full solution to the problem of border violence between Israel and Lebanon is going to require mutual respect for the security of each country within its internationally recognized borders. The Israelis are wrong to continue in their occupation of part of southern Lebanon. The Lebanese should put themselves or be put in a situation to ensure that no hostile action against Israel is taken from their territory. Both sides must act sternly against terrorists and desist from practices which adversely affect the civilian population on either side of the international frontier.

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

The way to achieve this situation is for the Israelis to withdraw totally and to cease to support irregular forces on the Lebanese side of the frontier while at the same time UNIFIL is enabled to fulfil its mandate through effective deployment.

In our view the Security Council should not restrict itself to the negative course of condemning those at fault, though I have to say there are plenty of such people on both sides of the frontier, but should try to take a positive and constructive view of the situation through the use of the United Nations Force which is already in being. This is what the Force is for, and it is up to the Security Council to support it. My delegation's position will depend upon how the Council reacts to this central consideration.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): I thank the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. ALAOUI (Morocco) (interpretation from Arabic): Permit me at the outset, Sir, to congratulate you upon your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the current month. I wish to assure you of our complete confidence in your wisdom and your ability to preside over the deliberations of the Council and guiding it in the best possible way.

It is also my pleasure to thank and express appreciation to the representative of Burkina Faso for the manner in which he presided over the deliberations of the Council during the preceding month.

I should also like to take this opportunity to congratulate the five new members of the Security Council and to wish them full success in their task.

The Security Council is meeting to consider the complaint brought by Lebanon concerning the latest acts of aggression by the Israeli armed forces against Lebanese villages and Lebanese citizens living in the south of that country. I need not go into the details of these events. They have been comprehensively dealt with by the Ambassador of Lebanon in the statement he delivered on the subject a few days ago, a statement which included a lengthy list of various kinds of acts of violence and sabotage undertaken once again by Israel's artillery and air force against Lebanon's sovereignty and innocent citizens.

A question comes to mind: How much of a coincidence is there between these practices and the acts of aggression, or rather the acts of profanation in the past few days by some members of the Israeli Knesset on the sanctity of the Al-Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem, with the support of the Israeli authorities and under the protection of the Israeli army? The reply to this question has its roots in the policy Israel has made its own, a policy that is directed against the Arab peoples and countries, a policy based essentially on the principle of the use of force, aggression, expansion and the denial of the most fundamental rules, norms and laws

(Mr. Alaoui, Morocco)

governing international relations. Worse still, in an attempt to legitimize this policy Israeli officials did not shrink from invoking the most trivial justifications, such as hiding behind what they call their right to protect Israel's security against terrorism, or their right to punish Arab citizens under occupation, citizens whose only sin is to insist on their rights and to resist Israel's practices in the region.

The direct reason for the deteriorating situation in southern Lebanon is Israel's refusal to implement Security Council resolutions and completely and unconditionally withdraw from all Lebanese soil; its insistence on what it calls its security belt, or security zone, inside Lebanese territory; its refusal to let the United Nations peace forces deploy in the region; the arming of illegitimate collaborationist forces and using them, either directly or within its own army, to spread terror, commit acts of violence and undertake arbitrary actions against innocent Lebanese citizens.

We all know that what Israel is trying to achieve by escalating its acts of terror in southern Lebanon is to plant the seeds of insecurity, to entrench instability in Lebanon, so that it may at a later stage justify its occupation of that country and have the last word in any initiative or any action aimed at rapprochement between the various parties and communities in conflict. Current trends and developments underline that fact.

The latest events came only a few days after the signing on 28 December in Damascus of the agreement between the various Lebanese parties in order to normalize the situation within Lebanon and achieve a definitive settlement to the conflict. All this can only reinforce our conviction that a large part of the internal problem in Lebanon is directly linked to the practices and policies of Israel in Lebanon. These practices and policies aim at implementing a wide and

(Mr. Alaoui, Morocco)

clear plan through which Israel attempts to impose a fait accompli so that it may subjugate all the peoples of the region to its will and once and for all annex Arab and Palestinian lands in a final manner.

However, we are convinced that the awareness and steadfastness of the Lebanese people - and this is underscored by the complaint being considered today by the Council - will prevent Israel from insisting upon and achieving this plan. We are convinced that right and justice will take the place of injustice and oppression. We are convinced that the international community will meet its responsibilities by standing at the side of the Arab peoples under occupation so as to allow them to regain their rights and so that stability and peace will return to the region as a whole.

The responsibility for Israel's stubbornness, its insistence on its arbitrary policy in the region and its defiance of United Nations resolutions, including those of the Council, is shared by the international community as a whole. The international community has to date been unable to take firm measures to put an end to Israel's behaviour in the region, as well as its insistence on arrogating to itself the right to strike any country at any time it sees fit in order to defend its selfish interests and its expansionist policy.

The effectiveness and credibility of the United Nations essentially hinge on the ability of the Security Council to maintain international peace and security. This ability is today on trial. It is being tested by the arbitrary acts against the people of Lebanon and against the sovereignty and the dignity of that country. The Security Council must undo the injustice that has once again been done to that country, not only by reaffirming the previous resolutions it adopted on this issue, but indeed by following up their implementation, because we believe that the

(Mr. Alaoui, Morocco)

responsibility of the Council does not stop at adopting a resolution; it goes beyond that to the implementation of its substance.

Any practical measure taken by the Security Council in this context must include forcing Israel to withdraw completely and unconditionally from all Lebanese territories occupied since 1978 and providing guarantees for the respect of Lebanon's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity inside the internationally recognized borders.

The delegation of the Kingdom of Morocco wishes to take this opportunity to renew Morocco's solidarity with Lebanon as a people and as a nation. We wish to reaffirm our full support for its unity and stability. We also wish to reaffirm that we are prepared to continue our efforts in all forums until Lebanon regains its stability and security and until it returns to what it once was: a symbol of co-existence between different communities within democracy and multilateralism.

My delegation renews its solidarity with the Palestinian and all other Arab peoples struggling against occupation in Gaza, the West Bank, the Golan Heights and southern Lebanon. We also renew our condemnation of all the arbitrary measures undertaken by Israel inside the occupied territories.

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

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

Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): My secretary tried to telephone the Presidential Palace in Beirut a few minutes ago. Here is how the conversation went - the tape is a little fuzzy, but I invite all representatives for a private hearing:

"Operator, as I told the previous operator, I am taping this because I have been trying to get this number for quite some time and I'm trying to keep a record. I'm trying to get the phone number of a spokesman at the Presidential Palace in Beirut. Can you try to get that number for me?

"Sorry, I have no circuits to Lebanon..

"What seems to be the problem, operator?

"Lebanon is a warring nation. It's very difficult to get through to them. I haven't been able to get a call through there all day.

"Is it always difficult to get through to them?

"Yes."

The international operator knows what everybody here knows.

Now, I gather that the Lebanese Ambassador was more successful. He must have gotten his instructions somehow. But because of the distances involved, I rule out carrier pigeon. Or perhaps, since the telephone lines to Damascus are intact, the orders came directly for a change.

In this morning's edition of The New York Times there is a picture of a building in Beirut destroyed in flames. There are many such buildings in Beirut today. In fact, all of Beirut is ablaze. There is a report from William Maclean of Reuters. Writing two days ago, he said:

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

"Forty-five people were killed and 250 wounded in ferocious tank battles in Christian-held areas. Pro-Syrian militias fought their way towards President Amin Gemayel's Palace.

"Beirut television said that the pro-Syrian fighters had broken into the Christian leader's mountain stronghold of Bikfaya In Bikfaya itself, streets gorged by shell craters were deserted. Civilians in cars packed with belongings were leaving the area."

He then quoted a pro-Syrian militia commander as saying:

"The battle is to bring Gemayel and the régime down."

Now, is the Security Council dealing with that emergency? Is the representative of Lebanon here to lodge a complaint against Syria? If he is not, then I have a question: What is he, the representative of a régime that is about to be toppled - or, for that matter, all of us - doing here in this Chamber this afternoon?

A few days ago when this debate began I said that there was no Government in Lebanon and that that absence of a Government and that instability did not date back to the Israeli action in 1982. The Israeli action was as a result of this endemic absence of central authority. In 1975-1976, 100,000 Lebanese were slaughtered and not a single Israeli soldier was in Lebanon. I also said a few days ago that the south was relatively the most tranquil part of the country, that the people there wished to be left alone, that all violence there was the result of outside, especially Syrian, subversion, that Syria was crushing Lebanese sovereignty by stirring conflict and terror throughout the country and that peace could come to Lebanon in one of two ways: it could come to it either by the total capitulation of Lebanon to Syria's dictates - a kind of Pax Syriana, a Hama peace - or, as we hope and as, I think, fair-minded people here hope, by a Lebanon that freed itself of Syrian occupation. Everyone except the blind - I would say even the blind now - knows that that is true.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

We cannot discuss the situation in the south of Lebanon without recognizing what is happening throughout the country. We cannot speak about it as though it were detached, as though we were speaking about a spot on the moon.

This surrealistic session - and I can only use that term - deserves a brief description: it is ridiculous. I say it with much pain. While I was speaking with a distinguished colleague here in the United Nations, I said that part of the problem of the United Nations - not only in my country but, I think, throughout the world - was that it allowed ridiculous things like this discussion - a discussion that is taking place at a time when the President of Lebanon is fighting for his life, when Syrian tanks are shelling targets inside Lebanon, when Syria has imposed an outside "agreement" and is now trying to ram it down the throat of Lebanon's ostensible Government. To have the representative of Lebanon come and present this discussion when he is having a hard time getting communications from this Government is ridiculous.

So what began as an ordinary joke has evolved into tragicomedy and is now turned into a sublime farce.

So, Mr. President, and distinguished representatives, especially those of the fair-minded countries I mentioned before, there is a broader issue here than merely the misplaced attack on Israel - because as far as Israel is concerned this discussion is meaningless. The broader issue is that - and I urge members of the Council to give it serious thought - a representative levels an entirely absurd complaint and then "consents" to modify it slightly, and the Council is asked to approve it. I can assure the Council of one thing: If unchecked, this practice will continue, and it will rob this body of any international significance.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): Since there are no further speakers, I should like to make a statement in my capacity as Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations.

(The President)

The last time the Security Council considered the situation in southern Lebanon was during February and March 1983. Since then, the situation there has remained tense. Both the statement by the Permanent Representative of Lebanon, His Excellency Ambassador Fakhoury on 13 January and the reports by the Secretary-General on the recent situation in the area where the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) is deployed have made us come to the conclusion that the situation in southern Lebanon is further deteriorating and that the area is fraught with great potential danger, which poses a threat to the peace and security of the area and affects the stability of the situation in the whole of Lebanon. The Chinese delegation therefore believes that it is indeed appropriate for the Security Council to consider the situation and adopt measures accordingly.

(The President)

International opinion unanimously holds that the root-cause of the tense situation in southern Lebanon lies in the invasion and occupation by Israel. The Israeli authorities should therefore be held responsible for the tension and all the consequences arising therefrom. As is well known, the Israeli troops have clung to southern Lebanon up to this day. Relying on their troops and local mercenaries, the Israeli authorities have set up a so-called security zone in the area, which is in fact "a State within a State" inside Lebanon. They have taken a series of moves and measures to bully the civilians in the occupied area which are in contravention of international law. All these constitute a serious encroachment on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and a case of gross trampling upon the United Nations Charter and the principles of international law.

Using the pretexts of "ensuring the security of their own civilians" and "preventing terrorist acts", the Israeli authorities launched a large-scale invasion of Lebanon over three years ago, and under the same excuses they are continuing their occupation of southern Lebanon today. The hypocrisy of these pretexts has long been laid bare by the Israeli authorities' own words and deeds, and they have been widely condemned and repudiated by the international community. What should be emphatically pointed out is that there will be no State sovereignty and territorial integrity in the world to speak of if all countries launch invasions against and occupy neighbouring countries and set up so-called security zones there under the pretext of protecting their own civilians. Will there be any international law then? No, there will only be chaos throughout the world. The fallacy of the Israeli authorities on the prevention of terrorist acts is a sheer confusion of right and wrong. The Israeli authorities must come to realize that since Lebanon has fallen victim to aggression with its territories being occupied, the Lebanese Government and people have every right to employ all necessary means to drive out the invaders and occupiers. This is justified self-defence in total

(The President)

conformity with the principles of international law and the provisions of the United Nations Charter. This is their right by law, both human and divine. We cannot accept the confusion between acts in self-defence and terrorism, nor can we tolerate aggression against other countries under the pretext of opposing "terrorism".

World opinion maintains unanimously that what the Israeli authorities should do, and indeed the only wise choice for them, is to withdraw immediately and unconditionally all their troops from the whole of Lebanon in compliance with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and strictly respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon. Any attempt to whitewash or justify their aggression and occupation will be in vain.

The Chinese Government has all along resolutely supported the Government and people of Lebanon in their struggle to safeguard their State sovereignty and territorial integrity. Proceeding from this principled stand, the Chinese delegation holds that the Security Council should truly discharge its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security and adopt the following measures regarding the situation in southern Lebanon: condemn Israeli invasion and occupation of southern Lebanon and Israeli acts of bullying the local civilians; insist on the immediate implementation of the relevant resolutions of the Council; demand an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from the entire Lebanese territory; demand the dismantling of the "security zones" and the dissolution of the "South Lebanese Army" by Israel, and ask Israel strictly to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

The Chinese people are deeply sympathetic to the Lebanese people for their long sufferings and sincerely hope that they will no longer be subjected to the oppression of the aggressors and realize national reconciliation so that they can rebuild a beautiful, tranquil and prosperous country in Lebanon.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic):

Concerning Lebanon's complaint contained in document S/17717, Lebanon has put forward a draft resolution in document S/17730/Rev.2. In accordance with rule 38 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, the State of the United Arab Emirates requests an immediate vote on the draft resolution. In this request the delegation of the United Arab Emirates hopes that the draft resolution will be approved by all members of the Security Council without exception for the following reasons: first, the draft resolution reflects the reality in southern Lebanon stemming from repeated acts of aggression carried out by Israel against southern Lebanon as well as its arbitrary acts committed against Lebanese citizens; secondly, the draft resolution includes a demand that Israel desist from its arbitrary acts in southern Lebanon; thirdly, Lebanon as a small State, victim of aggression, can resort only to the Security Council. Indeed, as was stated here by our Permanent Representative, Lebanon puts its trust in the Security Council.

We hope that this Council will not disappoint that trust. The Council's stand vis-à-vis this draft resolution, its first stand in 1986 - the International Year of Peace - a year in which the Security Council is celebrating 40 years since its first meeting, will be of utmost importance to the Security Council's credibility and to the Council's ability to meet its Charter responsibilities.

For all these reasons my delegation hopes that the Security Council will look positively on this draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): In accordance with the provisions of rule 38 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, the representative of the United Arab Emirates has requested that the revised draft resolution submitted by Lebanon and contained in document S/17730/Rev.2 be put to the vote. Unless I hear any objection I shall put it to the vote.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

(The President)

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to make statements before the vote.

Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): As this is the first time that I have spoken in the Council this month, let me begin by congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of this body. Relations between your country, China, and my country are continuing to develop very favourably and my delegation is delighted to see presiding over the Council. We are completely confident that you will preside over our deliberations with your acknowledged skill and wisdom.

I should also like to express my delegation's appreciation of the objectivity and skill of your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Burkina Faso.

Let me also express my personal regard for my colleagues who recently left the Council: the representatives of Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Peru, and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

May I also welcome the representatives of Bulgaria, the Congo, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates, and Venezuela, who this month joined this body. I am sure that they will contribute to our work and our efforts to make the Council as effective as possible in the pursuit of the very important role assigned to it under the Charter.

The situation in Lebanon is once again before the Security Council, and this is a matter of particular concern to Australia. Large numbers of people of Lebanese descent have embarked upon a new life in Australia; they retain an interest in Lebanon and close bonds of affection with their former homeland. For those reasons, as well as for reasons of our wider concern with the need to maintain peace, Australia has followed with sympathy and concern the complex and tragic chapters in Lebanon's more recent history.

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

I might add that I do not think it prudent or appropriate to seek to dismiss the deliberations of the Council as "ridiculous", as has been done. The situation in the Middle East as a whole and in Lebanon in particular is far too grave to be treated polemically or with sarcasm. In this body we should avoid polemics from all quarters, as I said when we considered this matter, I think, last March. What we in the Council should be doing is approach the situation in a constructive, responsible way; and, of course, that can be done only with the co-operation of the principal participants.

As my Delegation has made clear in former statements, Australia believes that a fundamental requirement in looking towards a resolution of the problems of Lebanon is that there should be strict respect for the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of Lebanon, within its internationally recognized boundaries.

We have accordingly followed with keen interest the efforts of the Secretary-General to discuss related issues with the parties concerned, including arrangements which would permit the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) to fulfil its mandate. The fact that to date UNIFIL has been unable to fulfil its mandate is, we believe, a matter of disappointment and regret. It is likely to remain so until the Government of Lebanon is able to extend its authority throughout its entire territory.

The Security Council has a responsibility to engage in constructive attempts to bring about the restoration of peace to Lebanon. The Australian delegation has argued consistently in the Council that our deliberations should be directed towards the achievement of practical and constructive progress. In the current context, our goal should be to eliminate, or at least to minimize, the causes of violence so as to bring some relief to the long-suffering people of Lebanon.

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

We believe, in particular, that all existing Security Council resolutions should be implemented in their entirety and that normal conditions of peace and security should be restored as soon as possible.

While the draft resolution before us has been considerably improved by several recent amendments, it still lacks elements which we believe should be reflected in a Security Council resolution on the situation in Lebanon. There is, for example, in our view, less than adequate reflection in this text of several important elements in earlier Security Council resolutions. Nor does the draft resolution, in our view, take full account of all recent acts on the Lebanon/Israel border.

For those reasons, Australia has been unable to subscribe fully to the text before us and we shall abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

Looking to the future, the Australian Government hopes that ways will be found to enable the troubled people of Lebanon to live in peace. This can be done only with the cessation of hostilities, the implementation of Security Council resolutions, and especially by the alleviation of the underlying causes of violence in that country.

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

Mr. de KEMOULARIA (France) (interpretation from French): It is with great pleasure that I join my predecessors in paying tribute to you, Sir, as President of the Security Council. The bonds between my country and China have a long, warm and friendly history. Our attraction to your rich and ancient culture largely explains the deep friendship of the French people for the Chinese people. The recent visit to China by the President of the French Republic as Head of State and previously as Head of the Opposition are eloquent proof of that state of affairs. Everyone at the Council table has already paid tribute to your great diplomatic abilities and, therefore, we are certain that President Li's will be a brilliant presidency.

(Mr. de Kemoularia, France)

I request you, Mr. President, to convey to your predecessor my delegation's thanks for the restraint and personal qualities displayed during his presidency. We regret his departure as also that of the representatives of Egypt, India, Peru and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. The friendship and co-operation between us here will surely continue in other bodies.

We bid welcome to our five new colleagues who have come to us with their valuable experience and friendship, which we will surely need.

The bonds of friendship and solidarity between France and Lebanon mean that the situation in that country is of special importance to the French Government and public opinion. In this regard, no one would be surprised to hear that we are following with great concern the recent developments in the Lebanese national tragedy. It is with similar concern that we have learnt of the new suffering inflicted on the population of southern Lebanon.

(Mr. de Kemoullaria, France)

Moreover, we noted with concern the information provided by the delegation of Israel in its letter of 26 December 1985 and in its recent statement in the Security Council regarding the resumption of direct attacks against the territory of its country.

For our part, as I stated on 11 March 1985, we can only deplore any and all acts of violence, which can only make the search for peaceful solutions more difficult. In that connection, we have on many occasions said to Israel that it is incorrect to believe that maintaining a direct or indirect presence in Lebanon could safeguard security along the border.

Under these particularly difficult circumstances, the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) - to whose action we pay a renewed tribute - has continued to play a humanitarian role to the benefit of the civilian population. That population must be enabled without delay to return to their homes in full safety and must, in any event, be protected. In that connection, I recall my statement of 17 October 1985 made during the debate on the renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL.

The new draft resolution before us today basically meets our concerns. It deplores acts of violence which we cannot condone. It reaffirms the need to implement the basic resolutions of the Security Council, without which the restoration of peace and security seems difficult to imagine.

It reiterates the great importance we attach to respect for the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of Lebanon, which is a basic principle of any peace settlement.

In the circumstances, and in conformity with our traditional solidarity with Lebanon - which, moreover, is again enduring a tragic situation - France will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

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

Ms. BYRNE (United States of America): I should like first to congratulate you, Sir, upon your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of January. We have all been much impressed by your wise and deft handling of the tasks that have already confronted you.

I should like also to convey our thanks to the representative of Burkina Faso for his distinguished stewardship of the office during the month of December.

I wish also to welcome the five new members of the Council. We look forward to working with them.

My Government is saddened by the necessity of voting against a draft resolution put forward at the behest of the Government of Lebanon, a close friend. The United States has demonstrated repeatedly its unwavering commitment to the restoration of Lebanon's unity, sovereignty and independence. We have worked, as others have, to give concrete expression to these goals and to advance the cause of peace in Lebanon and in the Middle East as a whole.

We share with the people of Lebanon and their Government deep concern at the situation in southern Lebanon. Our long-standing support for agreed-on arrangements which would provide for stability in southern Lebanon and security for Israel's northern border continues. It is precisely our attachment to the cause of peace in Lebanon that compels us to cast a negative vote on the draft resolution now before us.

This draft resolution cannot bring us closer to restoration of peace in Lebanon or to relieving the suffering of the Lebanese. The immediate motive for this complaint - the situation in the village of Kounin - now appears to be nearing resolution through the constructive efforts of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) supported by those parties interested in the security of South Lebanon.

(Ms. Byrne, United States)

In addition, this text fails to deal in a fair and balanced manner with the security problems of southern Lebanon, including the security of the Lebanon-Israel border. In recent weeks there have been rocket attacks on Israeli territory launched from Lebanese soil, as well as violence within southern Lebanon. Yet this partisan draft resolution ignores these facts.

Negative, one-sided draft resolutions such as this one only serve those who wish to prevent progress towards peace in the region. We call upon all those who truly wish to end the bloodshed and suffering in Lebanon - and in the rest of the Middle East - to work in serious, practical ways to help build the mutual trust that alone can end the cycle of violence that has so tragically and needlessly ravaged the Middle East.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): I thank the representative of the United States of America for the kind words she addressed to me.

I shall now put draft resolution S/17730/Rev.2 to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Bulgaria, China, Congo, France, Ghana, Madagascar, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Denmark, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): The result of the voting is as follows: 11 in favour, 1 against and 3 abstentions. The draft resolution has not been adopted, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Security Council.

I call now upon the representative of Lebanon.

Mr. FAKHOURY (Lebanon) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish to say a few words following the vote on the draft resolution we had sponsored, which enjoyed the support of the majority of Council members but which was killed by a United States veto.

I wish first of all to address you personally, Mr. President. I should like to pay a tribute to you for your efforts and endeavours and for the patience you demonstrated during the Council's two earlier meetings, during the consultations and discussions that took place before and after them, and during the present meeting.

I wish also to express our thanks and appreciation to representatives who expressed support for our draft resolution; theirs is a position in support of our cause and in support of the right of the people of southern Lebanon to live in peace and security, free from occupation and from Israel's acts of aggression and abusive practices.

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

The United States veto has killed the draft resolution, and therefore the threat to southern Lebanon and our people there persists.

This is not the first time that draft resolutions of this kind have been vetoed, thereby blocking the efforts of the Security Council. It is difficult for us to understand the real motive for casting a negative vote, in the form of a veto. The delegation of Lebanon had hoped that those members of the Council that have voted against or abstained on the draft resolution would express their concern about the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon, as well as for the fate of southern Lebanon, by supporting and voting in favour of the draft resolution.

In our contacts with other delegations, my delegation responded to some objections and observations by explaining Lebanon's position. But it was not possible to agree that there was any validity to the objection that the draft resolution was not balanced. To condemn or deplore all acts of violence would put the aggressor on an equal footing with the national resistance movement. That movement, which has written, and continues to write, glorious pages in the history of Lebanon and other countries, is a source of pride to us. We, the Lebanese, reject the notion that we should abandon our national resistance or denigrate its value and significance.

It is not my intention to deny the freedom of any member of the Council to take its own decisions. Lebanon believes in the freedom of decision-taking. But we do have a right, following the voting this evening, to raise the question of the destiny of southern Lebanon and the people there and, consequently, the destiny of this Council's resolutions and its reputation, prestige and credibility, at the beginning of a new year, which, it so happens, has been designated by the United Nations as the International Year of Peace. We have the right to raise that question in the light of the statement made earlier in this meeting by the

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

President, on behalf of the Security Council, on this fortieth anniversary of the first meeting of the Security Council.

My delegation sincerely hopes that no other Member State will find itself one day in the painful, deteriorating situation now facing southern Lebanon and its people. We hope that no other Member State will find itself in the position of my country at this moment. We hope that no other Member State will have to face what we have faced and feel the sorrow we are now feeling at the fact that the mandate and powers of the Security Council have been blocked and that this body has been prevented from carrying out its duties and responsibilities.

I would have been satisfied to stop at that point had it not been for the statement made earlier in this meeting by the representative of Israel. The least that one can say about the allegations in that statement is that they are totally without foundation. The proof that those allegations are unfounded - and I shall not use a stronger word - is that I am in constant contact with my Government, and the telephone circuits with Lebanon are therefore open. No doubt the operator recognized the identity of the caller and therefore did not put the telephone call through - if, that is, the allegation of the representative of Israel was true.

I shall confine myself to that observation; the other allegations by the representative of Israel do not deserve any answer.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Chinese): There are no other names on the list of speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of the consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

