



Security Council

UN LIBRARY

MAY 11 1988

UN'S COLLECTION

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2814
10 May 1988

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
EIGHT HUNDRED AND FOURTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 10 May 1988 at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. DJOUDI

(Algeria)

Members: Argentina
Brazil
China
France
Germany, Federal Republic of
Italy
Japan
Nepal
Senegal
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland
United States of America
Yugoslavia
Zambia

Mr. DELEECH
Mr. ALENCAR
Mr. YU Mengjia
Mr. BLANC
Count York von WARTENBURG
Mr. BUCCI
Mr. KAGAMI
Mr. RANA
Mr. BA
Mr. SMIRNOV
Mr. BIRCH
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 10.55 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

LETTER DATED 5 MAY 1988 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF LEBANON TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/19861)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In accordance with decisions taken on this subject at the previous meetings on this item, I invite the representative of Lebanon to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Bahrain, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, the Syrian Arab Republic and Tunisia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber; I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Fakhoury (Lebanon) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Al-Shakar (Bahrain), Mr. Bein (Israel), Mr. Salah (Jordan), Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait), Mr. Muntasser (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar), Mr. Shihabi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Osman (Somalia), Mr. Al-Masri (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Ghezal (Tunisia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber; Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

(continued in Arabic)

The first speaker is the representative of Somalia, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. OSMAN (Somalia) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. President, as Chairman of the Arab Group for May, and on behalf of the Arab Group, I should first like to take this opportunity to express to you and to the other members of the Council the thanks of the member countries of the Arab Group for having given us an opportunity to participate in the deliberations of the Council on the acts of aggression and the continued arbitrary practices perpetrated by the Israeli occupying forces in Lebanon.

It is also a pleasure for me to congratulate you on your assumption of the post of President of the Council for this month. We are sure that, thanks to your broad diplomatic experience, your profound knowledge and prestige, you will be able to carry out your task in an excellent manner which will help the Council to take the necessary measures and decisions to guarantee the security and unity of Lebanon.

I should also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Zuze, Permanent Representative of Zambia, who conducted the work of the Council last month with great skill and in an exemplary manner.

This is the fifth meeting of the Security Council in 1988 held to consider the acts and practices of aggression perpetrated by the Israeli occupying forces in occupied Arab and Palestinian territories. This is the fifth of these meetings at which violation of the territorial integrity of Lebanon by Israel is being considered. Israel is continuing to impose its hegemony either directly or through its agents in the region it has created in southern Lebanon, which it calls a security zone, thus violating the international borders of Lebanon, and defying the many resolutions of the Security Council, particularly resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978), 508 (1982), 509 (1982), which require that Israel withdraw its forces from all Lebanese territories.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

The question being considered by the Council for the second time in 1988 is Israel's invasion of the southern part of the Lebanese Republic, an independent country with full sovereignty. Nearly six years have passed since that invasion, which led to the occupation of part of southern Lebanon.

The international community and the Security Council have insistently denounced that occupation and the Council has adopted resolutions calling for the total withdrawal of Israel from within Lebanese borders, but Israel has constantly sought to strengthen its occupation of Lebanese territory and has pursued practices that leave no shadow of a doubt as to its expansionist policies within Lebanese territory.

Not content with that, and having illegally created the so-called peace zone, Israel has transformed Lebanon into an arena for its military activities in order to justify its continued occupation of southern Lebanon under the pretext of maintaining security. That pretext is frequently put forward by Israel to justify its expansionist policies and its arbitrary practices and to achieve its long-term goals.

Having listened closely to the statement of the representative of Lebanon, and having closely followed Israel's aggression against Lebanon, aggression that has taken the form of an invasion of southern Lebanon, we consider that the Israeli practices within Lebanese borders, which are internationally recognized, violate international law and the provisions of the cease-fire agreement concluded between Israel and Lebanon in 1949 and the resolutions of the Security Council calling for the total withdrawal of Israel from Lebanese territory.

The Arab Group is of the view that the Security Council must take a firm decision in order to eliminate all the consequences of the practices and expansionist policies of Israel, to put an end to those practices and to avoid a

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

fait accompli, particularly given the fait accompli policy constantly pursued by Israel in the Arab region.

The victims of Israeli aggression are innocent civilians, most of them children and women, Lebanese and Palestinians who have found refuge in Lebanon.

All this clearly proves that Israel's objectives and its policies and practices involve attacking Palestinian or Lebanese resistance bases and are aimed at clearing the territory. Consequently the Arab Group considers that Israel's aggression and its invasion of southern Lebanon, and its practices against Lebanon and its sovereignty and security, constitute part of the general policy pursued by Israel in the Arab region to obtain its strategic objectives and to achieve its historical aims in Lebanon.

The Arab Group considers that the Security Council must implement the relevant resolutions and seek practical means to make Israel respect them and to withdraw its troops from all Lebanese territory, from within the international borders, and to put an end to its interference in Lebanese affairs.

Peace and security in southern Lebanon depend on Israel's abandonment of its policies and aggressive practices and its obstinate refusal to implement the Security Council resolutions.

The many reports submitted to the Council by the Secretary-General clearly show that the serious and persistent situation in Lebanon and its explosiveness result from the attitude of Israel, which refuses to implement Security Council resolutions calling on it to withdraw fully and unconditionally from all Lebanese territory and enable the deployment of international forces up to the internationally recognized borders and make it possible for the Lebanese Government to extend its sovereignty and authority throughout the territory.

The Arab Group is convinced that the Security Council must make every effort to help Lebanon get out of this difficult situation, and fully assume its

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

responsibilities in order to safeguard peace and security in the Middle East region. It therefore requests the Council to adopt the draft resolution submitted by the Group of Non-Aligned Countries, and unanimously, so that it may assume its responsibilities in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Somalia for his kind words addressed to me.

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

Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for my delegation to participate in the proceedings of the Security Council today under your presidency. You are a brother possessing great diplomatic qualities, skill and tact. The Muslim Arab country of Algeria is a fraternal country having common links with Kuwait. We are sure that under your leadership the Council's work will be successful.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

I should also like to compliment Ambassador Zuze, the Permanent Representative of Zambia, for the exemplary skill and competence with which he conducted the proceedings of the Council last month.

Hardly has the Security Council concluded its examination of a crime committed by the Zionist entity in the Middle East when its attention has been drawn once again to another in the long list of crimes it has committed, ranging from murder to inhumane practices against the Palestinian people, whose legitimate rights and land it has plundered, as well as against other countries in the region. Invoking the pretext of aggression, it is practising expansionism and a policy of extension thanks to the weapons generously provided to it.

Because of these interminable practices of aggression and the Zionist obsession with the idea of perpetuating its occupation and imposing hegemony and domination and nipping in the bud any attempt to establish peace and to bring about a just solution which the international community has been demanding for many years, the Security Council has to meet again and again, as if it had nothing else to do.

A few days ago, last Friday, we heard the representative of Lebanon state before this Council that the Zionist entity had launched another criminal attack against the people of Lebanon, thus arrogantly proclaiming to the world its right to commit these barbarous acts on the national soil of an independent country that enjoys sovereignty as well as all the rights guaranteed under the United Nations Charter and by international law and custom.

Israel launched this new attack on the pretext of safeguarding the security of the northern part of its country. This pretext does not, however, deceive anyone. What kind of security is this that gives it the right to violate the security of others? What kind of security is it when Israel bombs whole villages, inflicting

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

casualties on innocent people and wreaking destruction? This pretext of seeking security is merely camouflage to hide the true aims of the attack, that is, to perpetuate the occupation of this land, so cherished by the Lebanese, in defiance of resolutions adopted by this Council and of the clearly expressed will of the international community, and to eliminate all possibility of national resistance.

Thus, the Zionist entity is endeavouring to divert the attention of the world, which for five months has been concentrating on the Palestinian people and its brave resistance, but there it has failed because of the overwhelming international support for the legitimate rights and sacred struggle of the Palestinians.

Israel is mistaken if it thinks that its escalation of aggression and devastation of Lebanese territory, its attacks on the Arab States and its murder of symbols of the national Palestinian struggle will help it put an end to the sacred uprising of the young generation of the Palestinian people, which has terrified the invaders and frustrated all their plans. All these new links in the chain of Zionist crimes furnish striking proof that Israel continually fails to learn the lessons imposed by its experience and the experience of other countries in the long history of mankind. No national struggle can be defeated by such practices. On the contrary, such aggression is the very way to increase resistance and provide another reason for achieving the national objectives, that is, Israel's withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories and the restoration of the natural rights of the Palestinian people as well as the establishment of a national homeland on its soil.

As was recently pointed out by His Majesty the Prince of Kuwait, in the course of the inauguration of the Conference of Arab Ministers in Kuwait, stones have shown that the Palestinian entity is stronger than its oppressor, that it is as strong as stone itself.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

In Kuwait we condemn this new attack against the sovereignty of Lebanon and the inviolability of its territory and we state our support for its people in its devastation. We think that this Israeli aggression in fact represents defiance of this Council's resolutions calling for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from southern Lebanon, in particular resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) and 508 (1982) and 509 (1982). Since the Council's credibility and prestige derive from respect for these resolutions, Kuwait calls upon the Council now to defend its credibility and prestige by condemning the Israeli attack and doing all in its power to exert pressure on Israel to withdraw from southern Lebanon so that the people in the region can play their part in establishing security there.

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

The next speaker is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like at the outset, to thank all the members of the Council who have supported the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in the current debate; I should also like to express my thanks to the other members.

It is a source of both pleasure and pride to see an Algerian-Arab brother, an illustrious son of free Africa and an active colleague in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries presiding over the Security Council this month. The people, the National Liberation Front and the Government of Algeria have rendered and continue to render the utmost support to the Palestinian people in its struggle, under the leadership of its sole, legitimate representative, the PLO, for the realization of its inalienable national rights in Palestine and against the Israeli occupation and acts of violence and terror practised by Israel against us.

Mr. President, we are fully confident that your experience and keen interest in the success of the Council's work will undoubtedly lead us to achieve the desired results during this month.

I cannot fail to express my thanks and appreciation to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Zambia, Ambassador Zuze, for his efforts and excellent conduct of the Council's business last month.

It has become evident that the rulers of Tel Aviv are bent on the continuation of policies of terror and torture against our people in the occupied Palestinian territories. The media tell us daily of murder, torture, demolition and expulsion; they have even decided to deport an American national of Palestinian origin who advocates non-violence. The rulers of Tel Aviv were not satisfied with committing the crime of assassination of one of the leaders of the Palestinian revolution, the martyr Khalil al-Wazir, Abu Jihad - which has been condemned by the Council; they were not satisfied with the violation of the sovereignty of a friendly, hospitable country, Tunisia, but have carried out repeated acts of aggression against it.

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine
Liberation Organization)

It has become clear that expansion and aggression are an inherent instinct of the rulers of Tel Aviv. There is no limit to their greed and provocations aimed at aborting all initiatives and endeavours to achieve a peaceful and just political solution of the question of Palestine and the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The Council has before it a request from Lebanon to consider this fresh act of aggression carried out by Israel against Lebanon's sovereignty and the murderous terrorist acts against the Lebanese people. We hope that the Council will be able to adopt a resolution condemning Israel and introduce deterrent measures to prevent a repetition of such acts of aggression - measures to ensure Israel's compliance with and implementation of the Council's previous resolutions in this regard.

(spoke in English)

The representative of Lebanon has already apprised the Council of the facts. In many letters and for a very long period of time Lebanon has informed the Council of Israel's acts of aggression, violations of Lebanese territorial integrity, interference and intervention in Lebanese domestic affairs. Acts of aggression committed by Israel have taken a variety of forms: incursions, invasions, shelling and bombardment, bombing, and others. Lebanon has complained that its territory has been desecrated by the boots of the Israeli armed forces. Lebanon has complained that Israel has used Lebanese territory as a dumping ground for Palestinians expelled from their homes under Israeli occupation. Since 1978 Israel has been occupying Lebanese territory and committing acts on Lebanese territory in defiance of all norms of international law and, needless to say, in disregard and contempt of Security Council resolutions.

Israel makes no secret about its intentions and designs. As mentioned by the representative of Lebanon, the co-ordinator of Israeli activities in southern

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine
Liberation Organization)

Lebanon, Uri Lubrani, has defiantly proclaimed that Israel has a role to play in Lebanon, including, he added, a role in the forthcoming election of the President of Lebanon.

It is worth noting that the renewed aggression was described in the Daily News Bulletin of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency on 4 May 1988 as the battle for Maidoun Village in southern Lebanon. The Bulletin continued:

"The Israel Defence Forces and South Lebanese Army forces, supported by artillery and missile-firing Cobra helicopter gunships, captured Maidoun after what was reported to be a short but fierce battle."

One is reminded of the battle for Monte Cassino during the Second World War. The least we can say is that the Lebanese patriots, who had put up a fierce defence and paid with 50 martyrs, did honour to their country and people combating Israeli aggression. Two thousand Israeli troops under cover of 1,000 shells fired at the rate of 20 a minute was explained by General Rabin - the Defence Minister representing the so-called peace-promoting Israeli Labour Party - as a

"routine operation as part of the policy of routine security measures in south Lebanon ... and to transmit a clear message to the local population that they should not co-operate with those circles which aid the terrorists against us [that is, against Israel], from any type of organization."

Mr. Rabin went on to say:

"The maintenance of the security zone is not sufficient without preventive actions against terrorist targets, whether deep in Lebanon or in the zone and its immediate environs."

Notwithstanding the admitted fact that the so-called terrorists had left the region before the Israeli Army arrived - they must have vanished or maybe there

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine
Liberation Organization)

were none to start with; but then let us blame NBC for that - 1,000 shells were fired and 50 human beings were killed. The Jerusalem Post described the operation as a "show of strength rather than a military mission aimed at specific targets". A show of strength indeed - albeit brutal and savage - an act of State terrorism no less, was needed in Israel to show that its Army is really strong. A bloody confrontational situation had to be provoked. Israel's juntas have always been masters at provoking such situations, or at adding fuel to the fire. After all, Sharon's decision to move and live in a requisitioned Palestinian home in the Old City of Jerusalem is just one example of those provocations.

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine
Liberation Organization)

Could that be the answer to the failure and frustration of the Israeli army in its confrontation with the Palestinian stone-throwers in the occupied Palestinian territories, or is it a message to those heroes - the Davids of 1987-1988 - a message of intimidation and forthcoming brutality? Or, is it a message that Israel's army can provide protection and security and thus encourage American Jews at this "difficult time" to visit Israel which needs the "presence as much as the money" of American Jews. This was announced early this month by the Chairman of the Jewish Agency Board of Governors, the South African, Mendel Kaplan.

To what extent does Israel have designs over Lebanon? Let us recall history because it is relevant and important. In 1919 the World Zionist Organization presented its plan for the so-called Jewish homeland. The northern border of the Jewish homeland, according to the Zionists is -

"... at a point in the Mediterranean sea in the vicinity of Sidon and following the watersheds of the foothills of the Lebanon as far as Jisr El Kara'on, thence to El-Bire ...".

It will be recalled that in his statement the other day the representative of Lebanon informed the Council of the heavy concentrated shelling of the dam on the Karoun lake. The designs of Israel are not merely to extend the so-called "security zone"; the design and the aim is to annex that zone.

Israel invaded Lebanon in 1978, and the Security Council unanimously adopted a number of resolutions demanding the immediate, total and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from Lebanon. Naturally, Israel disregards such demands. The Government of the United States is committed to protect the aggressor and encourages Israel to keep its domination over the area and the people. Israel claims that by acting as the gendarme and by maintaining its troops, and any mercenaries it can enlist and establish, it will defend itself. But long before the Palestinians found refuge in

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine
Liberation Organization)

Lebanon the designs of Israel had been exposed. It will be recalled that Ben Gurion aimed at establishing a Christian State at least in south Lebanon. In his diaries one reads:

"The Moslem rule in Lebanon is artificial and easily undermined. A Christian State ought to be set up whose southern border would be the Litani River. Then we'll form an alliance with it."

Here I venture to ask: If the Litani River were to be the southern border of Lebanon, to what State would the Lebanese territory south of the Litani belong? That makes plain the so-called incursion, invasion, or occupation of south Lebanon since 1978.

That idea of Ben-Gurion apparently proved to be unattainable, so he noted "... All we need to do then is to find a Christian Lebanese Officer, perhaps no higher than a captain or a major, and win him over or buy him with money, so that he would declare himself the saviour of the Maronite population; then the Israeli army would enter Lebanon, occupy the territory in question and establish a Christian Government which would form an alliance with Israel."

The dream was to annex southern Lebanon, but the dreamers of Israel, like all dreamers, are awakened to reality when patriotic and nationalist forces confront them with determination and whatever weaponry they can secure. The sacred stones of Palestine are shattering Zionist aims. The resolute and firm stand of the Lebanese people, all the Lebanese people, transcending their affiliations and confessional groupings, have shattered those dreams. Israel has only one safe way out - to withdraw from all Palestinian, Lebanese and Syrian territory occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and to hasten with speed to the peace-negotiating table, under the auspices of the United Nations. But, then, why not this Council? The Council is entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security,

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine
Liberation Organization)

but before the responsibility of maintenance the Council must achieve that peace, which it should maintain. At this juncture we repeat our appeal to Council members to show no reluctance in endorsing and supporting the Secretary-General's endeavours to convene the International Peace Conference called for by the General Assembly. To one permanent member in particular we wish to say: Please heed this appeal and do not prove to be the obstacle.

The Palestine Liberation Organization wishes to state that an "alert" has been issued in Washington, D.C. The alert is attributed to official sources of the Administration and it reads:

"Possible PLO threat against US targets. You may be aware of charges in several Middle Eastern and particularly Palestinian circles that the United States knew of and approved Abu Jihad's assassination. On April 18 the State Department spokesman said that the United States condemns this act of political assassination, had no knowledge of and was not involved in any way in this assassination. It has come to our attention that the PLO leader, Arafat, may have personally approved a series of terrorist attacks against American citizens and facilities abroad, possibly in retaliation for last month's assassination of Abu Jihad. Any possible targeting of American personnel and facilities in retaliation for Abu Jihad's assassination would be totally reprehensible and unjustified. We would hold the PLO responsible for any such attacks."

In reply the Palestine Liberation Organization issued a statement this morning, and I should like to make it clear here. It states:

(continued in Arabic)

"The Palestine Liberation Organization considers this official US position as a grave indication and fresh proof of American intentions to carry

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine
Liberation Organization)

out acts of aggression against the Palestine Liberation Organization and its leadership. The PLO also considers it to be a continuation of the US position hostile to the Palestinian people and their sole, legitimate representative, the PLO, a position which has continued to cover up its crimes and its constant hostility to our people under a fabricated pretext that brands the struggle of the Palestinian people as terrorism and accuses its leadership of preparing for acts of terrorism. The Palestine Liberation Organization is fully aware of the political and operative objectives of the American claims. It considers those events to be an American tendency to become more involved in continuous acts of terrorism against our people and our leadership. This makes the PLO strongly alert to the dangers inherent in these American tendencies and hostility to the Palestinian people and their leadership.

"The PLO, while reminding US public opinion of its role in guaranteeing the safety of a number of US citizens on more than one occasion and in more than one place, despite the constant hostile position to which the United States Administration clings against the people of Palestine, their leadership and their just cause, and proceeding from a position of responsibility and deep awareness of the new scheme, reaffirms its ability to face up to that scheme in such a way as would expose it, frustrate it and guarantee the safety of the march and the leadership, and also uphold its reputation of honourable struggle far removed from terrorism and its commitment to internationally approved ways of struggle. The United States Administration can deceive no one and will not change its full support for the terrorists who are ruling Israel, because that support is very clear."

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization for his kind words addressed to me and to my country.

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

Mr. AL-SHAKAR (Bahrain) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. President, I am particularly pleased and proud to see you, a dear brother, presiding over the deliberations of the Security Council for the month of May. You represent a fraternal Arab country, Algeria, which is united with my country by very close and strong ties based on Arabism and a common history and future. Yours is an important responsibility and we are certain that, thanks to your experience, diplomatic skill and personal qualities, you will be able to conduct the work of the Council with great competence and effectiveness. I wish also to express our gratitude to your predecessor, Ambassador Zuze, the Permanent Representative of Zambia, on the exemplary manner in which he conducted the work of the Council during the month of April.

The Security Council recently met following Israel's flagrant aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Tunisia and Israel's assassination of Abu Jihad. We are here today to discuss Israel's invasion of southern Lebanon, which it carried out last week. The facts clearly prove that terrorist act perpetrated by Israel against Lebanon, a fraternal country, and no one can continue to try to cover up that act of criminal aggression by claiming that there was no proof that Israel had in fact committed that act of aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and against the security of its land and its people, as was the case with its aggression against Tunisia.

(Mr. Al-Shakar, Bahrain)

Israel, with its artillery and troops, invaded the southern part of Lebanon and the Beka'a area and sowed destruction in the two villages of Maydoon and Ain al Tina. That Zionist terrorist act resulted in the deaths of at least 40 people.

That Israeli incursion into Lebanon is a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter, the principles and norms of international law and all the values and principles of the United Nations. In fact, Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter states that all Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. Israel has never observed that Article of the Charter with respect to Lebanon or other Arab countries. The Israeli invasion of Lebanon demonstrates the Israeli leaders' hatred of the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples. That is why we can state without exaggeration that Israel's invasion of Lebanon is an act that must not be considered in isolation from events in the occupied Palestinian territories, that is, the resistance of the Palestinian people to the brutal Israeli occupation. That invasion occurred at a time when the heroic uprising of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories was intensifying, as it has been since last December. The persistence of that heroic uprising, which is now entering its sixth month, has become a threat to Israel and is a source of concern to its leaders. It threatens the intentions of the Israeli leaders to take over even more Arab territory.

The fuss created by Israel with respect to its security in order to justify its invasion of Lebanon is a fallacious and unacceptable argument. In fact, Israel has frequently created the same fuss concerning its earlier invasions of Lebanon and attacks against Tunisia and the Iraqi nuclear reactor. By its repeated attacks on Arab States, Israel is striving to destabilize Arab States and to sow terror in

(Mr. Al-Shakar, Bahrain)

the region in order for it to become a dominant force in the area, intimidate Arab States and thereby impose its own peace in the region. There is no doubt that Israel's invasion of Lebanon did not occur in a vacuum. Israel deliberately decided to invade Lebanon in order to divert the attention of the international community from the scope and consequences of the heroic uprising of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories, from the stone-throwing which the people have used to defend their national rights and to resist occupation, injustice and the Zionist practices that have been carried out for more than 20 years.

(Mr. Al-Shakar, Bahrain)

Israel is mistaken if it thinks that its invasion of Lebanon will put an end to the struggle of the Palestinian people and foil its heroic uprising, which is intensifying despite terrorist Israel's practices and crimes, which take the form of daily assassinations, murders, arrests, deportations, broken bones, and the demolition of houses in the occupied Palestinian territories and Lebanon. Its criminal policies will merely strengthen the determination of the Palestinian people to follow the path they have chosen for themselves in order to continue their legitimate resistance and attain their inalienable rights.

Israel's repeated acts of aggression against Lebanon are not new. The Security Council has been seized of them on more than one occasion and has adopted a number of resolutions on the subject, but these resolutions have not been respected by Israel. On the contrary, Israel has trampled them underfoot, believing that peace and security in Lebanon is a card which can be played by it to make Lebanon yield to the Zionist blackmail. This Zionist vision will never be realized, whatever Israel's policies of aggression. It can never decide Lebanon's future. Nor will its policies of expansion and terrorism, which seek to tear Lebanon, its land and its people, apart, ever shake the faith of Lebanon in its Arab character and national commitment.

As for peace and security within the southern borders of Lebanon, they cannot be achieved by invasion and aggression, nor by the occupation of a part of Lebanese soil by Israel; they will be achieved only by respect for and implementation of the relevant Security Council resolutions, particularly resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) and 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), which call for the complete, immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all Lebanese territory, and for Israel to respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity, airspace and territorial waters of Lebanon. They also demand the immediate cessation of acts of aggression or

(Mr. Al-Shakar, Bahrain)

invasion against Lebanese territory, and that the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) be enabled to fulfil the mandate entrusted to it under Security Council resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978).

Bahrain, which has stood at the side of Lebanon, a fraternal country, in defense of its sovereignty, security and territorial integrity - which have been violated by the Zionist enemy's invasion, occupation and deportation of its citizens - has again condemned the Israeli occupation and invasion of fraternal Lebanon and denounced the criminal aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and its citizens, which is in flagrant violation of all international standards and norms.

Consequently, Bahrain appeals to the Security Council to restore its credibility in Lebanon and Middle East by adopting a courageous and sincere attitude condemning Israel's terrorist expansionist policy of oppression and by taking the position that Lebanon expects of it in order to regain its security and stability. Naturally, this can only be achieved by adopting a resolution which dissuades Israel from this policy by ensuring that it is not encouraged or rewarded for its aggression or its invasion of Lebanon.

The Security Council is called on today to restore its credibility and put an end to Israel's unbridled conduct in Lebanon and its contempt for the sovereignty of a fraternal country which occupies a privileged position and is one of the founding Members of the Organization. If Israel is not dissuaded by the Council it will be encouraged to continue its acts of aggression in Lebanon, pursue all its plans of expansion and commit other acts of aggression. Indeed, the Security Council has an international responsibility to maintain security in Lebanon. This is an important responsibility of the Council which it and its members must

(Mr. Al-Shakar, Bahrain)

assume - by taking strong measures aimed at preventing Israel from embarking on other such adventures - if the Council truly wants to deter such aggression and prevent the repetition of such invasions in the future.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Bahrain for his kind words addressed to me and to my country.

The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MAKSOUUD (interpretation from Arabic): It is a source of pride to me, Sir, to see you presiding over the Council during this month, in particular because Algeria, that struggling militant Arab State, has always been in the forefront of those who have supported the rights of peoples. I am personally pleased and proud to see you, Sir, presiding over the Council in view of your wisdom and commitment to the causes of third world peoples, and in particular to the causes of the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples.

(Mr. Maksoud)

(spoke in English)

Once again the Security Council is called upon to deal with another aspect of Israel's addiction to aggression, invasion and suppression. Once again Lebanon, a founding Member of the United Nations and a founding member of the League of Arab States, has been treated to an aggressive incursion which tends to underline the constancy of Israel's objective of expansion.

We have heard, not only from Mr. Rabin but also from Prime Minister Shamir, that this latest incursion is routine. What does that routinization of Israel's aggression on Lebanon mean? What does it carry with it? Does it mean that Lebanon should expect more incursions? Does it assume that the frequency is an anticipated reality with which Lebanon has to live? Does it mean that the so-called security zone - which has been established in clear violation of Lebanon's sovereignty - is to be incorporated as a security zone for Israel, hence keeping the role of Lebanon's central Government in the south of Lebanon hanging? General Shamron stated that the murderous incursion has as its aim "to render the security zone more secure".

Then the Israeli representative yesterday, in responding to the Syrian representative, had the audacity to complain about what he called a libel against Israel, even an anti-Semitic libel. He quoted the Ambassador of the Syrian Arab Republic as speaking of an "expansionist policy" and said:

"I am shocked that none of the members of the Security Council saw fit to react to this libel". (S/PV.2813, p. 56)

Now what is the libel referring to? It is referring to a statement by the Syrian Ambassador, as follows:

(continued in Arabic)

"It is clear to all that the aim of the repression to which I have just referred is identical to the repression that is occurring today. The goal is

(Mr. Maksoud)

to create a state of psychosis that will compel the inhabitants of southern Lebanon to abandon their lands and property, thereby draining the area of its population and giving a free hand to the expansionist policy of the World Jewish Congress ...". (S/PV.2811, p. 28-30)

(spoke in English)

Where is the anti-Semitic statement? Or is it that the Israeli representative, as well as others, are going to interpret, through a form of political and intellectual terrorism, that any dissent from their official policy, any questioning of their aggressive designs, any criticism of their oppressive measures, any reference to their documented conferences of Zionism, is going to be treated as anti-Semitic in order to pre-empt any form of criticism, condemnation or scepticism about their ideas and policies?

This is but an example of the attempts by Israel and their representatives to harass the international community and forcibly silence it against any condemnation of their acts. It is unfortunate that he states that Israel is equally, like every other Member of the United Nations, committed to security and territorial integrity.

We challenge Israel to tell the world community what are the territories over which it claims to exercise sovereignty? Where are the borders it claims to be final and worthy of defence? Where is Israel extending to, in order that the world community should know where are the parameters of its borders? All these questions remain unanswered, because Israel is the only State in the world that does not reveal what its borders are. Where are its frontiers? What is the territory over which it claims sovereignty? Israel in this respect is a State in a state of becoming, and therefore any attempt to unravel the documented evidence of its expansionist objectives would be clearly denounced as anti-Semitism. I am sure - and the record has proved it - that the members of the United Nations Security

(Mr. Maksoud)

Council will not allow themselves to be subjected to this kind of diplomatic political and intellectual terrorism.

The Israeli representative claims that the security zone in the south of Lebanon is to be maintained only because the central Government of Lebanon cannot exercise its authority over it. Were it not for the tragic consequences of Israel's maintenance of the security zone, this would be a matter for historical laughter. Who since 1978 has prevented the central Government of Lebanon, the legitimate authority of Lebanon and the national army of Lebanon from extending to the south of Lebanon in order to thwart the Lebanese Government from assuming its full responsibilities up to the borders of Lebanon? Who since 1978 has encroached upon Lebanon through an invasionary mechanism and claimed to the world that it has withdrawn, while setting up a visible challenge to the central authority of Lebanon, namely by providing logistical, financial and military support to a mercenary group, guided, organized and deployed by the Israeli forces?

Since 1978 the national army of Lebanon has been disabled, and even the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) has been deliberately disabled from being deployed as a symbol and a mechanism for Lebanese sovereignty to be exercised. When the United Nations Security Council adopted resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978), it did so in order to enable the legitimate authority of Lebanon, with the help of the United Nations, to be extended up to the borders of Lebanon. Who has made it difficult for the Lebanese Government and difficult and almost impossible for the United Nations Force in the south of Lebanon to exercise their full authority? Who has made it impossible for Lebanon to exercise its authority in the south of Lebanon?

(Mr. Maksoud)

Therefore, when the Israelis claim that they have to maintain a so-called security zone in the south of Lebanon because of the absence of authority, we answer, without equivocation, let the Lebanese national authority and national army, with the assistance of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), be deployed in the south of Lebanon, and then the central Government of Lebanon will exercise its full authority and sovereignty. It is Israel that is directly responsible for paralyzing UNIFIL and preventing the Lebanese central Government from exercising its authority in the south of Lebanon.

Hence, it is easy to conclude how this act of contempt and defiance by Israel, that its causes and the continuous attempts to probe into the Lebanese body politic Israel carries out and carried out in its last incursion into the Bekaa and in the south are an attempt to harass the Lebanese and to prevent them from exercising their sovereignty inside the so-called security zone.

The visibility of the challenge by the Israeli mercenaries in the south of Lebanon to the national institution of Lebanon, namely, the Lebanese army, is not only an insult to the world community, but a deliberate attempt to further destabilize the Lebanese body politic.

If Member States of the United Nations proclaim their commitment to the national unity, integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon, then, it behoves them to do everything within their power, morally, diplomatically and even through deterrent measures such as sanctions, to impose upon the Israelis the need to comply with the international will as it has been articulated in the various Security Council resolutions pertaining to the south of Lebanon.

(Mr. Maksoud)

The uprising in the occupied Palestinian territories over the last six months, has brought about what many analysts and experts assert is the demoralization of the Israeli occupation forces in the West Bank and Gaza. The repressive measures and brutality which are well known and well documented indicate that the Israeli army has been demoralized and frustrated. A phenomenon of civil disobedience and non-violent resistance has, as I said earlier in this Council, brought out the best in Jewish values and traditions, and caused outrage, on the part of many in the Jewish communities throughout the world, at the recklessness and brutality of Israel's occupation. It has also brought out the worst in the behaviour of the Israeli establishment. One of the worst features of their behaviour is not merely the brutality of the Israelis in the occupied territories, but Israel's assumption that it can transform the south of Lebanon and the east Bekaa into a dumping ground for its frustrations. In order to distract attention from the uprising, to restore the so-called morale of the Israeli armed forces, Israel murdered Abu Jihad in Tunisia, and made its latest incursion into Lebanon; as if the Lebanese people, the more than 40 persons who were killed, could be called on to serve as the sacrificial elements to restore the so-called morale of Israel; as if the internal debate within the Zionist body politic could be extrapolated into either invasion or attack, because the Israeli establishment cannot face the consequences of the demoralization which the uprising has inflicted upon the Israeli body politic.

(Mr. Maksoud)

That is why we have assumed, perhaps over-ambitiously, that the Security Council would defend its own decisions and resolutions, and that, because of the confidence that Lebanon has placed in the United Nations, the repeated acts of defiance against Lebanon's sovereignty and integrity have become the actual as well as moral responsibility of the United Nations.

If Israel is allowed to perpetuate the tragedy Lebanon is suffering through its constant threats to Lebanon's integrity, sovereignty and people, then confidence in the United Nations, which is ultimately the essence, strength, stamina, and vitality of the United Nations will erode.

Lebanon, a small country with a great history, a founding Member of the United Nations, has testified before the world that smallness and bigness are irrelevant in terms of international law; that bigness must be accompanied by greatness; for the difference between a big Power and a great Power is the measure of wisdom, courage and independent judgement displayed on issues that might appear to be internally controversial.

That is why we consider this last incursion into Lebanon to be of major importance. We have heard advice that perhaps Lebanon should not come to the Security Council at this time. But, as Ambassador Fakhoury stated, Lebanon did not time the attack on it. Advice to Lebanon as to timing, should be readdressed to Israel, and directed to having it cease its incursions and aggressions.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank Ambassador Maksoud for the kind words he addressed to me and to my country.

(spoke in French)

I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of Algeria.

On 2 May Israeli land, naval and air invasion forces launched a new aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

The number of troops, the weapons used and their deployment over a large area of Lebanese territory mark this operation as a true invasion the extreme gravity of which cannot escape the Council's attention.

The ferocity of the battles, the many victims and the scale of the material damage and destruction, particularly in the village of Meidoun, inevitably remind us of previous invasions, those of 1978 and 1982.

Thus the Israel leaders have caused Lebanon to be dismembered and destabilized and completely exposed to Israeli attacks as an outlet for their troops' frustration at their failure to bring about pacification, their morale seriously shaken by the capacity for resistance of the Palestinian people in Gaza and the West Bank.

This new war of aggression imposed on the Lebanese people cannot be divorced from that being waged by the forces of oppression against the Palestinian people in the occupied territories. It is in fact an extension of it. The Zionist régime, once again revealing its vocation for external aggression - as recently against Tunisia - is seeking an immediate military solution to the difficulties it is undergoing in a territory for whose annexation it is actively preparing. The aggression against Lebanon is thus revealed for what it really is: a mask for the failure of the iron-fist policy in the occupied territories. We may, moreover, add that if the Zionist invasion forces hasten to withdraw from Lebanon that is only

(The President)

because the memory is still fresh of the failure inflicted on them by the forces of Lebanese national resistance during the invasion of Lebanon in 1982.

In Lebanon, as in the occupied Arab territories, what strikes most impartial observers - along with the pathetic means available to the oppressed faced with the extraordinary repressive machine of the oppressor and invader - is the presence of an unswerving determination to survive all Israeli attempts at national liquidation and dismemberment.

What inspires the Lebanese is their indestructible aspiration to see the integrity and sovereignty of their State survive, just as the Palestinians are inspired by their indestructible aspiration to see their nation again live in freedom and independence.

This year Zionism is celebrating 40 years of fait accompli, but fireworks cannot hide usurpation: the stones being thrown are a rejection of the occupation and the plunder. A people's history is not judged by or subject to the human view. Forty years is a long time compared with the life expectancy of Palestinians determined to combat occupation; it is but a short time compared with the history of a people determined to pursue their task of winning back all their rights.

While we are convinced that Lebanon will survive the fragmentation created and encouraged by the invader, and that its unity will emerge strengthened, we are also persuaded that - and I say this with conviction as representative of a country and people whose resistance continued for 132 years before freedom was regained - the struggle for freedom, dignity and national independence of the Palestinian people will triumph in the end.

The Israeli leaders cannot hope to solve the Palestinian question by burying the Palestinians in the ruins of their homes razed by bulldozers, as at Baita; nor can they shatter the sovereign will of Lebanon with the bombardment of Meidoun.

(The President)

The international community has expressed that conviction, in particular in the many resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly relating to respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and independence.

The international community is unanimously condemning the latest invasion of Lebanon. In coming to the Council sovereign Lebanon expects it to echo that international condemnation in accordance with the responsibilities conferred upon it by the Charter and to censure the arrogant and cynical aggression. It cannot but vigorously condemn the recent invasion of Lebanon by Israeli forces and demand that they be withdrawn from Lebanese territory immediately and completely and cease violating Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity and the security of its civilian population. The Council cannot but reaffirm once again its firm attachment to strict respect for Lebanon's sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity within internationally recognized borders.

Any hesitation by the Council and, a fortiori, any inaction could not fail to be interpreted by the Israeli leaders as encouragement of their policy of aggression and fait accompli and would thus have the most damaging consequences both for international peace and security and for the authority of this Council, which is entrusted with maintaining them.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

(continued in Arabic)

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic wishes to speak. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): It was not my intention to lengthen this meeting by replying to a statement devoid of any value - that made by the Israeli representative yesterday, in which he dwelt on some of the facts mentioned in my statement. Nevertheless I find myself compelled to address the Council to reaffirm the facts I gave.

One wonders: if the Council is not the appropriate forum in which to state and hear the truth, then what is it? Is it but a forum in which to hear the lies of the Israeli representatives and their claims and attempts to divert the attention of international public opinion from the truth of what is happening in the occupied territories and in southern Lebanon and from the true nature of the settler-expansionist policy pursued by Israel?

The Council must fulfil its role as enshrined in the United Nations Charter, the Charter it was my country's honour to sign as one of the founding Members of the world Organization, which is supposed to take a firm and courageous stand against aggressive racist régimes such as the Zionist-settler régime of Tel Aviv and the racist régime of Pretoria.

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

It is supposed to adopt measures that will ensure the cessation of their brutal policies against the peoples of Palestine, southern Africa and other occupied territories.

In my statement I said very clearly that Israel is the tool implementing the expansionist policies drawn up by the international Zionist conferences that have been organized since the end of the last century and that have planned the settlement of Palestine and expansion at the expense of Arab lands in the region in order to establish a so-called Greater Israel. This is an undeniable historical fact. If the Israeli representative qualified this fact as anti-Semitic, that means that he is practising intellectual terrorism in this Council, qualifying any word of truth as anti-Semitism. Maybe that representative has forgotten or feigned forgetfulness of the schemes drawn up by Zionist organizations for Greater Israel. He might have forgotten the map put forward by the World Zionist Conference at the peace conference at Versailles following the First World War. Maybe he has forgotten, feigned forgetfulness or wishes members of this Council to forget the phrase engraved on the door of the Israeli Knesset: "From the Euphrates to the Nile is your country, people of Israel".

As members here know, the Euphrates is in northern Syria and the Nile runs through the middle of Arab Egypt, that is to say, the expansionist dreams of Israel, which translate those of world Zionism of a Greater Israel, extend from the Euphrates to the Nile. This is not an anti-Semitic statement, and if the Israeli representative believes that it is then the equation is clear: world Zionism is anti-Semitic. We as Arabs and Semites are anti-world Zionism because it is a world movement that is anti-Semitic. We distinguish between Judaism as a religion with its civilized values and long history, on the one hand, and the Zionist movement, as an anti-Semitic movement, on the other, because the latter is based on aggression, settlement and racist thinking. Therefore we are anti-Zionism and

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

distinguish between Zionism and Judaism, which is part of our heritage.

Christianity as well is part of our heritage as is Islam.

The Israeli representative fears the words "expansionist policy of Israel". I would pose a question to members of this Council: What does the annexation of Syrian Arab Golan mean? Does it not mean an expansionist policy? What does the establishment of a "security zone" in southern Lebanon mean? Does it not mean an expansionist policy? What does the occupation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and the refusal to return them mean? Do they not mean an expansionist policy? What does the occupation of the demilitarized zone established by the truce agreements of 1949 mean? Is it not a policy of expansion? Israel has carried all of this out under the slogan of achieving Israel's security. It has established a "security zone" in southern Lebanon to achieve Israel's security. It has annexed the Syrian Arab Golan heights so as to ensure Israel's security. It refuses to withdraw from the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories in order to ensure Israel's security. I should like to ask now: What does the doctrine of Israeli security mean? Very clearly - and as clarified by Israeli practices in the region - it means an expansionist doctrine.

It brings to mind very clearly, without any distortion of historical facts, that in all its dimensions it is equivalent to the nazi Lebensraum doctrine. Nazi Germany occupied Austria, Poland and many other places in Europe under the doctrine of Lebensraum, which was only a cover-up for occupation and expansion. Now world Zionism brings up the doctrine of Israel's security. It occupies and expands in order to ensure Israel's security. No one can be convinced by those lies and distortions of facts and history to which the Israeli representatives are accustomed to resort before this Council and other organs and forums in the United Nations. We hope that members of this Council will all take a stand dictated by their consciences and by their responsibility as members of this lofty forum,

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

which is responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. We call upon them to stand against Israeli aggression and take all necessary measures to stop it and to deter Israel from continuing along that path.

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

Mr. BEIN (Israel): I have listened very carefully to accusations in the Council - accusations that are accepted even when they are not true. What I am not ready to accept is lies.

The Syrian Ambassador is probably very well versed in Nazi terminology, such as he used just a minute ago, and we all know who use the Lebensraum ideology. Greater Syria is not a dream of Israel; 35,000 soldiers in Lebanon are not Israel's but Syrian.

What I want to point out is that two representatives here claimed that I, supposedly without basis, have accused the Syrian Ambassador of using anti-Semitic terminology. I have before me S/PV.2811, page 28-30, from which I quote the following from the Syrian Ambassador's statement:

"The goal is to create a state of psychosis that will compel the inhabitants of southern Lebanon to abandon their lands and property, thereby draining the area of its population and giving a free hand to the expansionist policy of the World Jewish Congress, with Israel as its agent."

This is not the first time that has been done here; it has been done in the General Assembly: representatives try to mix the terminologies "Zionist" and "Jewish". That is a very clear anti-Semitic tendency, and a very clear anti-Semitic libel when the Jewish Congress is accused of an "expansionist policy ... with Israel as its agent".

Yesterday I said that I was very astonished that none of the members of the Security Council reacted to this anti-Semitic libel and that it was very clear from what source these ideas come to Syria, since the arch-Nazi alive today, Alois Brunner, resides in Syria under State immunity.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I take it that the Council is ready to vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

(The President)

There being no objection, it is so decided.

First, I shall call on members of the Council who wish to make a statement before the vote.

Mr. BIRCH (United Kingdom): Mr. President, it is a pleasure to see you in the Chair and to know that the Council's work is in such good hands. We look forward to working with you.

I should also like to express our thanks to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Zambia, who guided us with his habitual skill and good humour through the month of April.

My delegation listened with care to the statements which have been made in the debate and in particular to those by the Permanent Representative of Lebanon and the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel. I draw attention to the declaration on the subject made by the Presidency of the European Community on behalf of the 12 members on 6 May.

We have heard an unhappily familiar tale. There is now a 10-year history of destructive interventions by Israeli forces in Lebanon and occupation by Israel of a part of Lebanese territory. There is equally a history of armed attacks mounted from Lebanese territory against Israel. This Council, given its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, cannot ignore them. Both forms of attack are unacceptable; both undermine the stability of the area; both make more difficult the achievement of the peace and security which Israel, as well as Lebanon, has the right to expect. But not only is the recent Israeli action a violation of Lebanese sovereignty; it is also a disproportionate response. Far from providing a solution to the problem we all recognize, it makes the solution all the more difficult. We continue to urge Israel to complete its withdrawal from southern Lebanon and to allow the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon to deploy its forces to the international border, in accordance with Security Council resolution 425 (1978).

(Mr. Birch, United Kingdom)

The destruction of houses and the displacement of civilians in Lebanon, as in the occupied territories, cannot be the way forward. The damage done by Israel to its own cause is manifest: its attempt by force to acquire greater security in the short term is prejudicial to the need which it shares with its neighbours, that is, greater security in the long term and stability for the region as a whole.

The draft resolution before the Council, as we have made clear to its authors, would respond more effectively to the needs of the situation if - like Security Council resolution 509 (1982) - it included a call for an end to all military activities across the Lebanese-Israeli border. But in view of the excess, yet again, of Israeli actions and of their damaging consequences, my delegation will vote for the draft resolution.

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

I shall now put the draft resolution contained in document S/19868 to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, China, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Nepal, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: United States of America

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The result of the vote is as follows: 14 in favour and 1 against. The draft resolution has not been adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Security Council.

I shall now call on members of the Council who wish to make a statement after the vote.

Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): Mr. President, my delegation is pleased to see you in the Chair guiding our deliberations. My country enjoys excellent relations with Algeria. We are aware of your extensive experience in the United Nations and appreciate your diplomatic skills, grace and good humour.

We take this occasion also to express our deep gratitude to your predecessor, Ambassador Zuze of Zambia, who led us firmly and well during a busy month.

Today the United States voted against the draft resolution on southern Lebanon. As we have explained on previous, similar occasions, we believe the Security Council should not address the problems of southern Lebanon in resolutions that fail to recognize the attacks and reprisals originating on both sides of the Israeli-Lebanese border.

The United States strongly supports the independence, territorial integrity and unity of Lebanon. We have called publicly and repeatedly for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Lebanon and the extension of central-government authority throughout the country. This is still our position. We are deeply concerned at the recent heavy casualties, the devastation of property, the displacement of individuals, the cross-border shellings, and other activities in both directions.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

The sad truth remains that as long as armed, extremist elements use southern Lebanon to stage terrorist attacks against Israel, the border between Israel and Lebanon cannot be secure. All those who provide funds and arms to militias and other groups that operate in southern Lebanon, while denying the authority of the central Lebanese Government, must share the responsibility for the continued instability in that area.

The United States is aware that armed Palestinian elements, supported by Hezbollah and other groups, have made repeated attempts in the last four months to enter Israel from Lebanon to carry out violent acts. Therefore we cannot accept a resolution that does not acknowledge the well-known fact that hostile acts against Israel are originating in Lebanon.

My Government reaffirms its commitment to United Nations Security Council resolution 425 (1978). We abhor the senseless loss of life and recurrent terrorist violence that afflict the lives of those who, on either side of the Israeli-Lebanese border, desire to live peacefully. We remain ready to work with all parties for the restoration of peace and security for both Lebanon and Israel. We continue to believe it essential that there be agreed security arrangements to assure stability and security in this area.

Finally, my delegation must comment on the absurd charge made by one speaker this morning that the concern of my Government for the welfare of its citizens abroad is somehow intended as a threat to others. I recall that in this Council Chamber in October 1985 a representative of that same group expressed utter contempt for the safety of an American citizen, Mr. Leon Klinghoffer, brutally murdered aboard the Achille Lauro. It is no longer a secret who murdered Mr. Klinghoffer, and it is therefore obvious that when representatives of that group speak in this Chamber we feel concern for the safety of other American citizens.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the United States for his kind words to me.

(continued in Arabic)

The representative of Lebanon has asked to speak, and I call on him.

Mr. FAKHOURY (Lebanon) (interpretation from Arabic): It is regrettable that the Security Council was unable to adopt a draft resolution condemning the Israeli invasion of southern Lebanon and western Bekaa due to the opposition of the United States of America, the great Power that is currently attempting to achieve a comprehensive solution of the crisis in the Middle East. This United States position comes at a time of debate between the moderates and the extremists in Israel itself. The extremists might consider it as encouragement for them to continue their aggressive policy against Lebanon and to continue to apply their new theory of the need to maintain security in the security zone established by Israel in order to preserve the security of its northern region. From one theory to the other and from one doctrine to the other Israel continues to invade and to carry out its practices without deterrence.

Israel might also consider the United States position as encouragement for the policy of interference in the internal affairs of Lebanon. Lebanon fears that the new Israeli storming of southern Lebanon will fall within the framework of that policy. If this is true, it will be of extreme gravity because Lebanon has only three months before its presidential elections this year. There are precedents for Israel's interference in the internal affairs of Lebanon. It invaded Lebanon and occupied its capital in 1982, just before the presidential elections of that year.

The delegation of Lebanon cannot fail to express its thanks and appreciation to you, Sir, and to the other members of the Council who voted for the draft resolution. We are entitled to wonder whether the voices of all those

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

representatives are wrong and the one dissenting voice, that of the United States, is the only right one. That question need not be answered. The United States of America bears full responsibility for the failure to adopt the draft resolution before the Council. It is responsible before Lebanese public opinion and before all States.

It is responsible in particular for the fact that Israel did not wait for the vote on the draft resolution, apparently confident in advance of what the result would be. Indeed, at 2 p.m. Lebanese time Israel shelled the village of Kabrikha with the missile-launching Cobra helicopter gunships. That town is outside the so-called security zone. At present we do not have information about damage to property or loss of life. That is yet another example of continued Israeli aggression against Lebanon. Israel's insistence upon the continuation of the policy of aggression for its own sake is again living proof of its flouting of Security Council resolutions, the United Nations Charter and international law and norms and of its contempt for the Council itself and its debates.

Members of the Council and speakers at previous meetings have spared me the effort of replying to what was said by the representative of Israel. In their statements they have refuted the pretexts and the claims repeatedly put forward by the representatives of Israel on every occasion. In their statements they have expressed support for Lebanon and solidarity with its Government and people. I thank you, Mr. President, and I thank them.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): There are no further speakers on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the current stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.