



Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2699
18 July 1986

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
SIX HUNDRED AND NINETY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 18 July 1986, at 12 noon

President: Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand)

Members:

Australia	Mr. WOOLCOTT
Bulgaria	Mr. TSVETKOV
China	Mr. LI Luye
Congo	Mr. GAYAMA
Denmark	Mr. BRUCKNER
France	Mr. BROCHAND
Ghana	Mr. GBEHO
Madagascar	Mr. RAKOTONDAMBOA
Trinidad and Tobago	Mr. ALLEYNE
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. SAFRONCHUK
United Arab Emirates	Mr. AL-SHAALI
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. MAXEY
United States of America	Ms. BYRNE
Venezuela	Mr. PABON GARCIA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The full 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 12.10 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE UNITED NATIONS INTERIM FORCE IN
LEBANON (S/18164 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1)

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Lebanon in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the 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 conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr.Fakhoury (Lebanon) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) covering the period 10 April to 10 July 1986, which is contained in document S/18164 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1. Members of the Council also have before them the following other documents: S/18202, letter dated 7 July 1986 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; and S/18226, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.

(The President)

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Australia, Bulgaria, China, 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 and Venezuela

The PRESIDENT: There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has thus been adopted unanimously as resolution 586 (1986).

(The President)

I shall now call upon those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. BROCHAND (France) (interpretation from French): The Security Council has met to decide upon the twentieth renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), and, without concealing its concern about the conditions in which that Force is being used, France wishes to reaffirm its commitment to UNIFIL.

Last April my country proposed that the Security Council decide in favour of a shorter mandate, as it had already done on several earlier occasions. France considered that the Council should prompt the international community to make a fairer appraisal of UNIFIL's activities. We stated that we wished

"to induce the countries concerned to reflect and to consider the situation,"

(S/PV.2681, p. 14-15)

and, in that spirit, we requested the Secretary-General to report to the Council.

Of course, we must observe that many obstacles - as the report testifies - still lie in the way of action by the Force in accordance with its mandate as set forth in Security Council resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978). We can therefore only deplore the continuing difficulties encountered in the negotiations being held by the Secretariat.

Nevertheless, we consider that the adoption of resolution 583 (1986), by which the Council voted - unanimously, for the first time - to extend the mandate, indicated that our appeal for an urgent consideration of the problems facing the Force had been heard. The past three months have provided time for the reflection that we urged.

(Mr. Brochand, France)

The usefulness of UNIFIL's activities has been broadly recognized. Its financing, while still a matter of concern, is now assured on a broader basis. Our desire to rebalance responsibilities and risks within UNIFIL has met with understanding. Lastly, we note with satisfaction the Secretary-General's renewed efforts and we wish to express to him our encouragement and to urge him to pursue resolutely his difficult negotiations in the field with the various parties involved.

In the more positive context that has now been created, it is quite clear that the extension of the mandate cannot henceforth be a mere matter of routine. We are not facing the question before us in the context of a broader responsibility. My country thus continues to give it the response it has always given because of its devotion to the unity, sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon.

That is why France, which makes a particularly significant contribution to the Interim Force and which is ready, as long as UNIFIL is considered necessary, to continue that support, voted in favour of the renewal of its mandate for a six-month period, as requested by the Government of Lebanon and recommended by the United Nations Secretary-General.

Mr. MAXEY (United Kingdom): My delegation welcomes the unanimous vote by which the Council has decided to extend the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) for a further period of six months, in accordance with the request made by the Government of Lebanon. My Government has steadfastly supported the deployment of the Force with the aim, set out in Security Council resolution 425 (1978), of securing the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory, the restoration of international peace and security and the return of

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

the Lebanese Government's effective authority in the area. There can be no doubt that UNIFIL is an important factor for stability in the area and that it embodies the international community's commitment to Lebanon. We consider its provision of humanitarian assistance to the local population in its area of operation to be of particular value. While my Government favours the continuation of UNIFIL's role, however, it should be understood that we do not believe that the renewal of its mandate should be looked upon as automatic. We look for real progress in the coming mandate period towards full implementation of UNIFIL's mandate. We welcome the Secretary-General's conclusion in paragraph 28 of his report of 17 June that the United Nations should pursue a process of negotiation with the two Governments concerned in order to reach agreement with them on practical measures for bringing this about. His efforts to that end, which he has pursued through the visits to the area of Under-Secretary-General Goulding and Mr. Aimé, have our full support and co-operation.

An essential component of any solution to the tense and unhappy situation in southern Lebanon, as the Secretary-General's report indicates, is the completion of the withdrawal of Israeli forces to the international border. In this regard we welcome the Israeli assurance, referred to in paragraph 25 of the report, that it does not intend to maintain a military presence in Lebanon indefinitely. In these matters I regret that there tends to be nothing more enduring than the temporary. We look to the Israeli Government to take full account of this Council's unanimous wish to secure a rapid end to the present unsatisfactory situation in which Israeli forces and others controlled by them occupy Lebanese territory and prevent the exercise of Lebanese sovereignty.

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

My delegation recognizes that a number of developments are required to bring about peaceful and stable conditions on the border between Israel and Lebanon. A recent example of the continuing difficulties was the violent incident on the night of 9-10 July at Rosh Hanigra, and there was another yesterday at Jezzine. But we draw encouragement from the express resolve of the parties concerned that the situation should not be allowed to revert to that which obtained in 1982.

In renewing the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months the Council has, I believe, responded positively to the Secretary-General's call for a sustained effort by the United Nations to find a way of implementing Security Council resolution 425 (1978) in full. But it is hardly necessary for me to point out that uncertainty and doubt will continue to surround this effort for as long as the financing of the Force remains in its present critical state. It is crucial, therefore, for the effectiveness of the international community's efforts to resolve the problems of southern Lebanon, that Member States pay promptly and in full both their current assessed contributions to UNIFIL and the backlog of arrears which some have built up. This applies with particular force to permanent members of the Council. My delegation is encouraged that certain countries have reconsidered their earlier refusal to pay their assessed contributions and urges them to make also the payments for which they are in arrears.

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

Our gratitude to the troop-contributing countries is all the greater in so far as they continue to absorb a higher proportion of the cost than should be the case. I should like to express my delegation's particular appreciation of the courage and discipline displayed by the officers and men of UNIFIL, who operate in difficult and often dangerous conditions. I have no doubt that all members of the Council share our view that harassment of UNIFIL by armed elements, from whatever side or quarter, is totally unacceptable and that it is incumbent on any Member State in a position to exert influence to do all it can to put an end to such actions. All the parties involved are obliged to co-operate fully with the Force in the exercise of its mandate from this Council. Our sincere thanks go also to the Force Commander, Major-General Hagglund, to his military and civilian staff, and to the officers of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) attached to his command, who have carried out their responsibilities with great professionalism and dedication on behalf of the international community.

Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Today the Security Council has met once again to extend the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). Our consideration of this item serves as a stark reminder of Israel's ongoing aggression in southern Lebanon, and thus indicates the continuing relevance of the tasks that have been entrusted to UNIFIL in pursuance of Council resolutions.

Unfortunately, we must once again conclude that the Security Council's demands, very clearly formulated in UNIFIL's mandate, have remained unfulfilled because of Israel's stubborn refusal to withdraw its troops unconditionally from the entire territory of Lebanon. For that reason, because of the actions of Tel Aviv, UNIFIL has so far been deprived of any opportunity to carry out the

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

functions entrusted to it - the main one being, as set forth in Security Council resolution 425 (1978), to confirm the withdrawal of the aggressor's troops to the international boundary.

The reasons for the present extremely difficult, indeed dangerous, situation are obvious. Israel continues to lord it over Lebanese territory. As a result of the liberation struggle of the patriotic forces in Lebanon, the usurpers have been obliged to abandon part of the territory they seized. Nevertheless, Israel continues to hang on to border areas in Lebanon, where, relying on local mercenaries, it has illegally and in violation of the elementary rules of international law created the so-called security zone.

On the whole, as the Secretary-General's report indicates, there has been no reduction in the scope of the acts of aggression carried out by the Israeli army and its henchmen against the Arab population. As a result of their aggression, they seized the southern part of Lebanon, and Israel is now attempting by all the means in its power to maintain its presence in that sovereign country and to create there a beachhead for striking new blows deep into Lebanese territory and for destabilizing the general situation in Lebanon.

It is obvious that Israel's acts are aimed also at heightening international tension and undermining the efforts of the Lebanese to normalize the situation in their country. Evidence of this is the most recent barbaric air raids on populated regions in the Beirut area.

We know exactly who stands behind Israel, who makes it impossible to call the impenitent aggressor to reason and to ensure the implementation of the decisions adopted by the Security Council, including those relating to the carrying out of UNIFIL's mandate.

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

It would not be a bad thing if the United States were to give some thought to the statement contained in the Secretary-General's report in document S/18164, dated 17 June 1986, to the effect that the presence of its "strategic ally", Israel, in southern Lebanon not only leads to a further escalation of violence but, indeed, works to the detriment of Israel itself.

The Soviet Union roundly condemns the ongoing aggression by Israel in Lebanon and expresses its solidarity with the Lebanese people, which is resisting the occupation. The key to solving the Lebanese problem is clearly indicated in Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), which demand that Israel withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally from all Lebanese territory. The sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Lebanese State must be respected and an end must be put to the arbitrary treatment of that country's civilian population. In carrying out those tasks, the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) has an important role to play, as is indicated in its mandate. In our view, UNIFIL's presence should promote the speedy implementation of the essential goal - namely, to ensure the unconditional withdrawal of Israeli occupying forces from all Lebanese territory.

The Soviet Union views the problem of ensuring the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon in the general context of efforts to achieve a comprehensive peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict. The principles and machinery for such a settlement are described in the well-known initiative put forward by the Soviet Union. First and foremost, what is required is an international conference on the Middle East, the immediate convening of which has repeatedly been supported by the General Assembly and an overwhelming majority of States Members of the Organization.

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

In the light of the present situation, and taking into account the request made by the Lebanese Government as well as the recommendation by the Secretary-General, the Soviet delegation supports a decision to extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period. We therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution before the Council. At the same time, the Soviet Union believes that the presence of UNIFIL in Lebanon is a purely temporary and provisional step - as has, in fact, been stressed by preceding speakers - and should by no means be construed as a way of freezing the situation to serve the interests of the Israeli aggressor. We trust, also, that if any new developments should occur in the situation the Secretary-General will promptly inform the Security Council, which, if necessary, would meet again to take the necessary decisions.

The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of Lebanon.

Mr. FAKHOURY (Lebanon) (interpretation from Arabic): On behalf of the delegation of Lebanon, Sir, it gives me pleasure to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of July. I am confident that your rich diplomatic experience will enable you to conduct the Council's business with your customary wisdom, ability, courtesy and tact.

It gives me pleasure also to convey to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Madagascar, our appreciation for his exemplary presidency of the Council during the past month.

The Council's unanimous decision to extend the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) for a further six months deserves our thanks and gratitude. We consider this support to be a positive indication of the Council's wish to shoulder its responsibilities and to implement fully, speedily and completely Security Council resolution 425 (1978) and all subsequent resolutions on the subject.

The last time I appeared before the Council I made it clear that Lebanon had never considered the establishment of UNIFIL and the extension of its mandate to be an end in itself: it was only a means to implement the will of the international community, as expressed in resolution 425 (1978). The extension of the mandate of the international force without there having been any progress on the ground falls short of our objective.

The report of the Secretary-General (S/18164) of 17 June, and the annex thereto (S/18164/Add.1), dated 10 July, are crystal clear concerning the necessity to implement the relevant resolutions.

The continued grave and volatile situation in southern Lebanon results from Israel's refusal to implement the resolutions of the Security Council which call for its complete and unconditional withdrawal from Lebanese territory, for the

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

deployment of international forces within internationally recognized boundaries, and for the exercise of sovereignty and authority by the Lebanese Government over all its territories, so that southern Lebanon may become a region of security, peace and stability.

Therefore, the differences of opinion and position between Lebanon and Israel referred to in the report are only natural and come as no surprise. Ever since 1978 Lebanon has been calling upon the Council to implement its resolutions, while Israel has been intransigent in its rejection of Council resolutions and in blocking their implementation. Lebanon's insistence on the implementation of those resolutions proceeds from the principle of its right to liberate its territory, to protect its boundaries and to maintain its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The Secretary-General's report and the annex thereto have enumerated in detail the incidents and practices that took place in UNFIL's zone of operation in the period 10 April-10 July 1986.

A few days ago, precisely on the night of 14-15 July, Israel added a new episode to the series of its acts of aggression: its military jets bombed three villages well inside Lebanese territory, only a few miles away from the capital, Beirut. On 10 July, Israel had also bombed the Ein El Helwa Camp near Sidon. Israel's naval blockade of the ports of Sidon and Tyre remains in force.

Israel must realize that security, peace and stability in the south and in the region are conditional upon renunciation of the policy of occupation and aggression; Israel must abandon its intransigent refusal to implement the Council's resolutions.

In conclusion, I should like to place on record the thanks and appreciation of the Government of Lebanon for the continuing efforts of the Secretary-General, and his associates.

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

I should also like to place on record our gratitude to Major General Hagglund, and his command, to the officers, enlisted men and civilian employees, of the international force, and to the international observers. We are similarly indebted to the contributing States for their generosity and for the sacrifices they have made in the cause of peace and security in Lebanon and in the region.

Our special appreciation goes to the previous Commander of the interim Force, Lieutenant-General Callaghan, for his wise leadership.

The delegation of Lebanon hopes that the appeal made by the Secretary-General in his latest report will evoke a speedy and generous response that will reduce UNIFIL's large budgetary deficit and contributing States' accumulated arrears.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Lebanon for his kind words addressed to the presidency.

I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Israel 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 him 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. Netanyahu (Israel) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I invite the representative of Israel to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): Mr. President, I should like to congratulate you on the excellent manner in which you have been conducting the work of the Council, as I should like to congratulate your predecessor for having completed such work.

In view of some of the remarks that have been made here today about my country's policies and practices on the matter under discussion, I should like to spell out exactly what is our policy and what is our practice, because I think the reality conflicts rather sharply with some of the statements made here.

We have no interest whatsoever in Lebanon's territory or, for that matter, in Lebanon's internal affairs, as such. We do have an interest in our territory and in our internal affairs, and the chief problem that we have been facing from that border for many years now is the threat of terrorist attacks against our towns and villages in the northern part of Israel. That threat manifested itself on many occasions in the form of armed incursions, terrorist attacks on villages, rocketings, shellings, and the like. Our policy, therefore, is geared to prevent that.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

If we talk about how to prevent that, we must also ask who will prevent it. The basic problem that we find on the other side of the border is the absence of a body or an authority or a power that is able to police that area, to discharge the most fundamental responsibility of sovereignty, namely, to control one's own territory and to control armed incursions from one's territory against a neighbouring State. In this regard, we view UNIFIL as a positive force because it introduces a measure of stability into a very unstable area, one that has a power vacuum in terms of a central authority. But that is not UNIFIL's mandate, nor could it be UNIFIL's principal activity. It is a by-product of the situation in Lebanon and of UNIFIL's deployment there. Similarly, UNIFIL cannot, regrettably, police that area against terrorist attacks. It contributes to that and it helps in a measurable but not decisive way. Having visited that border just last week and spoken to our commanders, to the commanders of UNIFIL and to some of the soldiers there, I believe there is no question that UNIFIL has been helping. By the same token, however, there is no question in our minds - or, for that matter, in the mind of any fair-minded observer - that it is not within UNIFIL's capacity to carry out the policing action that ideally and normally, and in any other circumstances, would be expected of the Government of Lebanon.

But that is not the only area that the Government of Lebanon is not able to police. Both the representative of Lebanon and the representative of the Soviet Union have spoken of "Lebanese sovereignty" and "the Lebanese Government" - to which I raise a simple question: How can we speak of the south when we cannot even speak of Lebanese sovereignty and a central authority in the Lebanese capital itself, Beirut, which today is under direct occupation of the Syrian army? And to

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

borrow a phrase from the Soviet representative, we know who stands behind them. The Lebanese Government is not able to discharge that fundamental authority in the very seat of its own Government, let alone in the distant south.

The results are interesting: if one charts the number of incidents and killings and casualties in Lebanon, one will see that they are considerably higher in the vicinity of Beirut than they are in the south. In fact, over the last year there has been a significant reduction in the number of cross-border attacks in the south. Unfortunately those attacks have not ceased. If they had, our particular activities would not be necessary. In other words, we are interested in protecting our northern border, and we take actions vis-à-vis the terrorist concentrations and attacks that emanate from the south of Lebanon because the Government of Lebanon has no effective control, and certainly no effective security control, over any part of its territory, including over one that is contiguous to ours.

Now, we would be the first to welcome a change in that situation. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss with the Government of Lebanon, and with any element in Lebanon, the possibility of making security arrangements in the south that would ensure for us the safety and peace needed by our citizens in the north. So far we have met with a blank wall, as far as such talks are concerned. In the absence of a negotiating partner and of an effective authority in the south, we continue to take action of the kind that we took the other day. That boatful of terrorists was not aimed at the security zone; it was aimed at Israel proper, and we blocked it in order to prevent the kinds of incursions that have been attempted in the last year, none of which has penetrated the fence, our border, but many have been tried and have failed. That incident was another such attempt. The attempt

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

was not to strike at Israel or at Israel's soldiers; it was to strike at Israel's civilian centres, and that is, of course, something that every Government not only can take action to prevent but must take action to prevent, because its first obligation is to protect its citizens.

I did not hear any reference to that action on the part of the representative of Lebanon, nor to the fact that the car bombs in Jezzine - one exploded and the other was caught in time the other day - were deployed not by a Lebanese fighting for the so-called liberation of south Lebanon, but by a citizen of Syria holding a Syrian passport. So what we have is a war of terror directed against Israel. It is directed by outside forces, those who stand behind those outside forces who speak here of aggression and of territorial sovereignty.

Those words ring rather hollow not only because of their indirect policies in Lebanon and their direct policies in places like Afghanistan - not only because of the backing that Syria and others give to those groups - but because of the fact that, in summation, there is no Lebanese authority to exert the kind of sovereignty and the kind of security which certainly the citizens of Lebanon demand for themselves but which we, as neighbours of Lebanon, unconditionally believe is our right to have on our side of the border.

Until the Government of Lebanon is able to discharge that responsibility, we shall continue to take action to defend our citizens and we shall continue to hold out our hand to anyone in Lebanon who will assume that responsibility.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Israel for his kind words addressed to the presidency.

Ms. BYRNE (United States of America): Contrary to allegations made by one member of this Council, the United States has steadfastly worked to support the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon. We believe that the best means to bring permanent stability to southern Lebanon would be agreement on long-term security arrangements relating to the Israel-Lebanon border. In the interim, there appears to be no real alternative to UNIFIL. Therefore, my Government voted today to extend its mandate. UNIFIL has clearly contributed to efforts to bring stability to southern Lebanon despite the limitations placed upon it.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Lebanon.

Mr. FAKHOURY (Lebanon) (interpretation from Arabic): Members of the Council must have noted that the representative of Israel once again has given us views that divert attention from the basic subject before the Council, which is southern Lebanon. He should be the last person entitled to speak of occupation. In alleging the non-existence of Lebanese authority in the south, he seems to have forgotten that part of the mandate of the international Force is to help the Lebanese Government to extend its authority and sovereignty in the south, and that Israel is a party that opposes the implementation of Security Council resolution 425 (1978) and does not allow the deployment of the international Force to internationally recognized boundaries. It is Israel that does not allow the international Force to help the Lebanese Government to extend its sovereignty.

(Mr. Fakhoury, Lebanon)

Some of the matters referred to by the representative of Israel fall within the purview of Lebanon's internal affairs, for which Lebanon alone bears responsibility. Lebanon considers that the implementation of resolution 425 (1978) and follow-up resolutions would guarantee regional stability, security and peace. That is the aim of those resolutions.

The Israeli representative's proposal for negotiations with the Lebanese Government or with various organizations or elements is out of the question. Let Israel implement resolution 425 (1978); let Israel withdraw from Lebanon; I assure the Israeli representative that the Lebanese Government would then be fully able to extend its authority and sovereignty and ensure regional security.

Let Israel give such an arrangement a try. Israel may say that a security zone is the best alternative, but there is another alternative, decided upon by this Council. Let Israel be kind enough to accept it and to declare its acceptance.

The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

