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Introduction

The history of the Middle East involves thousands of years of complex relationships and engagements. The Middle East is home to a multitude of non-state actors that the United States views as terrorist organizations. The Lebanese-based Shia organization Hezbollah is one of these non-state actors. The goal of this paper is to address Hezbollah's impact in the present day Middle East and what should be expected from Hezbollah as the Arab Spring revolutionizes the Middle East. Also, this paper will define the cyber capabilities of Hezbollah and the threat that these capabilities pose to world security. More specifically, this paper will cover the national security of the United States. An understanding of how and why Hezbollah was created is necessary in order to understand the impact Hezbollah has today and will have in the future.
History

Lebanon is located in the Middle East in a geostrategic location between Israel, Syria, Turkey, and the Mediterranean Sea. Lebanon has a demographic that presents a diverse, often disparate socio-economic portrait of Lebanon’s people. In 1943 when Lebanon gained its independence from France, a “three president system was implemented (Norton). France created a political structure based upon the three major religious groups. Each of the three major religious groups, Maronite Christians, Sunni Muslims, and Shia Muslims, were granted one of the three presidents based upon the size of each religious group by the French.

The size of each religious group was determined by the French Census of 1932. However, the census did not take into account population changes across the distribution of the three major religions/political entities which had occurred over the next 11 years, and was considered inaccurate. France awarded the most powerful position, President, to the largest religious group, the Maronite Christians. The second most powerful position of Prime Minister was given to the second largest group, the Sunni Muslims. The third most powerful position of Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies was given to the Shia Muslims. While the President and Prime Minister shared near-equal powers, including the power of veto, the Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies possessed significantly less power overall and also did not have the power of veto. This left the Shia Muslims feeling neglected in the political system with no way to voice their opinion.
The precursor to Hezbollah started in the 1970s when Saddam Hussein began to feel threatened by the Shia Muslims. Saddam persecuted many Shia Muslims before a majority of this group escaped. Most of the Shia Muslims sought refuge in Lebanon with new beliefs of revolution in the Lebanese government. Saddam’s ban on Shia Muslims from entering Iraq created a large and fairly disgruntled base of Shia Muslims within Lebanon.

Iran’s connection to the creation of Hezbollah began when Khomeini was expelled from Iraq along with other Shia clerics (“Hizballah (Party of God)”). Among the Shia Muslims that were expelled from Iran was Ayatollah Khomeini, the former Supreme Leader of Iran and the head of the Iranian Revolution. Two other key players in the creation of Hezbollah were the Shia clerics Subhi al-Tufayli and Abbas al-Musawi. Al-Musawi is famous for mentoring Sayyid Hassan Nasrallah, the leader of Hezbollah since February 16, 1992. Hezbollah evolved out of the transnational politics and geopolitical conditions of the 1980s, beginning with the aftermath of the Iranian revolution.

On June 6, 1982, Israel invaded Lebanon after an exchange of fire on the Israel – Lebanon border. The southern Shia originally welcomed the Israelis peacefully, but their extended presence created discontent and eventually the creation of Hezbollah. In fact, Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak stated, “When we entered Lebanon ... there was no Hezbollah. We were accepted with perfumed rice and roses by the Shia in the south. It was our presence there that created
Hezbollah," (Norton 33). Had Israel withdrawn immediately after the invasion, there is a strong possibility that Hezbollah never would have had the fuel to form.

Two other countries also played a major part in the creation of Hezbollah: Iran and Syria. Iran’s original incentive for sponsoring Hezbollah was to spread the Islamic Revolution. Hezbollah, like Iran, is predominantly Shia Muslim. Only about 10% of the Muslims in the Middle East are Shia, the vast majority being Sunni Muslims. Iran’s sponsoring of Hezbollah gave it a strong foothold for forming a second Shia-controlled country, a forward operating base against Israel and another country to help spread the Islamic Revolution. Hezbollah’s literal translation in Arabic means ‘Party of God,’ showing the belief under which the party was created.

Syria initially began sponsoring Hezbollah to continue its alliance with Iran.

In return for Syria’s support of Hezbollah, Iran gave Syria 9 million tons of discounted crude oil per year (Naftali 161). Supporting Hezbollah kept Syria in Iran’s good graces. Hezbollah understands that Syria is an alliance of convenience for both parties and that they are expendable. Financially this is not a major concern to Hezbollah because Iran is the primary financial contributor to Hezbollah through money, weapons, and training. Syria provides political support to Hezbollah, quick transportation of aid from Tehran to Beirut, and a safe haven from Israel if necessary.

In 1985, Hezbollah released a letter to the world called ”Downtrodden in Lebanon and in the World,” which often referred to as the “Open Letter”. The Open Letter stated many of the main points that Hezbollah stood for when it was formed
in 1982. The document said that both the United States and Soviet Union are equally to blame for all of the problems in the world because of the oppression they brought on third world countries throughout the Cold War. The United States is the primary enemy of Islam though, because they use Israel to enforce their agenda in the Middle East (Norton 36).

Hezbollah continued to list their struggles throughout the document, specifically how Lebanon turned to the United Nations for help. However, the superpowers of the world, primarily the United States, prevented any support for Lebanon. The Open Letter states Hezbollah’s primary goals as a freedom-fighting group: to unite under the common banner of Islam and to regain freedom through a sacrifice of blood. Nasrallah and Deputy Secretary General Naim Qassem have recently declared the 1985 open letter obsolete and no longer an authoritative guide to the party’s positions (Blanford 46). Instead, Hezbollah is working towards an open political system, free of corruption, and a chance to influence politics. Nasrallah has emphasized multiple times that they have no desire to engage in open war with the United States. It is also Hezbollah’s desire to avoid war with Israel, yet they will do anything to protect Lebanon. These revised viewpoints show the modernization of Hezbollah and the organization’s desire to become a political entity, not solely a militant group against Israel.

Hezbollah became internationally recognized in October 1983 when it bombed the U.S. Marine Barracks with the help of Iran. 220 marines, 18 sailors, 3 soldiers and 5 Lebanese civilians were killed. That same day, 58 French soldiers
were killed in another bombing ("Who are Hezbollah?"). Iran assisted Hezbollah in the execution in both of these bombings. This was the military act that gained significant international recognition for Hezbollah even though it was planned and pushed through by Iran. Contrary to the beliefs of most people, Hezbollah has only been involved in several military attacks not focused against Israel, and these attacks lessened as Hezbollah has moderated its viewpoints.

In the early years of Hezbollah’s formation, they acted as a tool for Syria and Iran. Syria feared Iran and Hezbollah’s growing strength, so Syria continuously kept Hezbollah at arm’s reach, and even going to the lengths of supporting Amal. Amal is a rival organization to Hezbollah, it is comprised mostly of Shia Muslims. During the Hezbollah – Amal engagement, Syrian soldiers killed 23 members of Hezbollah (Mannes, 161). Syria would continue to play both sides of the war through time by supporting Hezbollah as well as Hezbollah’s enemies. Without Iran’s strong support for Hezbollah, Syria most likely would not provide any support to help their growth because Hezbollah represents a threat to Syria’s political power in Lebanon.

Throughout the Israeli invasion, Hezbollah gained strong support from Palestinian refugees in southern Lebanon. Amal, or Green Party, refused to support the refugees because of their violent nature, but Hezbollah welcomed them with open arms after their primary religious authority, Ayatollah Muhammad Hussein Fadlallah, backed Hezbollah’s support of the Palestinian refugees. Syria’s opposition to the Palestinian refugee support was disregarded because Hezbollah listens to Fadlallah like many Catholics listen to the Pope. Despite Hezbollah’s reputation as a
militant extremist group, there are many countries that believe Hezbollah is strictly a resistance group.

Hezbollah became the primary resistance group against Israel in the 1990s. Hezbollah called upon its friendly relations with the Palestinian refugees in Lebanon to fight Israel. In 1993, both sides verbally agreed to the “rules of the game,” which were a list of rules that both sides would follow to prevent extreme violence. The primary rule was that Israel would not attack Lebanese civilians; in return, Hezbollah would only attack Israelis in Israel’s Security Zone in southern Lebanon. In 1996, Israel made one of its biggest mistakes of the war when it bombed the UN base in Qana, Lebanon. Israel claimed that the shelling was an accident, but an international investigation found that Israel purposefully performed the act. The deaths of 106 civilians caused further support for Hezbollah (Blanford).

Hezbollah’s training emphasized guerilla warfare, which posed a challenge for the Israeli Army, trained in traditional warfare. The advantage of Hezbollah’s guerilla tactics was that it became easy to focus attacks on Israeli soldiers and follow the rules of the game. The Israeli soldiers fought under a “shoot first, ask questions later” policy. This sometimes resulted in accidents, which regularly meant that civilians died. With each accident, Israel’s support decreased in south Lebanon and resulted in increased support of Hezbollah. According to Amnesty International, between 1993 and 1996, the rules of the game were breached 13 times by Hezbollah and 231 times by Israel (Blanford).
Hezbollah's uncanny success against Israel provided hope for other groups fighting Israel, particularly the Palestinians. After Israel withdrew from Lebanon in 2000, the Palestinians rose up and fought against Israel with an increased intensity during the second intifada. Hezbollah trained Palestinians in both the West Bank and Gaza during this war. Hezbollah took the stance that they would help train the Palestinians but it would be the Palestinians' duty to liberate their own country. Hezbollah's relationship with the Palestinians during this period can be compared to Iran's relationship with Hezbollah since 1982.

It has been repeatedly mentioned that Hezbollah has toned down the amount of violent attacks since its formation in 1982. The main reason for this is because the Shia cleric Muhammed Hussein Fadlallah recommended Hezbollah take part in the new elections in 1992. Several different Muslim clerics agreed with Fadlallah because not all problems can be solved with violence. Sometimes the only way to victory is through political compromise. This caused a major ideological change in Hezbollah. Previously, Hezbollah would influence people through its actions; now Hezbollah would use its words as well. Nasrallah knew that the level of violence being performed by Hezbollah would have to diminish to have any political success.

Iran's Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei, son of Ruhollah Khomeini, gave his blessing for Hezbollah to take part in the Lebanese elections. It was announced on July 3, 1992 that Hezbollah would take part in the elections. Since 1992 Hezbollah has won approximately 10% of the total seats available in parliament. Syria had a lot
of control over the parliamentary elections in Lebanon and provided a limit to the number of Hezbollah participants that were allowed to run for office. This refers back to Syria's fear of Hezbollah's strength and growing popularity. Syria does not, however, have control over the municipal elections in Lebanon. Lebanon had its first municipal elections in over 30 years in 1998. Hezbollah dominated the elections in 1998, beating its Shia rival Amal in total seats by 2 to 1 (Norton).
Post September 11, 2001

Following the attacks on September 11, 2001, President Bush passed Executive Order 13224. Executive Order 13224 included a list of steps that the United States would take to combat al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups. Hezbollah was not included on this list, and neither was the Palestinian organization Hamas. Several activist groups, mainly the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee, pushed to have Hezbollah and Hamas included on United States Department of State Foreign Terrorist Organizations list. Many people within the government resisted this move saying that al-Qaeda was the primary target and American resources should be spent focusing on al-Qaeda, not a wide range of terrorist groups. The other problem by adding Hezbollah and Hamas is that it would force other countries to step down on the war on terror (Norton 76).

The United States views Hezbollah and Hamas as terrorist groups although other countries view the two as resistance groups. Countries that take this stance would not support the United States’ war on terror because it would sever their ties with Hamas and Hezbollah. Regardless, Hezbollah and Hamas were added to the Foreign Terrorist Organizations list and became enemies in the war on terror. Following this change, Israel immediately offered its support to the United States’ war on terror. The addition of Hezbollah and Hamas, arguably Israel’s two largest enemies at the time, assisted in Israel’s decision to help the United States in the war on terror.
The decision to call Hezbollah a terrorist organization by the United States is not entirely consistent with the United Nations definition of a terrorist organization. A United Nations panel on March 17, 2005 described terrorism as any act “intended to cause death or serious bodily harm to civilians or non-combatants with the purpose of intimidating a population or compelling a government or an international organization to do or abstain from doing any act,” (Atoki).

Hezbollah has had a strong base for stating its case as a resistance group as opposed to a terrorist organization because it has vowed not to attack civilians and on multiple occasions, has protected Lebanon from Israel. Many countries view Hezbollah as a resistance group because they protect their country militarily and by providing services to its citizens like running hospitals or health centers, such as the al-Janoub hospital in the southern Lebanese city of Nabatiyah (Levitt).

Hezbollah has gained tremendous support over the years at the social level. There are Hezbollah-run hospitals that accept any patient regardless of their religious beliefs (Levitt). When Israel invaded Lebanon again in 2006, Hezbollah immediately responded and aided Shia families that lost their homes by providing a stipend to live on and quickly rebuilding their homes. Most people view Hezbollah as a renegade terrorist group looking for a fight. Instead, Hezbollah has shown that it values community and building a better Lebanon.

On February 14, 2005, Rafiq al-Hariri, the Sunni Prime Minister, was assassinated in a car bomb in Beirut. Rafiq al-Hariri backed the reform movement that focused on forcing Syria out of Lebanese politics. Syria and members of
Hezbollah were accused of carrying out the assassination. Because of the potential Syrian involvement in the assassination, one would expect an overthrow of Syrian influence. On March 8, Hezbollah held a demonstration in Beirut in which 400,000 people of Lebanon’s population of 4,000,000 attended. During the demonstration, Hezbollah provided their support to Syria despite the alleged Syrian involvement in the assassination. On March 14, the Cedar Revolution held a demonstration in Beirut. The Cedar Revolution is a pro-democratic party that was supported by al-Hariri with a primary goal of ridding Lebanon of Syrian troops. The Cedar Revolution reportedly brought in 1 million people (Blanford), the largest demonstration in the Middle East since 1975. Syrian troops were removed from Lebanon in April of 2005.

Following the demonstrations, Hezbollah was brought to the political table and recognized as a national resistance group. Many Lebanese politicians urged Hezbollah to disarm because they were no longer in a time of war. In fact, people were beginning to mock Hezbollah for not disarming as if it were a joke. Nonetheless, Hezbollah remained armed, citing its aim as a resistance rather than power and terror (Rubin). In 2006, Israel overheard multiple conversations between Hamas and Hezbollah. During these conversations, Nasrallah referred to Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert and Defense Minister Amir Peretz as weak (Norton 134).

By July 13, 2006 Israel had invaded Lebanon a second time. On July 14, Hezbollah sank the INS Hanit, a vessel operated by the Israeli Navy. The sinking of
the INS Hanit opened Israel's eyes to Hezbollah's military capability. It also showed that Hezbollah developed an increased military wing since the Israeli withdrawal in 2000. Hezbollah provided Israel with a reason to invade Lebanon. Israel responded to Hezbollah, but Israel was not expecting the amount of resistance that Hezbollah provided. Iran's financial and weapon contributions seemed to be paying off. Hezbollah gained great respect during the Israeli invasion, because it proved to be the only line of defense against Israel. Israel's invasion ended up having a negative effect overall on the Israeli image and Hezbollah became even more revered in Lebanon, even though Lebanon suffered a majority of the casualties and structural damage.
The Arab Spring and the Future of Hezbollah

The Arab Spring is a revolutionary wave of changes and protests in the Arab world. It began on December 18, 2010 in Tunisia and has spread throughout the Middle East. The goals of each protest and revolution are different depending on the country. In Tunisia, Libya, Egypt, Syria, and Yemen, the primary goal is regime change. In countries like Jordan, Kuwait, and Morocco, the goal of the Arab Spring is to change the government. The Arab Spring has not directly impacted Lebanon; however, Hezbollah’s ally Syria is currently in the middle of an uprising.

The Arab Spring has brought several questions that address the future of Hezbollah, primarily concerning Syria. Hezbollah receives aid from Iran via Syria through the Beirut-Damascus Highway. Iran flies weapons, people and money into Damascus and then they make their way to Beirut before being distributed to Hezbollah. If Bashar al-Assad is overthrown and Syria begins to moderate, the alliance between Syria and Iran will be in jeopardy. Syrian moderation will present a few questions about the future of Hezbollah:

- Will Syria keep friendly relations with Iran and Hezbollah?
- Will Iran be able to quickly and easily fund Hezbollah?
- Can Hezbollah survive without the direct support of Iran and Syria?
- Will Israel take advantage of the situation to combat Hezbollah?

If the new leaders of Syria choose to remain loyal to Hezbollah and Iran, then it can be concluded that the transfer of aid from Iran to Hezbollah will not be hampered. Iran realizes that its physical connection to Hezbollah could be destroyed
if Assad is overthrown. Iran is most likely already talking to other potential candidates to support in future elections to ensure that the Iran – Syria – Hezbollah alliance can be maintained. If Syria does moderate and ends the friendly relations with Hezbollah and Iran, then Iran will face a challenge of directly supporting Hezbollah. Iran has always used Damascus to funnel aid into Lebanon. With the Damascus airport off-limits, Hezbollah will need to find an alternative path into Lebanon. The first logical path would be the Beirut International Airport. With Hezbollah’s control of the Beirut International Airport, this presents a realistic possibility, but Hezbollah will likely be confronted by the international community mainly for allowing Iran to freely fly aid into Lebanon (Edelman, and Karlin).

Hezbollah faces its own challenges with an unfriendly Syrian neighbor. If Hezbollah is not receiving aid from Iran and Syria, then Hezbollah will need to become self-sustaining. With Hezbollah’s strong control of south Lebanon and financial support from Muslims, Hezbollah should be able to self-sustain for a period of time. Many members of Hezbollah receive salaries for their work, but feel wrong for doing so because they believe they are doing their duty for their god, Allah. These members would most likely be willing to receive a reduced salary in order to support the organization. Hezbollah receives aid through expatriates and charity organizations, but that is mostly in the form of money. Iran and Syria provide weapons for Hezbollah’s military wing. Without a flow of weapons from both Iran and Syria, then Hezbollah would be weakened in a war of attrition with Israel.
A Syrian moderation would be to the liking of Israel, not solely because it may have another friendly neighbor, but for the chance to invade Lebanon for a third time. Israel will notice that Hezbollah will be weakened without direct military support from Iran and Syria. Hezbollah possesses an impressive arsenal of weapons, but will be stressed to succeed in a war of attrition against Israel without receiving military aid. Historically, Israel has been quick to capitalize on opportunities to attack its enemies when they are weak so it should be expected that this scenario would be no different. A safe northern border with Lebanon and a friendly Syrian neighbor are in Israel's best interest, and they will do everything capable to achieve this.
Cyber Capabilities

As the world becomes more integrated with technology and as technology develops, the threat of cyber attacks becomes more prevalent. The possibility that a terrorist organization like Hezbollah could utilize cyber attacks as opposed to the traditional terrorist attacks like car bombs and hijackings is highly probable. The ability to hide behind a keyboard and monitor helps an attacker from exposing his identity while causing damage to the intended target. There has not been a great deal of research done on Hezbollah's cyber capabilities to date, but based on current trends within the cyber world and other capabilities of Hezbollah, a list of Hezbollah's cyber capabilities can be created.

Hezbollah has an estimated budget of $935,000 committed to cyber warfare along with the capability to engage in fiber optic cable tapping, enabling data interception and the hijacking of Internet and communications connections (Coleman). Along with the ability to intercept communications there are a number of simple attacks that can be utilized to bring down critical infrastructure in the United States. A Distributed Denial of Service attack can be employed against any company in order to overload their network and bring it offline for a period of time. A Distributed Denial of Service attack (DDoS) overloads a network with requests until it cannot process the heightened amount of traffic. The network then ceases to operate and requires a complete shutdown before it can function correctly. DDoS attacks are simple to execute but cause financial losses to the company from lost sales and lost productivity.
Hezbollah has been recruiting Information Technology professionals into the organization (Hudson). The most logical reason is to develop another wing within its operations division, Cyber Warfare. Hezbollah already has the personnel required to execute a cyber attack on the United States. The only requirement left for Hezbollah is to find a notable target worth executing an attack on. Financial institutions pose a viable target for a terrorist organization, because they can stop the flow of money in a country and also cause trouble in the stock market. The infrastructure of energy companies is another target that Hezbollah could focus on. Being able to shutdown the power grid for any period of time instantly causes a decrease in money flow and is a hazard to the health of people on life support in hospitals.

With the ability to easily attack a country through cyber warfare it can be expected to face hybrid warfare in the future. Hybrid warfare is the combination of terrorism and cyber warfare combined. The goal of hybrid warfare is the same as terrorism, to terrorize and harm another group of people. There are a few of advantages of using cyber warfare instead of traditional means of terrorism. First, the cost of executing a cyber attack is significantly less than that of a physical attack. The only required need for a cyber attack is a computer connected to the Internet. Secondly, there is no direct or immediate risk to the individuals carrying out the attack. You do not immediately put yourself in harms way when operating behind a computer. Cyber attacks are sometimes viewed as an act of war and a country could retaliate with military force. Lastly, there are many professionals in the information technology world that are able to execute a cyber attack. The resources needed to
perform a cyber attack are not only cheaper but also easier to locate. The advantages to performing a hybrid attack far outweigh the advantages of executing a traditional terrorist attack.

There is no reason to assume Hezbollah’s cyber capabilities are not developing. Hezbollah, by using its ability to attack targets through cyber warfare, can avoid exposing itself to the international community, while still affecting the financial stability of a country. Without further research into the cyber capabilities of Hezbollah; however, there cannot be an accurate assessment. What has been provided is a bare minimum of their cyber capabilities based upon publicly released information.
Conclusion

As it has been stated, Hezbollah is a non-state actor with the ability to affect the politics of Lebanon, but also the rest of the world. Hezbollah controls a certain amount of power because of its close proximity to Israel, but also from its strong relationship with Iran and increasing cyber capabilities. The history of Hezbollah is complex as is most of the history in the Middle East. The reason for the creation of Hezbollah is not linked to one single event, and as a result there cannot be a single possibility for the disarmament or peaceful cooperation of Hezbollah.

The future of Hezbollah is currently undefined and not wholly within its control. Hezbollah relies strongly on Iran's military aid as well as a stable neighbor in Syria. If, and most likely when, the Bashar al-Assad regime falls in Syria, then Hezbollah will find itself in a difficult situation. Hezbollah has proven time and again that it is a non-state actor with considerable influence in not just the region, but the world also. The financial instability that Hezbollah can force on another country makes it a threat to the world security on a daily basis. The future of the Middle East and the world is strongly reliant on the future of the Syria – Iran – Hezbollah relationship, for better or worse.
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Appendix

The Open Letter

An Open Letter

The Hizbullah Program

The Jerusalem Quarterly, number Forty-Eight, Fall 1988
This is a slightly abridged translation of "Nass al-Risala al-Mafuha allati wa-jahahaa Hizbullah ila-l-Mustad'afin fi Lubnan wa-l-alam", published February 16, 1985 in al-Safir (Beirut), and also in a separate brochure. It carries the unmistakable imprint of Sheikh Muhammad Hussein Fadlallah, the Hizbullah mentor, and is inspired by his book Ma'maal-Qawma fi-l-Islam (Beirut 1979). See also his article in al-Muntarak (Beirut), October 1986.

Our Identity
We are often asked: Who are we, the Hizbullah, and what is our identity? We are the sons of the umma (Muslim community) - the party of God (Hizb Allah) the vanguard of which was made victorious by God in Iran. There the vanguard succeeded to lay down the bases of a Muslim state which plays a central role in the world. We obey the orders of one leader, wise and just, that of our tutor and faqih (jurist) who fulfills all the necessary conditions: Ruhollah Musawi Khomeini. God save him!

By virtue of the above, we do not constitute an organized and closed party in Lebanon. nor are we a tight political cadre. We are an umma linked to the Muslims of the whole world by the solid doctrinal and religious connection of Islam, whose message God wanted to be fulfilled by the Seal of the Prophets, i.e., Muhammad. This is why whatever touches or strikes the Muslims in Afghanistan, Iraq, the Philippines and elsewhere reverberates throughout the whole Muslim umma of which we are an integral part. Our behavior is dictated to us by legal principles laid down by the light of an overall political conception defined by the leading jurist (wilayat al-faqih).

As for our culture, it is based on the Holy Koran, the Sunna and the legal rulings of the faqih who is our source of imitation (marja' al-taqlid). Our culture is crystal clear. It is not complicated and is accessible to all.

No one can imagine the importance of our military potential as our military apparatus is not separate from our overall social fabric. Each of us is a fighting soldier. And when it becomes necessary to carry out the Holy War, each of us takes up his assignment in the fight in accordance with the injunctions of the Law, and that in the framework of the mission carried out under the tutelage of the Commanding Jurist.

Our Fight
The US has tried, through its local agents, to persuade the people that those who crushed their arrogance in Lebanon and frustrated their conspiracy against the oppressed (mustad'afin) were nothing but a bunch of fanatic terrorists whose sole aim is to dynamite bars and destroy slot machines. Such suggestions cannot and will not mislead our umma, for the whole world knows that whoever wishes to oppose the US, that arrogant superpower, cannot indulge in marginal acts which may make it deviate from its major objective. We combat abomination and we shall tear out its very roots, its primary roots, which are the US. All attempts made to drive us into marginal actions will fail, especially as our determination to fight the US is solid.

We declare openly and loudly that we are an umma which fears God only and is by no means ready to tolerate injustice, aggression and humiliation. America, its Atlantic Pact allies, and the Zionist entity in the holy land of Palestine, attacked us and continue to do so without respite. Their aim is to make us eat dust continually. This is why we are, more and more, in a state of permanent alert in order to repel aggression and defend our religion, our existence, our dignity. They invaded our country, destroyed our villages, slit the throats of our children, violated our
sanctuaries and appointed masters over our people who committed the worst massacres against our umma. They do not cease to give support to these allies of Israel, and do not enable us to decide our future according to our own wishes.

In a single night the Israelis and the Phalangists executed thousands of our sons, women and children in Sabra and Shatilla. No international organization protested or denounced this ferocious massacre in an effective manner, a massacre perpetrated with the tacit accord of America's European allies, which had retreated a few days, maybe even a few hours earlier, from the Palestinian camps. The Lebanese defeatists accepted putting the camps under the protection of that crafty fox, the US envoy Philip Habib.

We have no alternative but to confront aggression by sacrifice. The coordination between the Phalangists and Israel continues and develops. A hundred thousand victims - this is the approximate balance sheet of crimes committed by them and by the US against us. Almost half a million Muslims were forced to leave their homes. Their quarters were virtually totally destroyed in Nab'a, my own Beirut suburb, as well as in Burj Hammud, Dekonaneh, Tel Zaatar, Sinbay, Ghawarina and Jubeil - all in areas controlled today by the 'Lebanese Forces'. The Zionist occupation then launched its usurpatory invasion of Lebanon in full and open collusion with the Phalanges. The latter condemned all attempts to resist the invading forces. They participated in the implementation of certain Israeli plans in order to accomplish its Lebanese dream and acceded to all Israeli requests in order to gain power.

And this is, in fact, what happened. Bashir Jumayyil, that butcher, seized power with the help also of OPEC countries and the Jumayyil family. Bashir tried to improve his ugly image by joining the six-member Committee of Public Safety presided over by former President Elias Sarkis, which was nothing but an American-Israeli bridge borrowed by the Phalangists in order to control the oppressed. Our people could not tolerate humiliation any more. It destroyed the oppressors, the invaders and their lackeys. But the US persisted in its folly and installed Amin Jumayyil to replace his brother. Some of his first so called achievements were to destroy the homes of refugees and other displaced persons, attack mosques, and order the army to bombard the southern suburbs of Beirut, where the oppressed people resided. He invited European troops to help him against us and signed the May 17th, [1984] accord with Israel making Lebanon an American protectorate.

Our people could not bear any more treachery. It decided to oppose infidelity - be it French, American or Israeli - by striking at their headquarters and launching a veritable war of resistance against the Occupation forces. Finally, the enemy had to decide to retreat by stages.

**Our Objectives**

Let us put it truthfully: the sons of Hizbullah know who are their major enemies in the Middle East - the Phalanges, Israel, France and the US. The sons of our umma are now in a state of growing confrontation with them, and will remain so until the realization of the following three objectives:

(a) to expel the Americans, the French and their allies definitely from Lebanon, putting an end to any colonialist entity on our land;

(b) to submit the Phalanges to a just power and bring them all to justice for the crimes they have perpetrated against Muslims and Christians;

(c) to permit all the sons of our people to determine their future and to choose in all the liberty the form of government they desire. We call upon all of them to pick the option of Islamic government which, alone, is capable of guaranteeing justice and liberty for all. Only an Islamic regime can stop any further tentative attempts of imperialistic infiltration into our country.

These are Lebanon's objectives; those are its enemies. As for our friends, they are all the world's oppressed peoples. Our friends are also those who combat our enemies and who defend us from their evil. Towards these friends, individuals as well as organizations, we turn and say:
Friends, wherever you are in Lebanon... we are in agreement with you on the great and necessary objectives: destroying American hegemony in our land; putting an end to the burdensome Israeli Occupation; beating back all the Phalangists' attempts to monopolize power and administration. Even though we have, friends, quite different viewpoints as to the means of the struggle, on the levels upon which it must be carried out, we should surmount these tiny divergencies and consolidate cooperation between us in view of the grand design.

We are an umma which adheres to the message of Islam. We want all the oppressed to be able to study the divine message in order to bring justice, peace and tranquillity to the world. This is why we don't want to impose Islam upon anybody, as much as we that others impose upon us their convictions and their political systems. We don't want Islam to reign in Lebanon by force as is the case with the Maronites today. This is the minimum that we can accept in order to be able to accede by legal means to realize our ambitions, to save Lebanon from its dependence upon East and West, to put an end to foreign occupation and to adopt a regime freely wanted by the people of Lebanon.

This is our perception of the present state of affairs. This is the Lebanon we envision. In the light of our conceptions, our opposition to the present system is the function of two factors; (1) the present regime is the product of an arrogance so unjust that no reform or modification can remedy it. It should be changed radically, and (2) World Imperialism which is hostile to Islam.

We consider that all opposition in Lebanon voiced in the name of reform can only profit, ultimately, the present system. All such opposition which operates within the framework of the conservation and safeguarding of the present constitution without demanding changes at the level of the very foundation of the regime is, hence, an opposition of pure formality which cannot satisfy the interests of the oppressed masses. Likewise, any opposition which confronts the present regime but within the limits fixed by it, is an illusory opposition which renders a great service to the Jumayyiil system. Moreover, we cannot be concerned by any proposition of political reform which accepts the rotten system actually in effect. We could not care less about the creation of this or that governmental coalition or about the participation of this or that political personality in some ministerial post, which is but a part of this unjust regime.

The politics followed by the chiefs of political Maronism through the 'Lebanese Front' and the 'Lebanese Forces' cannot guarantee peace and tranquillity for the Christians of Lebanon, whereas it is predicated upon 'asabiyya (narrow-minded particularism), on confessional privileges and on the alliance with colonialism. The Lebanese crisis has proven that confessional privileges are one of the principal causes of the great explosion which ravaged the country. It also proved that outside help was of no use to the Christians of Lebanon, just when they need it most. The bell tolled for the fanatic Christians to rid themselves of denominational allegiance and of illusion deriving from the monopolization of privileges to the detriment of other communities. The Christians should answer the appeal from heaven and have recourse to reason instead of arms, to persuasion instead of confessionalism.

To the Christians

If you, Christians, cannot tolerate that Muslims share with you certain domains of government, Allah has also made it intolerable for Muslims to participate in an unjust regime, unjust for you and for us, in a regime which is not predicated upon the prescriptions (ahkam) of religion and upon the basis of the Law (the Shari'a) as laid down by Muhammad, the Seal of the Prophets. If you search for justice, who is more just than Allah? It is He who sent down from the sky the message of Islam through his successive prophets in order that they judge the people and give everyone his rights. If you were deceived and misled into believing that we anticipate vengeance against you - your fears are unjustified. For those of you who are peaceful, continue to live in our midst without anybody even thinking to trouble you.

We don't wish you evil. We call upon you to embrace Islam so that you can be happy in this world and the next. If you refuse to adhere to Islam, maintain your ties with the Muslims and
don't take part in any activity against them. Free yourselves from the consequences of hateful
confessionalism. Banish from your hearts all fanaticism and parochialism. Open your hearts to
our Call (da'wa) which we address to you. Open yourselves up to Islam where you'll find
salvation and happiness upon earth and in the hereafter. We extend this invitation also to all the
oppressed among the non-Muslims. As for those who belong to Islam only formally, we exhort
them to adhere to Islam in religious practice and to renounce all fanaticisms which are rejected by
our religion.

World Scene
We reject both the USSR and the US, both Capitalism and Communism, for both are incapable of
laying the foundations for a just society.
With special vehemence we reject UNIFIL as they were sent by world arrogance to occupy areas
evacuated by Israel and serve for the latter as a buffer zone. They should be treated much like the
Zionists. All should know that the goals of the Phalangists regime do not carry any weight with
the Combatants of the Holy War, i.e., the Islamic resistance. This is the quagmire which awaits
all foreign intervention.
There, then, are our conceptions and our objectives which serve as our basis and inspire our
march. Those who accept them should know that all rights belong to Allah and He bestows them.
Those who reject them, we'll be patient with them, till Allah decides between us and the people of
injustice.

The Necessity for the Destruction of Israel (See ICT Note)
We see in Israel the vanguard of the United States in our Islamic world. It is the hated enemy that
must be fought until the hated ones get what they deserve. This enemy is the greatest danger to
our future generations and to the destiny of our lands, particularly as it glorifies the ideas of
settlement and expansion, initiated in Palestine, and yearning outward to the extension of the
Great Israel, from the Euphrates to the Nile.
Our primary assumption in our fight against Israel states that the Zionist entity is aggressive from
its inception, and built on lands wrested from their owners, at the expense of the rights of the
Muslim people. Therefore our struggle will end only when this entity is obliterated. We recognize
no treaty with it, no cease fire, and no peace agreements, whether separate or consolidated.
We vigorously condemn all plans for negotiation with Israel, and regard all negotiators as
enemies, for the reason that such negotiation is nothing but the recognition of the legitimacy of
the Zionist occupation of Palestine. Therefore we oppose and reject the Camp David Agreements,
the proposals of King Fahd, the Fez and Reagan plan, Brezhnev's and the French- Egyptian
proposals, and all other programs that include the recognition (even the implied recognition) of the
Zionist entity.

ICT note: This paragraph did not appear in the original translation published by the Jerusalem
Quarterly. It is possible that this omission is due to the fact that the source (al-Safir) for the
translation did not include this text, which appears in the original Hizballah Program. The original
Program was published on 16 February 1985. The organization's spokesman, Sheikh Ibrahim al-
Amin read the Program at the al-Ouzai Mosque in west Beirut and afterwards it was published as
an open letter "to all the Opressed in Lebanon and the World". It should be emphasised that none
of Hizballah's web sites have published the full text of the organization's program, and they prefer
to publish the 1996 electoral program which was intended for the specific propaganda
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Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001
Blocking Property and Prohibiting Transactions With Persons Who Commit, Threaten to Commit, or Support Terrorism


I, GEORGE W. BUSH, President of the United States of America, find that grave acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism committed by foreign terrorists, including the terrorist attacks in New York, Pennsylvania, and the Pentagon committed on September 11, 2001, acts recognized and condemned in UNSCR 1368 of September 12, 2001, and UNSCR 1269 of October 19, 1999, and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on United States nationals or the United States constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States, and in furtherance of my proclamation of September 14, 2001, Declaration of National Emergency by Reason of Certain Terrorist Attacks, hereby declare a national emergency to deal with that threat. I also find that because of the pervasiveness and expansiveness of the financial foundation of foreign terrorists, financial sanctions may be appropriate for those foreign persons that support or otherwise associate with these foreign terrorists. I also find that a need exists for further consultation and cooperation with, and sharing of information by, United States and foreign financial institutions as an additional tool to enable the United States to combat the financing of terrorism.

I hereby order:

Section 1. Except to the extent required by section 203(b) of IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1702(b)), or provided in regulations, orders, directives, or licenses that may be issued pursuant to this order, and notwithstanding any contract entered into or any license or permit granted prior to the effective date of this order, all property and interests in property of the following persons that are in the United States or that hereafter come within the United States, or that hereafter come within the possession or control of United States persons are blocked:
(a) foreign persons listed in the Annex to this order;
(b) foreign persons determined by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General, to have committed, or to pose a significant risk of committing, acts of terrorism that threaten the security of U.S. nationals or the national security, foreign policy, or economy of the United States;
(c) persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of those persons listed in the Annex to this order or those persons determined to be subject to subsection 1(b), 1(c), or 1(d) of this order;
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(d) except as provided in section 5 of this order and after such consultation, if any, with foreign authorities as the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General, deems appropriate in the exercise of his discretion, persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General;
(i) to assist in, sponsor, or provide financial, material, or technological support for, or financial or other services to or in support of, such acts of terrorism or those persons listed in the Annex to this order or determined to be subject to this order; or
(ii) to be otherwise associated with those persons listed in the Annex to this order or those persons determined to be subject to subsection 1(b), 1(c), or 1(d)(i) of this order.
Sec. 2. Except to the extent required by section 203(b) of IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1702(b)), or provided in regulations, orders, directives, or licenses that may be issued pursuant to this order, and notwithstanding any contract entered into or any license or permit granted prior to the effective date:
(a) any transaction or dealing by United States persons or within the United States in property or interests in property blocked pursuant to this order is prohibited, including but not limited to the making or receiving of any contribution of funds, goods, or services to or for the benefit of those persons listed in the Annex to this order or determined to be subject to this order;
(b) any transaction by any United States person or within the United States that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions set forth in this order is prohibited; and
(c) any conspiracy formed to violate any of the prohibitions set forth in this order is prohibited.
Sec. 3. For purposes of this order:
(a) the term "person" means an individual or entity;
(b) the term "entity" means a partnership, association, corporation, or other organization, group, or subgroup;
(c) the term "United States person" means any United States citizen, permanent resident alien, entity organized under the laws of the United States (including foreign branches), or any person in the United States; and
(d) the term "terrorism" means an activity that --
(i) involves a violent act or an act dangerous to human life, property, or infrastructure; and (ii) appears to be intended --
(A) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population;
(B) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or
(C) to affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, kidnapping, or hostage-taking.
Sec. 4. I hereby determine that the making of donations of the type specified in section 203(b)(2) of IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1702(b)(2)) by United States persons to persons determined to be subject to this order would seriously impair my ability to deal with the national emergency declared in this order, and would endanger Armed Forces of the United States that are in a situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, and hereby prohibit such donations as provided by section 1 of this order. Furthermore, I hereby determine that the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (title IX, Public Law 106-387) shall not affect the imposition or the continuation of the imposition of any unilateral agricultural sanction or unilateral medical sanction on any person determined to be subject to this order because imminent involvement of the Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances.
Sec. 5. With respect to those persons designated pursuant to subsection 1(d) of this order, the Secretary of the Treasury, in the exercise of his discretion and in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, may take such other actions than the complete blocking of property or interests in property as the President is authorized to take under IEEPA and UNPA if the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, deems such other actions to be consistent with the national interests of the United States, considering such factors as he deems appropriate.
Sec. 6. The Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and other appropriate agencies shall make all relevant efforts to cooperate and coordinate with other countries, including through
technical assistance, as well as bilateral and multilateral agreements and arrangements, to achieve the objectives of this order, including the prevention and suppression of acts of terrorism, the denial of financing and financial services to terrorists and terrorist organizations, and the sharing of intelligence about funding activities in support of terrorism.

Sec. 7. The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, is hereby authorized to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA and UNPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this order. The Secretary of the Treasury may redelegate any of these functions to other officers and agencies of the United States Government. All agencies of the United States Government are hereby directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of this order.

Sec. 8. Nothing in this order is intended to affect the continued effectiveness of any rules, regulations, orders, licenses, or other forms of administrative action issued, taken, or continued in effect heretofore or hereafter under 31 C.F.R. chapter V, except as expressly terminated, modified, or suspended by or pursuant to this order.

Sec. 9. Nothing contained in this order is intended to create, nor does it create, any right, benefit, or privilege, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by a party against the United States, its agencies, officers, employees or any other person.

Sec. 10. For those persons listed in the Annex to this order or determined to be subject to this order who might have a constitutional presence in the United States, I find that because of the ability to transfer funds or assets instantaneously, prior notice to such persons of measures to be taken pursuant to this order would render these measures ineffectual. I therefore determine that for these measures to be effective in addressing the national emergency declared in this order, there need be no prior notice of a listing or determination made pursuant to this order.

Sec. 11. (a) This order is effective at 12:01 a.m. eastern daylight time on September 24, 2001. (b) This order shall be transmitted to the Congress and published in the Federal Register.

GEORGE W. BUSH THE WHITE HOUSE,

Al Qaeda/Islamic Army
Abu Sayyaf Group
Armed Islamic Group (GIA) Harakat ul-Mujahidin (HUM) Al-Jihad (Egyptian Islamic Jihad)

ANNEX
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Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU) Asbat al-Ansar
Salafist Group for Call and Combat (GSPC) Libyan Islamic Fighting Group
Al-Itihaad al-Islamiya (AIAI)
Islamic Army of Aden
Usama bin Laden
Muhammad Atif (aka, Subhi Abu Sitta, Abu Hafs Al Masri) Sayf al-Adl
Shaykh Sa'id (aka, Mustafa Muhammad Ahmad)
Abu Hafs the Mauritanian (aka, Mahfouz Ould al-Walid, Khalid Al- Shanqiti) Ibn Al-Shaykh al-Libi
Abu Zubeidah (aka, Zayn al-Abidin Muhammad Husayn, Tariq)
Abd al-Hadi al-Iraqi (aka, Abu Abdallah)
Ayman al-Zawahiri
Thirwat Salah Shihata
Tariq Anwar al-Sayyid Ahmad (aka, Fathi, Amr al-Fathi)
Muhammad Salah (aka, Nasr Fahmi Nasr Hasanayn)
Makhtab Al-Khidamat/Al Kifah
Wafa Humanitarian Organization
Al Rashid Trust
Mamoun Darkazanli Import-Export Company

UN Resolution 1559
Press Release SC/8181
Security Council 5028th Meeting (Night)
SECURITY COUNCIL DECLARES SUPPORT FOR FREE, FAIR PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION IN LEBANON; CALLS FOR WITHDRAWAL OF FOREIGN FORCES THERE
Of 9 in Favour, to None Against, with 6 Abstentions
The Security Council this evening declared its support for a free and fair presidential election in Lebanon conducted according to Lebanese constitutional rules devised without foreign interference or influence and, in that connection, called upon all remaining foreign forces to withdraw from Lebanon.
By a vote of 9 in favour (Angola, Benin, Chile, France, Germany, Romania, Spain, United Kingdom, United States) to none against, with 6 abstentions (Algeria, Brazil, China, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation), the Council adopted resolution 1559 (2004), reaffirming its call for the strict respect of Lebanon’s sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity, and political independence under the sole and exclusive authority of the Government of Lebanon throughout the country.
In a related provision, the Council called for the disbanding and disarmament of all Lebanese and non-Lebanese militias. It also called upon all parties concerned to cooperate fully and urgently with the Council for the full implementation of all its resolutions concerning the restoration in Lebanon of territorial integrity, full sovereignty and political independence.
Requesting the Council to withdraw its consideration of that resolution before the vote, Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Emigrants of Lebanon, Mohamad Issa, said that friendly Syria had helped Lebanon to maintain stability and security within its borders. Syrian troops had been deployed and redeployed at Lebanon’s request, and had contributed to rebuffing the radical reactions emanating from repulsive Israeli actions. Also, the matter was purely internal and related to the upcoming presidential elections in Lebanon.
Asserting that the Syrian actions in the past week had made a “crude mockery” of the principle of a free and fair presidential electoral process, the United States’ representative said the Syrian Government had imposed its political will on Lebanon and had compelled the Cabinet and Lebanese National Assembly to amend its constitution and abort the electoral process by extending the term of the current President by three years. Clearly, the Lebanese Parliament had been pressured, and even threatened, by Syria and its agents to make them comply.
Similarly, the representative of France, who, along with the United States, had introduced the resolution, worried that persistent serious interference in the political life of Lebanon might cause it to retreat from the objectives that had been reaffirmed constantly by the international community. That was why a rapid mobilization and a decisive reaction from the Council had seemed essential. By refraining to act, the Council would have sanctioned interference in the internal affairs of another State. By acting in a robust manner, it was showing its confidence in Lebanon’s future, which must include its full restoration of sovereignty, and not the intensification of interference.
02/09/2004
Having abstained in the voting, China’s representative said that respect for the principles of sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-interference in internal affairs constituted a centrepiece of China’s foreign policy and were principles of the United Nations. In adherence to those principles, he supported safeguarding the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon. But, the draft resolution touched on the question of the presidential elections in Lebanon, and such questions fell within Lebanon’s internal affairs and should be decided by the Lebanese people themselves.
The representative of the Russian Federation said that, with tensions high in the region, any wrong step might exacerbate the situation and lead to a new focal point of instability. He had tabled amendments to the text, aimed at moving it towards the context of a Middle East settlement as a whole and preventing the document from being one-sided and from concentrating solely on domestic Lebanese affairs. His proposals would have improved the draft by making it more acceptable to Council members. Their lack of acceptance, however, had made it impossible for him to support the resolution.
Pakistan's speaker said he had also abstained, as the resolution was not consistent with the Council's functions and responsibilities. Moreover, there was no evidence of any urgent threat to peace. There had been no complaint from the country whose sovereignty and integrity the draft purported to uphold. On the contrary, the Lebanese representatives had communicated to the Council their opposition to consideration of the resolution. Besides, the text addressed the wrong threat. If there were a threat to Lebanon, that was well known and did not arise from Syria. Explanations of vote were also made by the representatives of Algeria, Brazil, Chile, Angola, Philippines and Benin.

The meeting began at 7:38 p.m. and was adjourned at 8:38 p.m. Resolution 1559 (2004) reads as follows:

"The Security Council,


"Reiterating its strong support for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally territorially recognized borders,

"Noting the determination of Lebanon to ensure the withdrawal of all non-Lebanese forces from Lebanon,

"Gravely concerned at the continued presence of armed militias in Lebanon, which prevent the Lebanese government from exercising its full sovereignty over all Lebanese territory,

"Reaffirming the importance of the extension of the control of the Government of Lebanon over all Lebanese territory,

"Mindful of the upcoming Lebanese presidential elections and underlining the importance of free and fair elections according to Lebanese constitutional rules devised without foreign interference or influence,

"1. Reaffirms its call for the strict respect of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity, and political independence of Lebanon under the sole and exclusive authority of the Government of Lebanon throughout Lebanon;

2. Calls upon all remaining foreign forces to withdraw from Lebanon;

3. "3. Calls for the disbanding and disarmament of all Lebanese and non-Lebanese militias;

4. "4. Supports the extension of the control of the Government of Lebanon over all Lebanese

5. "5. Declares its support for a free and fair electoral process in Lebanon's upcoming presidential election conducted according to Lebanese constitutional rules devised without foreign interference or influence;

6. Calls upon all parties concerned to cooperate fully and urgently with the Security Council for the full implementation of this and all relevant resolutions concerning the restoration of the territorial integrity, full sovereignty, and political independence of Lebanon;

7. Requests that the Secretary-General report to the Security Council within thirty days on the implementation by the parties of this resolution and decides to remain actively seized of this matter."

Statements

MOHAMAD ISSA, Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Emigrants of Lebanon, said that there were no militias in Lebanon. There was only the national Lebanese resistance, which appeared after the Israeli occupation and which would remain so long as Israel remained. The resistance force existed alongside the Lebanese national forces. Lebanon determined the presence and size of the force, depending on the country's need. The authority of Lebanon extended to all parts of Lebanon except those areas occupied by Israel.

He said that submitting the draft resolution confused two matters. The first was the distinguished relations linking Lebanon and Syria, which achieved their joint interests, particularly the interests of Lebanon. Friendly Syria had helped Lebanon to maintain stability and security within its borders. It had warded off radicalism and violence, fed by the violence exercised by Israel against the Palestinians. Secondly, the matter was purely internal, and related to the presidential elections to be held in Lebanon. Syrian troops came to Lebanon in accordance with legitimate
requests. Their presence was guarded by an agreement concluded by two sovereign States. Those troops had been redeployed several times. They contributed to rebuffing the radical reactions emanating from repulsive Israeli actions.

Hence, saying that Syria supported radical movements in Lebanon was not true. To the contrary, Syria supported the Lebanese national resistance, which desired to liberate the territories occupied by Israel. The draft resolution was talking about supporting free and just elections in Lebanon. He did not believe that that internal matter had ever been discussed in the Council relating to any Member State. It was an internal matter, he stressed. The United Nations had not interfered in that matter with regard to any other State. There was no justification for the draft resolution, which constituted an interference in the internal affairs of a Member State.

In addition, it discussed bilateral relations between two friendly nations, neither of which had filed any complaint concerning those relations. He called for the withdrawal of the draft resolution.

Action on Text

Next, the Council adopted the resolution by a vote of 9 in favour (Angola, Benin, Chile, France, Germany, Romania, Spain, United Kingdom, United States) to none against, with 8 abstentions (Algeria, Brazil, China, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation).

Speaking after the vote, JOHN DANFORTH (United States) said that the Security Council had consistently affirmed that it supported the full sovereignty and independence of Lebanon, free of all foreign forces. Lebanon should be allowed to determine its own future and assume control of its own territory, yet the Lebanese people were still unable to exercise their rights as a free people. With France, the United States had introduced the resolution, joined by several other co-sponsors. He had asked for a vote tonight because the situation in Lebanon was moving very quickly.

He explained that the Syrian Government had imposed its political will on Lebanon and had compelled the Cabinet and Lebanese National Assembly to amend its constitution and abort the electoral process by extending the term of the current President by three years. The final vote in the Assembly was scheduled for Friday so it was imperative for the Council to address the issue now. The Lebanese Parliament and Cabinet should express the will of the Lebanese people through a free and fair presidential electoral process. What the Lebanese people and he had witnessed in the past week in terms of Syrian actions was a “crude mockery” of that principle.

Clearly, he continued, the Lebanese Parliament had been pressured, and even threatened, by Syria and its agents to make them comply. He strongly supported the extension and control of Lebanon’s Government over all Lebanese territory, including southern Lebanon, as called for by the Council for the past four years. The continued presence of armed Hezbollah militia and the presence of Syrian military and Iranian forces in Lebanon hindered that goal.

He said that that situation, 14 years after the end of Lebanon’s civil war and four years after the Council had accepted unanimously the Secretary-General’s report that Israel had complied fully with Council resolution 425, was simply unacceptable. It was wrong for Syria to continue to maintain forces in Lebanon in “flat contravention” of the spirit and clear intent of the Taif Accord, and it would be very wrong for it to continue to interfere in the presidential electoral process in Lebanon.

JEAN-MARC DE LA SABLIERE (France) welcomed the adoption of the resolution. Lebanon had been through several decades of upheaval. After the war it had started to rebuild and had committed itself to a strengthened rule of law, faithful to its democratic aspirations. After a very troubled period, Lebanon must be able to restore confidence and prosperity, and that included the full restoration of its sovereignty and the free exercise of democracy. The Council had, since 1978, and well after that, noted Israel’s withdrawal and had been calling for respect for the territorial integrity, political independence and sovereignty of Lebanon. It had also regularly reaffirmed those objectives.

Today, he said, serious dangers threatened the future of Lebanon. Serious interference had persisted in the political life of the country, particularly in the electoral process, and occupation and the presence of armed militias had been maintained. France was deeply concerned that Lebanon might retreat from the objectives that had been reaffirmed constantly by the international community. That was why a rapid mobilization and a decisive reaction from the Council seemed essential. Withdrawal of foreign forces should no longer be delayed and the electoral process
should carry on without any foreign interference. Those demands were in keeping with the Council's position for more than 25 years and did not constitute interference in a State's internal affairs.

By refraining to act, he added, the Council would sanction interference in the internal affairs of another State. By acting in a robust manner, the Council was showing its confidence in Lebanon's future, which must include its full restoration of sovereignty, and not the intensification of interference.

WANG GUANGYA (China) said that respect for the principles of sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-interference in internal affairs constituted a centrepiece of China's foreign policy and were principles of the United Nations. In adherence to those principles, he supported the safeguarding of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon. The draft resolution touched on the question of the presidential elections in Lebanon. Such questions fell within the internal affairs of Lebanon and should be decided by the Lebanese people themselves. China had abstained in the vote on the draft.

China had closely followed the developments in Lebanon and hoped that Lebanon would maintain stability and economic development, which would be in the interest of peace and stability in the Middle East. He reiterated the hope that the parties concerned would be able to satisfactorily resolve all problems, including those on the Israeli/Palestinian, Israeli/Lebanese and Israeli/Syrian tracks so that lasting peace could be achieved in the Middle East.

ABDALLAH BAALE (Algeria) said that his country was staunchly committed to the sovereignty, unity and independence of Lebanon, as well as to respect for non-interference in its internal affairs, and had decided to abstain on the draft resolution for the following reasons. First, the situation in Lebanon did not appear to constitute a threat to international peace and security. Therefore, it was not of a nature to prompt an examination by and decision of the Council. Secondly, it was Israel, by its policies of occupation and aggression, and its repression of the Palestinians, which constituted an undeniable threat to international peace and security, he said. That should have required an urgent consideration and effective measures on the part of the Security Council. He had hoped to see the Council display towards Israel the same firmness shown today towards Lebanon, by demanding Israel's withdrawal from Arab lands.

Thirdly, the Council must not interfere in the internal affairs of States or in bilateral affairs between States. The Council's consideration of an internal matter for Lebanon constituted a harmful precedent which must not be repeated, unless the Council was to be led into serious excesses, running counter to the United Nations Charter. Only a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement could bring about a definitive peace in the Middle East.

MUNIR AKRAM (Pakistan) said he had abstained for a number of reasons, including that the resolution was not consistent with the Council's functions and responsibilities, especially under Article 41 of the Charter. In the present case, there was no evidence of any urgent threat to peace. There had been no complaint from the country whose sovereignty and integrity the draft purported to uphold. On the contrary, the Lebanese representatives had communicated to the Council their opposition to consideration of the resolution.

In addition, he said, that the resolution addressed the wrong threat. If there was a threat to Lebanon, that was well known and did not arise from Syria. He construed the provisions of operative paragraph 2 as now worded as constituting a reference to those foreign forces which had entered Lebanon uninvited and by the use of force. Also, the resolution went beyond the Council's mandate and authority, as described in Article 24 (2) of the Charter. The resolution, in preambular paragraph 6 and operative paragraph 5 intervened in the internal affairs of Lebanon. Such intervention was unacceptable and contrary to the Charter. That had also set an unfortunate precedent.

He said the text was also unclear, since it would be impossible for the Council to determine whether and when the constitutional rules of any country were “devised without foreign interference or influence”. For that reason, that provision was also unimplementable. Indeed, the Council would find it impossible to enforce changes in the national constitutions and rules of sovereign States. Action was taken on the text under an item on the Middle East. The Council must address the real threat to peace in the region, arising from the occupation of Palestinian and Arab territories, including the territory of Syria. He trusted it would not be deflected or diverted from that objective by the resolution it adopted today.
ANDREY DENISOV (Russian Federation) said the main purpose of the draft had been to prevent further escalation in the Middle East. Tension was high; any wrong step might exacerbate the regional situation and lead to a new focal point of instability, in addition to the existing Palestinian/Israeli conflict and Iraq. There was also a possibility that the fragile political balance in Lebanon might be in danger. So, he had tabled amendments, the purpose of which was to move the draft towards the context of a Middle East settlement as a whole and to prevent the document from being one-sided and from concentrating solely on domestic Lebanese affairs. Russia's proposals improved the draft by making it more acceptable to Council members. Unfortunately, they had not been adopted, and he, therefore, had been unable to support the resolution.

RONALDO MOTA SARDEMBERG (Brazil) said he had abstained on the vote. His delegation was following closely the events in Lebanon, as a result of its friendly historic ties to the Lebanese people. Bilateral relations with Lebanon were a high priority for Brazil. Resolution 1559 dealt with matters within the domestic jurisdiction of Lebanon. The existence of a dispute likely to endanger international peace and security had not been properly characterized in the text. He reiterated his commitment to a lasting peace in the Middle East, in conformity with, among other things, Council resolutions and various peace initiatives.

CRISTIAN MAQUEIRA (Chile) said he had voted in favour of the text because he supported its philosophy. The amendments to the original text had addressed his delegation's concerns. At the same time, he stated that the resolution meant that once again a double standard had been imposed in the Middle East conflict because of the clear lack of political will to deal with Israel's occupation of Arab lands. Also, there was no mention of the peace plan, which was the only viable mechanism to achieve lasting peace in the Middle East.

ISMAEL ABRAAO GASPAR MARTINS (Angola) said he voted in favour of the resolution, as the concerns expressed and the proposed amendments had been taken into account sufficiently. While it was not a perfect resolution, it was a "possible" resolution. He hoped that in adopting the resolution, the Council would be able to give an effective contribution to the political independence and sovereignty of Lebanon in its territorially recognized borders. He also hoped that its adoption would not have undesirable effects, since the situation in Lebanon did not represent an immediate threat to peace and security. The approach adopted by the Council could have been better balanced.

Also, the Council could have taken a more proactive role to the problems in the region. He would have preferred to seize the opportunity for an encouragement by the Council to the Governments of Lebanon and Syria to conclude a bilateral agreement, under the auspices of the Council. That approach might have safeguarded the interests of all the parties concerned and better achieved the objectives set by the international community.

LAURO L. BAJA, JR. (Philippines) said he had abstained because the resolution could not be justified as part of the role given to the Council in the collective security system under the Charter. There was a fine but clear boundary that marked the Council's role, as embodied in Article 39. Resolution 1559 had crossed that line and had collided "head on" with the principle of non-interference.

He said he had understood the promotion of Lebanon's enhanced territorial sovereignty and integrity, but no matter how noble its motives, the resolution placed the Council in a situation of acting in a manner which it sought to avoid in the first place, namely, not to interfere in the internal affairs of a country. The amendments tabled by Russia would have moved the resolution out of a distinct Lebanese internal affairs context. As a founding member of the Organization, he had felt a special duty to defend the Charter and its principles.

JOEL W. ADECHI (Benin) said he had supported the draft, as the initiative had been aimed at stabilizing Lebanon. He voted in favour of it because he had wished to reaffirm Council support for Lebanon's sovereignty and independence. Resolution 1559 dealt with the situation in the Middle East. He reaffirmed his support for the efforts to bring about a comprehensive political settlement in that region, including the withdrawal of all foreign forces present in the countries of the region. Accordingly, he had repeatedly expressed his commitment to peace and security in the region.
UN Resolution 1701

Press Release SC/8181
Security Council 5028th Meeting (Night)
SECURITY COUNCIL DECLARES SUPPORT FOR FREE, FAIR PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION IN LEBANON; CALLS FOR WITHDRAWAL OF FOREIGN FORCES THERE
Of 9 in Favour, to None Against, with 6 Abstentions
The Security Council this evening declared its support for a free and fair presidential election in Lebanon conducted according to Lebanese constitutional rules devised without foreign interference or influence and, in that connection, called upon all remaining foreign forces to withdraw from Lebanon.
By a vote of 9 in favour (Angola, Benin, Chile, France, Germany, Romania, Spain, United Kingdom, United States) to none against, with 6 abstentions (Algeria, Brazil, China, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation), the Council adopted resolution 1559 (2004), reaffirming its call for the strict respect of Lebanon’s sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity, and political independence under the sole and exclusive authority of the Government of Lebanon throughout the country.
In a related provision, the Council called for the disbanding and disarmament of all Lebanese and non-Lebanese militias. It also called upon all parties concerned to cooperate fully and urgently with the Council for the full implementation of all its resolutions concerning the restoration in Lebanon of territorial integrity, full sovereignty and political independence.
Requesting the Council to withdraw its consideration of that resolution before the vote, Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Emigrants of Lebanon, Mohamad Issa, said that friendly Syria had helped Lebanon to maintain stability and security within its borders. Syrian troops had been deployed and redeployed at Lebanon’s request, and had contributed to rebuffing the radical reactions emanating from repulsive Israeli actions. Also, the matter was purely internal and related to the upcoming presidential elections in Lebanon.
Asserting that the Syrian actions in the past week had made a “crude mockery” of the principle of a free and fair presidential electoral process, the United States’ representative said the Syrian Government had imposed its political will on Lebanon and had compelled the Cabinet and Lebanese National Assembly to amend its constitution and abort the electoral process by extending the term of the current President by three years. Clearly, the Lebanese Parliament had been pressured, and even threatened, by Syria and its agents to make them comply.
Similarly, the representative of France, who, along with the United States, had introduced the resolution, worried that persistent serious interference in the political life of Lebanon might cause it to retreat from the objectives that had been reaffirmed constantly by the international community. That was why a rapid mobilization and a decisive reaction from the Council had seemed essential. By refraining to act, the Council would have sanctioned interference in the internal affairs of another State. By acting in a robust manner, it was showing its confidence in Lebanon’s future, which must include its full restoration of sovereignty, and not the intensification of interference.
02/09/2004
Having abstained in the voting, China’s representative said that respect for the principles of sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-interference in internal affairs constituted a centrepiece of China’s foreign policy and were principles of the United Nations. In adherence to those principles, he supported safeguarding the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon. But, the draft resolution touched on the question of the presidential elections in Lebanon, and such questions fell within Lebanon’s internal affairs and should be decided by the Lebanese people themselves.
The representative of the Russian Federation said that, with tensions high in the region, any wrong step might exacerbate the situation and lead to a new focal point of instability. He had tabled amendments to the text, aimed at moving it towards the context of a Middle East settlement as a whole and preventing the document from being one-sided and from concentrating solely on domestic Lebanese affairs. His proposals would have improved the draft by making it more acceptable to Council members. Their lack of acceptance, however, had made it impossible for him to support the resolution.
Pakistan's speaker said he had also abstained, as the resolution was not consistent with the Council's functions and responsibilities. Moreover, there was no evidence of any urgent threat to peace. There had been no complaint from the country whose sovereignty and integrity the draft purported to uphold. On the contrary, the Lebanese representatives had communicated to the Council their opposition to consideration of the resolution. Besides, the text addressed the wrong threat. If there were a threat to Lebanon, that was well known and did not arise from Syria. Explanations of vote were also made by the representatives of Algeria, Brazil, Chile, Angola, Philippines and Benin.

The meeting began at 7:38 p.m. and was adjourned at 8:38 p.m. Resolution 1559 (2004) reads as follows:

The Security Council,


Reiterating its strong support for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally territorially recognized borders, 

Noting the determination of Lebanon to ensure the withdrawal of all non-Lebanese forces from Lebanon,

Gravely concerned at the continued presence of armed militias in Lebanon, which prevent the Lebanese government from exercising its full sovereignty over all Lebanese territory,

Reaffirming the importance of the extension of the control of the Government of Lebanon over all Lebanese territory,

Mindful of the upcoming Lebanese presidential elections and underlining the importance of free and fair elections according to Lebanese constitutional rules devised without foreign interference or influence,

1. Reaffirms its call for the strict respect of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity, and political independence of Lebanon under the sole and exclusive authority of the Government of Lebanon throughout Lebanon;

2. Calls upon all remaining foreign forces to withdraw from Lebanon;

3. "3. Calls for the disbanding and disarmament of all Lebanese and non-Lebanese militias;

4. "4. Supports the extension of the control of the Government of Lebanon over all Lebanese;

5. "5. Declares its support for a free and fair electoral process in Lebanon's upcoming presidential election conducted according to Lebanese constitutional rules devised without foreign interference or influence;

6. Calls upon all parties concerned to cooperate fully and urgently with the Security Council for the full implementation of this and all relevant resolutions concerning the restoration of the territorial integrity, full sovereignty, and political independence of Lebanon;

7. Requests that the Secretary-General report to the Security Council within thirty days on the implementation by the parties of this resolution and decides to remain actively seized of this matter."

Statements

MOHAMAD ISSA, Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Emigrants of Lebanon, said that there were no militias in Lebanon. There was only the national Lebanese resistance, which appeared after the Israeli occupation and which would remain so long as Israel remained. The resistance force existed alongside the Lebanese national forces. Lebanon determined the presence and size of the force, depending on the country's need. The authority of Lebanon extended to all parts of Lebanon except those areas occupied by Israel.

He said that submitting the draft resolution confused two matters. The first was the distinguished relations linking Lebanon and Syria, which achieved their joint interests, particularly the interests of Lebanon. Friendly Syria had helped Lebanon to maintain stability and security within its borders. It had warded off radicalism and violence, fed by the violence exercised by Israel against the Palestinians. Secondly, the matter was purely internal, and related to the presidential elections to be held in Lebanon. Syrian troops came to Lebanon in accordance with legitimate requests. Their presence was guarded by an agreement concluded by two sovereign States.
Those troops had been redeployed several times. They contributed to rebuffing the radical reactions emanating from repulsive Israeli actions. Hence, saying that Syria supported radical movements in Lebanon was not true. To the contrary, Syria supported the Lebanese national resistance, which desired to liberate the territories occupied by Israel. The draft resolution was talking about supporting free and just elections in Lebanon. He did not believe that that internal matter had ever been discussed in the Council relating to any Member State. It was an internal matter, he stressed. The United Nations had not interfered in that matter with regard to any other State. There was no justification for the draft resolution, which constituted an interference in the internal affairs of a Member State.

In addition, it discussed bilateral relations between two friendly nations, neither of which had filed any complaint concerning those relations. He called for the withdrawal of the draft resolution.

Action on Text

Next, the Council adopted the resolution by a vote of 9 in favour (Angola, Benin, Chile, France, Germany, Romania, Spain, United Kingdom, United States) to none against, with 6 abstentions (Algeria, Brazil, China, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation).

Speaking after the vote, JOHN DANFORTH (United States) said that the Security Council had consistently affirmed that it supported the full sovereignty and independence of Lebanon, free of all foreign forces. Lebanon should be allowed to determine its own future and assume control of its own territory, yet the Lebanese people were still unable to exercise their rights as a free people. With France, the United States had introduced the resolution, joined by several other co-sponsors. He had asked for a vote tonight because the situation in Lebanon was moving very quickly.

He explained that the Syrian Government had imposed its political will on Lebanon and had compelled the Cabinet and Lebanese National Assembly to amend its constitution and abort the electoral process by extending the term of the current President by three years. The final vote in the Assembly was scheduled for Friday so it was imperative for the Council to address the issue now. The Lebanese Parliament and Cabinet should express the will of the Lebanese people through a free and fair presidential electoral process. What the Lebanese people and he had witnessed in the past week in terms of Syrian actions was a "crude mockery" of that principle. Clearly, he continued, the Lebanese Parliament had been pressured, and even threatened, by Syria and its agents to make them comply. He strongly supported the extension and control of Lebanon's Government over all Lebanese territory, including southern Lebanon, as called for by the Council for the past four years. The continued presence of armed Hezbollah militia and the presence of Syrian military and Iranian forces in Lebanon hindered that goal.

He said that that situation, 14 years after the end of Lebanon's civil war and four years after the Council had accepted unanimously the Secretary-General's report that Israel had complied fully with Council resolution 425, was simply unacceptable. It was wrong for Syria to continue to maintain forces in Lebanon in "flat contravention" of the spirit and clear intent of the Taif Accord, and it would be very wrong for it to continue to interfere in the presidential electoral process in Lebanon.

JEAN-MARC DE LA SABLIERE (France) welcomed the adoption of the resolution. Lebanon had been through several decades of upheaval. After the war it had started to rebuild and had committed itself to a strengthened rule of law, faithful to its democratic aspirations. After a very troubled period, Lebanon must be able to restore confidence and prosperity, and that included the full restoration of its sovereignty and the free exercise of democracy. The Council had, since 1978, and well after that, noted Israel's withdrawal and had been calling for respect for the territorial integrity, political independence and sovereignty of Lebanon. It had also regularly reaffirmed those objectives.

Today, he said, serious dangers threatened the future of Lebanon. Serious interference had persisted in the political life of the country, particularly in the electoral process, and occupation and the presence of armed militias had been maintained. France was deeply concerned that Lebanon might retreat from the objectives that had been reaffirmed constantly by the international community. That was why a rapid mobilization and a decisive reaction from the Council seemed essential. Withdrawal of foreign forces should no longer be delayed and the electoral process should carry on without any foreign interference. Those demands were in keeping with the
Council’s position for more than 25 years and did not constitute interference in a State’s internal affairs.
By refraining to act, he added, the Council would sanction interference in the internal affairs of another State. By acting in a robust manner, the Council was showing its confidence in Lebanon’s future, which must include its full restoration of sovereignty, and not the intensification of interference.
WANG GUANGYA (China) said that respect for the principles of sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-interference in internal affairs constituted a centrepiece of China’s foreign policy and were principles of the United Nations. In adherence to those principles, he supported the safeguarding of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon. The draft resolution touched on the question of the presidential elections in Lebanon. Such questions fell within the internal affairs of Lebanon and should be decided by the Lebanese people themselves. Chinahadabstainedinthevoteforthedraft.
China had closely followed the developments in Lebanon and hoped that Lebanon would maintain stability and economic development, which would be in the interest of peace and stability in the Middle East. He reiterated the hope that the parties concerned would be able to satisfactorily resolve all problems, including those on the Israeli/Palestinian, Israeli/Lebanese and Israeli/Syrian tracks so that lasting peace could be achieved in the Middle East.
sovereignty, unity and independence of Lebanon, as well as to respect for non-interference in its internal affairs, and had decided to abstain on the draft resolution for the following reasons. First, the situation in Lebanon did not appear to constitute a threat to international peace and security. Therefore, it was not of a nature to prompt an examination by and decision of the Council. Secondly, it was Israel, by its policies of occupation and aggression, and its repression of the Palestinians, which constituted an undeniable threat to international peace and security, he said. That should have required an urgent consideration and effective measures on the part of the Security Council. He had hoped to see the Council display towards Israel the same firmness shown today towards Lebanon, by demanding Israel’s withdrawal from Arab lands.
Thirdly, the Council must not interfere in the internal affairs of States or in bilateral affairs between States. The Council’s consideration of an internal matter for Lebanon constituted a harmful precedent which must not be repeated, unless the Council was to be led into serious excesses, running counter to the United Nations Charter. Only a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement could bring about a definitive peace in the Middle East.
MUNIR AKRAM (Pakistan) said he had abstained for a number of reasons, including that the resolution was not consistent with the Council’s functions and responsibilities, especially under Article 41 of the Charter. In the present case, there was no evidence of any urgent threat to peace. There had been no complaint from the country whose sovereignty and integrity the draft purported to uphold. On the contrary, the Lebanese representatives had communicated to the Council their opposition to consideration of the resolution.
In addition, he said that the resolution addressed the wrong threat. If there was a threat to Lebanon, that was well known and did not arise from Syria. He construed the provisions of operative paragraph 2 as now worded as constituting a reference to those foreign forces which had entered Lebanon uninvited and by the use of force. Also, the resolution went beyond the Council’s mandate and authority, as described in Article 24 (2) of the Charter. The resolution, in preambular paragraph 6 and operative paragraph 5 intervened in the internal affairs of Lebanon. Such intervention was unacceptable and contrary to the Charter. That had also set an unfortunate precedent.
He said the text was also unclear, since it would be impossible for the Council to determine whether and when the constitutional rules of any country were “devised without foreign interference or influence”. For that reason, that provision was also unimplementable. Indeed, the Council would find it impossible to enforce changes in the national constitutions and rules of sovereign States. Action was taken on the text under an item on the Middle East. The Council must address the real threat to peace in the region, arising from the occupation of Palestinian and Arab territories, including the territory of Syria. He trusted it would not be deflected or diverted from that objective by the resolution it adopted today.
ANDREY DENISOV (Russian Federation) said the main purpose of the draft had been to prevent further escalation in the Middle East. Tension was high; any wrong step might exacerbate the
regional situation and lead to a new focal point of instability, in addition to the existing Palestinian/Israeli conflict and Iraq. There was also a possibility that the fragile political balance in Lebanon might be in danger. So, he had tabled amendments, the purpose of which was to move the draft towards the context of a Middle East settlement as a whole and to prevent the document from being one-sided and from concentrating solely on domestic Lebanese affairs. Russia’s proposals improved the draft by making it more acceptable to Council members. Unfortunately, they had not been adopted, and he, therefore, had been unable to support the resolution.

RONALDO MOTA SARDENBERG (Brazil) said he had abstained on the vote. His delegation was following closely the events in Lebanon, as a result of its friendly historic ties to the Lebanese people. Bilateral relations with Lebanon were a high priority for Brazil. Resolution 1559 dealt with matters within the domestic jurisdiction of Lebanon. The existence of a dispute likely to endanger international peace and security had not been properly characterized in the text. He reiterated his commitment to a lasting peace in the Middle East, in conformity with, among other things, Council resolutions and various peace initiatives.

CRISTIAN MAQUEIRA (Chile) said he had voted in favour of the text because he supported its philosophy. The amendments to the original text had addressed his delegation’s concerns. At the same time, he stated that the resolution meant that once again a double standard had been imposed in the Middle East conflict because of the clear lack of political will to deal with Israel’s occupation of Arab lands. Also, there was no mention of the peace plan, which was the only viable mechanism to achieve lasting peace in the Middle East.

ISMAEL ABRAAO GASPAR MARTINS (Angola) said he voted in favour of the resolution, as the concerns expressed and the proposed amendments had been taken into account sufficiently. While it was not a perfect resolution, it was a “possible” resolution. He hoped that in adopting the resolution, the Council would be able to give an effective contribution to the political independence and sovereignty of Lebanon in its territorially recognized borders. He also hoped that its adoption would not have undesirable effects, since the situation in Lebanon did not represent an immediate threat to peace and security. The approach adopted by the Council could have been better-balanced.

Also, the Council could have taken a more proactive role to the problems in the region. He would have preferred to seize the opportunity for an encouragement by the Council to the Governments of Lebanon and Syria to conclude a bilateral agreement, under the auspices of the Council. That approach might have safeguarded the interests of all the parties concerned and better achieved the objectives set by the international community.

LAURO L. BAJA, JR. (Philippines) said he had abstained because the resolution could not be justified as part of the role given to the Council in the collective security system under the Charter. There was a fine but clear boundary that marked the Council’s role, as embodied in Article 39. Resolution 1559 had crossed that line and had collided “head on” with the principle of non-interference.

He said he had understood the promotion of Lebanon's enhanced territorial sovereignty and integrity, but no matter how noble its motives, the resolution placed the Council in a situation of acting in a manner which it sought to avoid in the first place, namely, not to interfere in the internal affairs of a country. The amendments tabled by Russia would have moved the resolution out of a distinct Lebanese internal affairs context. As a founding member of the Organization, he had felt a special duty to defend the Charter and its principles.

JOEL W. ADECHI (Benin) said he had supported the draft, as the initiative had been aimed at stabilizing Lebanon. He voted in favour of it because he had wished to reaffirm Council support for Lebanon’s sovereignty and independence. Resolution 1559 dealt with the situation in the Middle East. He reaffirmed his support for the efforts to bring about a comprehensive political settlement in that region, including the withdrawal of all foreign forces present in the countries of the region. Accordingly, he had repeatedly expressed his commitment to peace and security in the region.
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Foreign Terrorist Organizations

BUREAU OF COUNTERTERRORISM

January 27, 2012

Foreign Terrorist Organizations (FTOs) are foreign organizations that are designated by the Secretary of State in accordance with section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended. FTO designations play a critical role in our fight against terrorism and are an effective means of curtailing support for terrorist activities and pressuring groups to get out of the terrorism business.

Current List of Designated Foreign Terrorist Organizations

1. Abu Nidal Organization (ANO) 2. Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG)
3. Al-Qaeda Martyrs Brigade (AAMS) 4. Al-Shabaab
5. Ansar al-Islam (AAI)
6. Aqbat al-Ansar
7. Aum Shinrikyo (AUM)
8. Basque Fatherland and Liberty (ETA)
9. Communist Party of the Philippines/New People’s Army (CPP/NPA)
10. Continuity Irish Republican Army (CIRA)
11. Gama’a al-Islamiyya (Islamic Group)
12. HAMAS (Islamic Resistance Movement)
15. Hizballah (Party of God)
16. Islamic Jihad Union (IJI)
17. Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU)
18. Jaish-e-Mohammed (JEM) (Army of Mohammed)
19. Jamaat Islamiya organization (JI)
20. Jama’ah Ansarut Tauhid (JAT)
21. Kahane Chai (Kach)
22. Kata’ib Hizballah (KHI)
23. Kongra-Gel (KGG, formerly Kurdistan Workers’ Party, PKK, KADEK) 24. Laashkar-e Tayyiba (LT) (Army of the Righteous)
25. Laashkar i Jhangvi (LJ)
26. Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE)
27. Libyan Islamic Fighting Group (LIG)
28. Moroccan Islamic Combatant Group (GICM)
29. Mujahedin-e Khalq Organization (MEK)
30. National Liberation Army (ELN)
31. Palestine Liberation Front (PLF)
32. Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ)
33. Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP)
34. PFLP-General Command (PFLP-GC)
35. al-Qaida in Iraq (AQI)
36. al-Qa’ida (AQ)
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37. al-Qa’ida in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP)
38. al-Qa’ida in the Islamic Maghreb (former GSPC)
39. Real IRA (RIRA)
40. Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC)
41. Revolutionary Organization 17 November (17N)
42. Revolutionary People’s Liberation Party/Front (DHKP/C)
43. Revolutionary Struggle (RS)
44. Shining Path (Sendero Luminoso, SL)
45. United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (UACC)
46. Harakat ul Jihad Islami (HUJI)
47. Tehrik-e Taliban Pakistan (TTP)
48. Jund al-Sham
49. Army of Islam (AOI)
50. Indian Mujahideen (IM)

Identification

The Bureau of Counterterrorism in the State Department (S/CT) continually monitors the activities of terrorist groups active around the world to identify potential targets for designation. When reviewing potential targets, S/CT looks not only at the actual terrorist attacks that a group has carried out, but also at whether the group has engaged in planning and preparations for possible future acts of terrorism or retains the capability and intent to carry out such acts.

Designation

Once a target is identified, S/CT prepares a detailed “administrative record,” which is a compilation of information, typically including both classified and open sources information, demonstrating that the statutory criteria for designation...
have been satisfied. If the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury, decides to make the designation, Congress is notified of the Secretary’s intent to designate the organization and given seven days to review the designation, as the INA requires. Upon the expiration of the seven-day waiting period and in the absence of Congressional action to block the designation, notice of the designation is published in the Federal Register, at which point the designation takes effect. By law an organization designated as an FTO may seek judicial review of the designation in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit not later than 30 days after the designation is published in the Federal Register.

Until recently the INA provided that FTOs must be redesignated every 2 years or the designation would lapse. Under the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (IRTPA), however, the redesignation requirement was replaced by certain review and revocation procedures. IRTPA provides that an FTO may file a petition for revocation 2 years after its designation date (or in the case of redesignated FTOs, its most recent redesignation date) or 2 years after the determination date on its most recent petition for revocation. In order to provide a basis for revocation, the petitioning FTO must provide evidence that the circumstances forming the basis for the designation are sufficiently different as to warrant revocation. If no such review has been conducted during a 5 year period with respect to a designation, then the Secretary of State is required to review the designation to determine whether revocation would be appropriate. In addition, the Secretary of State may at any time revoke a designation upon a finding that the circumstances forming the basis for the designation have changed in such a manner as to warrant revocation, or that the national security of the United States warrants a revocation. The same procedural requirements apply to revocations made by the Secretary of State as apply to redesignations. A designation may be revoked by an Act of Congress, or set aside by a Court order.

Legal Criteria for Designation under Section 219 of the INA as amended

1. It must be a foreign organization.
2. The organization must engage in terrorist activity, as defined in section 212 (a)(3)(B) of the INA (8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(3)(B)), or terrorism, as defined in section 140(d)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 (22 U.S.C. § 2656d(2)), or retain the capability and intent to engage in terrorist activity or terrorism.
3. The organization’s terrorist activity or terrorism must threaten the security of U.S. nationals or the national security (national defense, foreign relations, or the economic interests) of the United States.

Legal Ramifications of Designation

1. It is unlawful for a person in the United States or subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to knowingly provide "material support or resources" to a designated FTO. (The term "material support or resources" is defined in 18 U.S.C. § 2339A(b)(1) as "any property, tangible or intangible, or service, including currency or monetary instruments or financial securities, financial services, lodging, training, export advice or assistance, safehouses, false documentation or identification, communications equipment, facilities, weapons, lethal substances, explosives, or personnel (1 or more individuals who may or include oneself), and transportation, except medicine or religious materials." 18 U.S.C. § 2339A(b)(2) provides that for these purposes "the term 'training' means instruction or teaching designed to impart a specific skill, as opposed to general knowledge." 18 U.S.C. § 2339A(b)(3) further provides that for these purposes the term 'export advice or assistance' means advice or assistance derived from scientific, technical or other specialized knowledge.")
2. Representatives and members of a designated FTO, if they are aliens, are inadmissible to and, in certain circumstances, removable from the United States (see 8 U.S.C. §§ 1182 (a)(3)(B)(i)(IV)-(V), 1227 (a)(1)(A)).
3. Any U.S. financial institution that becomes aware that it has possession of or control over funds in which a designated FTO or its agent has an interest must retain possession of or control over the funds and report the funds to the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the U.S. Department of the Treasury.

Other Effects of Designation

1. Supports our efforts to curb terrorism financing and to encourage other nations to do the same. 2. Stigmatizes and isolates designated terrorist organizations internationally.
3. Deters donations or contributions to and economic transactions with named organizations.
4. Heightens public awareness and knowledge of terrorist organizations.
5. Signals to other governments our concern about named organizations.
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