

the aegis of the First Committee during the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly and expressed the hope that by providing that information, on the assassination, the Government of Chad would have made its contribution to the efforts of the international community. The Minister presented the disarmed weapon for examination by the Members of the Council and a videotape featuring a simulation of the terrorist act as well as brochures containing photographs.⁶

The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya reiterated the position expressed in the above-mentioned letter,⁵ that there was no logical justification for the convening of the Council, but—following the statement of the representative of Chad—he found it necessary to make certain observations. He rejected all allegations against his country and argued that there was no Libyan presence whatsoever on Chadian territory. The only forces stationed in the northern part of Chad were those of the legitimate Government of National Unity. He appraised the request for the meeting of the Council as an attempt on the part of the “rebel regime” in Chad to slander the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya; to belittle the military importance of the Government of National Unity; to justify obtaining more weapons and foreign mercenaries; and to mislead world public opinion. The speaker recounted his version of the issue, seeing President Hussein Habré as the main source of trouble owing to his refusal to accept any agreements, including the latest, namely, the Lagos Agreement of August 1979, that had been signed by 11 Chadian parties and had led to the formation of the Government recognized by OAU. He described the situation in Chad as civil war that had resulted in the elimination of many people and prompted some to seek asylum. He stated that Mr. Habré had impeded all efforts at conciliation initiated by leaders of some African countries. He observed that it was not surprising that “such

a Government” faced resistance from the Chadian people and that there had been an attempt on the “rebel’s” life. He also noted that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had a special relationship with Chad, being linked to its people by historical, geographical, cultural and spiritual ties, and gave an account of Libyan endeavours to achieve reconciliation in Chad. At the same time he emphasized that Libya intended to preserve the unity of its own soil, whatever the price. He referred to the “so-called Aouzou Strip” as an integral part of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya inherited from Italian colonialism and indicated as such on the map attached to the report of the United Nations Commission in Libya.⁷ The representative considered that the only solution to the conflict in Chad was to seek national reconciliation in accordance with the Lagos Accord, under the supervision of the OAU, with the participation of all the parties that signed that Accord.⁸

The President of the Security Council reminded the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya that the complaint under consideration came from the internationally recognized Government of Chad and that its legitimacy could not be challenged in the Council. He referred to the recommendations of the Council regarding settlement of the dispute between Chad and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, made at the request of that Government, in the statement made by the President of the Security Council on 6 April 1983.⁹

The representative of Chad denied all allegations and noted that the international community had been given an opportunity to judge for itself.¹⁰

The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya affirmed that Libya did not recognize and never would recognize the “government of insurgency” in Chad.¹⁰

⁶S/PV.2567, pp. 6-18.

⁷OR, 5th session of the General Assembly, Suppl. No. 15.

⁸S/PV.2567, pp. 22-30.

⁹Ibid., p. 30.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 31.

2. THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Decision of 12 March 1985 (2573rd meeting): rejection of a draft resolution

By a letter dated 25 February 1985 addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹ the representative of Lebanon requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the continuing acts of aggression and practices of the Israeli occupying forces in southern Lebanon, the Western Bekaa and the Rashaya district.

At its 2568th meeting, on 28 February 1985, the Security Council included the letter in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council decided to invite the following, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote: at the 2568th meeting, the representatives of Israel, Lebanon, Qatar and the Syrian Arab Republic;² at the 2570th meeting, the representatives of Algeria, India and the Islamic Republic of Iran;³ at the 2572nd meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Cuba,

Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Jordan, the United Arab Emirates, Vietnam and Yugoslavia;⁴ at the 2573rd meeting, the representatives of Bangladesh, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Senegal and the Sudan.⁵ At its 2568th meeting, the Council also extended an invitation under rule 39 of the Council’s provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Clovis Maksoud,⁶ the Permanent Observer for the League of Arab States. At its 2572nd meeting, the Council decided by a vote and in accordance with its previous practice to invite the representative of the PLO to participate in the deliberations without the right to vote.⁷ The Council considered the item at its 2568th, 2570th, 2572nd and 2573rd meetings, on 28 February and 7, 11 and 12 March 1985.

⁴See S/PV.2572.

⁵See S/PV.2573.

⁶See S/PV.2568; for further details, see chap. III of the present Supplement.

⁷For the vote (10 to 1, with 4 abstentions), see S/PV. 2572; for further details, see chap. III of the present Supplement.

¹S/16983.

²See S/PV.2568.

³See S/PV.2570.

At the 2568th meeting, on 28 February 1985, the representative of Lebanon reminded the Council of the Lebanese complaint six months earlier and of the failure of the Council to adopt a resolution, which, he said, had opened the way to Israel to persist in its practices and to feel released of its international commitments to the Charter of the United Nations, the Declaration of Human Rights or other conventions, in particular the 1949 Fourth Geneva Convention. The representative of Lebanon hoped that the Council, in view of the continuation of the Israeli practices, would adopt a clear resolution calling on Israel to put an end to the military operations and practices and to implement the Council's resolutions. He accused Israel of causing the failure of the Naqoura talks, which had been called for by the Secretary-General in order to obtain full Israeli withdrawal followed by arrangements for the achievement of security and stability. He then offered a detailed account of Israeli acts and practices in the area against the Lebanese population. In conclusion he requested that the Council: (a) express deepest concern at the Israeli military operations and practices in the areas of occupied Lebanon; (b) demand that Israel cease immediately those acts and operations; (c) condemn Israel and denounce its activities and practices; (d) reaffirm the importance of implementation of previous Council resolutions; (e) reaffirm provisions of the 1949 Fourth Geneva Convention and its applicability to territories occupied by Israel in Lebanon; (f) reaffirm that Israel must be committed to respect the aforementioned conventions and (g) affirm respect for Lebanon's sovereignty, independence and integrity.⁸

At the same meeting, the representative of Qatar referred to resolution 509 (1982), which called for the withdrawal of Israel to the international borders of Lebanon, and stated that the Council would not have been considering another Lebanese complaint had Israel implemented that and other Council resolutions. He affirmed the legitimate right of the Lebanese people to resist Israeli occupation, stated that the situation in southern Lebanon threatened peace and security and called upon the Council to end the Israeli occupation by adopting a resolution compelling Israel to respect the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international instruments, especially the 1949 Fourth Geneva Convention. In conclusion, he said that the new resolution must include provisions that would end Israel's disregard of Council resolutions.⁹

Also at the same meeting, the representative of Israel stated that the Government of Lebanon had the duty, under international law, to prevent its territory from being used for attacks against another State and that the State under such attacks had the right to take appropriate self-defence measures to protect its territories and citizens. He said that Israel had acted in that spirit and that it would continue to act to defend itself. He called upon the Government of Lebanon to exercise sovereignty over its territories and to stop the use of its territories for terrorist attacks against Israel.¹⁰

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic referred to the failure of the Council to adopt a resolution the last time it had considered a similar Lebanese complaint.¹¹ He

called upon the Council to condemn Israel's acts and practices in southern Lebanon. He stated that those acts were serious violations of articles 32, 33, 49, 53 and 55 of the 1949 Fourth Geneva Convention and that the Council must take the necessary measures in accordance with the provisions of the Charter and international law. He called upon the Council to shoulder its responsibility and to take all measures to eliminate acts of aggression against Lebanese territory.¹²

The representative of the United States of America stated that recourse to a Council resolution, which, he believed, would be one-sided, would not achieve the common objective of confirming the authority of the Government of Lebanon over its entire territory. He stated that his Government supported an orderly and rapid Israeli withdrawal from southern Lebanon and that the best way to achieve such an objective was to support a practical approach through the United Nations initiative to hold military-to-military talks between Lebanon and Israel at Naqoura.¹³

At the same meeting, statements were made by Egypt, France and the Ukraine. Israel, Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic also spoke in exercise of the right of reply.

At the 2570th meeting, on 7 March 1985, the President (Madagascar) drew the attention of the Security Council to the text of a draft resolution submitted by Lebanon.¹⁴

At the same meeting the representative of Yugoslavia, speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, stated that occupation did not bestow any rights on the occupier and that the occupier had but one duty: to withdraw. He added that there could be no justification for any act that limited or threatened the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of another State. He stated that no country could strengthen its security by using force against another or by occupying foreign territory, and that no matter what an aggressor or occupier claimed, resistance to occupation and aggression was legitimate and justified.¹⁵

The representative of India affirmed that it was appropriate that the Security Council, which was entrusted under the Charter with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, should take upon itself the task of finding ways and means of ameliorating the serious situation, which could have wider repercussions for peace and stability in the region. He reiterated the call of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries of 6 March 1985 for the speedy implementation of Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) in order to ensure the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Lebanese territories.¹⁶

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics called for the immediate implementation of previous Council resolutions, and emphasized that the implementation of the Council's resolutions was a matter of principle, if there were a desire for it to effectively perform the functions entrusted to it under the Charter.¹⁷

The representative of Denmark reiterated the need for speedy and total Israeli withdrawal and urged all parties to show the utmost restraint. He welcomed the negotiating

⁸See S/PV.2568.

⁹Ibid., pp. 18-23.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 31-37.

¹¹See S/PV.2556.

¹²S/PV.2568, pp. 37-54.

¹³Ibid., pp. 56 and 57.

¹⁴S/17000.

¹⁵S/PV.2570, pp. 18-22.

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 22-27.

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 28-33.

process with the United Nations involvement initiated at Naqoura and the efforts of the Secretary-General in implementation of Council resolution 555 (1984).¹⁸

The representative of the United States of America stated that its goals with regard to Lebanon were (a) withdrawal of all foreign forces; (b) stable and secure Lebanese-Israeli border; and (c) the extension of central government authority over all Lebanese territory, including the south. She added that the United States had repeatedly called on all parties to exercise restraint and urged them to take advantage of the Naqoura process.¹⁹

At the same meeting, the representatives of Lebanon, Algeria, Burkina Faso, the United Kingdom, Australia, the Islamic Republic of Iran and Israel made statements.

At the 2572nd meeting, the representatives of Lebanon, Thailand, China, France, Democratic Yemen, Cuba, the Ukraine, Peru, Madagascar, Jordan, the German Democratic Republic, the United Arab Emirates, Bangladesh and Viet Nam made statements. The representative of the PLO and Mr. C. Maksoud also spoke.

The representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the President of the Council spoke on procedural points.

At the 2573rd meeting, on 12 March 1985, the representative of Israel stated that Israel would never accept the principle that it could not defend itself against attacks and would continue to track its attackers back to their havens, confiscate their weapons and thwart their plans to murder Israelis.²⁰

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic argued that, according to the principles of international law and under Article 51 of the Charter, the right of the Lebanese people to resist Israeli aggression was the natural and the ideal means in the circumstances prevailing in southern Lebanon.²¹

At the same meeting, the President announced his intention to put to the vote the draft resolution that had been submitted by Lebanon.¹⁴ Under the preambular part of the draft resolution, the Security Council would have, *inter alia*, reaffirmed previous resolutions on Lebanon and recalled the relevant provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and stressed the humanitarian principles of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and the obligations arising from the regulations annexed to the Hague Convention of 1907. Under the operative part of the draft resolution, the Council would have: (a) condemned Israeli practices and measures against civilians in Southern Lebanon; (b) reaffirmed the need to implement the provisions of previous Council resolutions on Lebanon demanding withdrawal of Israeli forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon; (c) reiterated its call for strict respect for the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries; (d) affirmed that the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention applied to the territories occupied by Israel in southern Lebanon, the Western Bekaa and the Rashaya district; (e) demanded that the Government of Israel, the occupying Power, desist

forthwith from its practices against the civilian population in those areas and immediately lift all restrictions and obstacles to the restoration of normal conditions in those areas in violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention and other norms of international law; (f) requested the Secretary-General to establish a fact-finding mission to report on those Israeli practices and measures in southern Lebanon; and (g) requested the Secretary-General to keep the situation under review, to consult with the Government of Lebanon and to report to the Council as soon as possible.

At the 2573rd meeting, statements were made by the representatives of Cyprus, Indonesia, Nicaragua, Poland, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Pakistan, the Sudan, Czechoslovakia and Burkina Faso.

The representative of the United States of America, speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, indicated that it would vote against the draft because it was unbalanced. She stated that her delegation would still be ready to support a statement that reflected the dismay of the Council at the escalation of violence in Lebanon; expressed sympathy to the victims of violence; urged restraint of all parties; called on all parties to implement the recommendations of the Secretary-General's report; affirmed the application of the Fourth Geneva Convention to the occupied areas of Lebanon; and reaffirmed the commitment of all to the full restoration of Lebanon's sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and unity.²²

A statement before the vote was also made by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago.

At the same meeting, the draft resolution was voted upon and received 11 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions; it was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.²³

Decision of 17 April 1985 (2575th meeting): resolution 561 (1985)

At its 2575th meeting, on 17 April 1985, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), of 11 April 1985,²⁴ in its agenda.

The report of the Secretary-General contained an account of developments relating to UNIFIL from 10 October 1984 to 11 April 1985. The Secretary-General noted in his report that the situation in southern Lebanon had deteriorated noticeably in the last six months as a result of increasing confrontation between Israeli forces and Lebanese resistance groups. He believed that the presence of UNIFIL would be essential in those circumstances and he had recommended a six-month extension, taking account of the request of the Government of Lebanon contained in the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon dated 27 March 1985.²⁵

The Secretary-General described in his report the numerous attacks by Lebanese resistance groups against Israel Defence Forces (IDF) positions, including roadside explosions and suicide car-bomb attacks. He also described the increasingly frequent cordon-and-search operations listed

¹⁸Ibid., pp. 41-44.

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 45-52.

²⁰S/PV.2573, pp. 53-58.

²¹Ibid., pp. 60-72.

²²S/PV.2573, pp. 77-82.

²³For the vote, see S/PV.2573; see also chap. IV of the present Supplement.

²⁴S/17093.

²⁵S/17062.

in the report, with a view to preventing, within the limits of UNIFIL means, acts of violence against the population and the destruction of property. The reports also referred to the efforts of UNIFIL to contain the activities of Lebanese irregulars armed and controlled by the IDF.

The report also gave an account of the Naqoura talks. On 31 October 1984, following consultations with the Governments of Lebanon and Israel, the Secretary-General had announced the convocation of a conference of military representatives from the two countries to discuss military aspects relating to the withdrawal of Israeli forces and security arrangements in southern Lebanon in order to implement Council resolution 555 (1984). The talks took place under United Nations auspices at UNIFIL headquarters in Naqoura in November 1984 and lasted into January 1985, but had produced no results. The report also referred to the visit of Mr. Brian Urquhart, Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs, to the UNIFIL headquarters and to the discussions he had held with Lebanese government officials in January and April 1985.

The Secretary-General emphasized the need to establish, under the authority of the Council, conditions in which UNIFIL could function in cooperation with the Lebanese authorities and army. He pointed out that he could not conceal his dismay at the inappropriate situation in which UNIFIL had found itself on various occasions in the past. He stated that there should be a clear understanding that no armed military or paramilitary personnel of any kind be allowed to operate in the area, other than the Lebanese army and UNIFIL, and that all parties and elements publicly declare their support for and cooperation with the Lebanese authorities and UNIFIL.

Following the adoption of the agenda, the President invited the representative of Lebanon, at his request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.²⁶ The Council considered the issue at its 2575th meeting, on 17 April 1985.

At the same meeting, the President drew attention to the text of a draft resolution which had been drawn up in the course of the Council's consultations. He put the draft resolution to the vote; it received 13 votes to none, with 2 abstentions, and was adopted as resolution 561 (1985).²⁷ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978), 501 (1982), 508 (1982), 509 (1982) and 520 (1982), as well as all its resolutions on the situation in Lebanon,

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon of 11 April 1985, and taking note of the observations expressed therein,

Taking note of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General of 27 March 1985,

Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,

1. *Decides to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further interim period of six months, that is, until 19 October 1985;*

2. *Reiterates its strong support for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;*

3. *Re-emphasizes the terms of reference and general guidelines of the Force as stated in the report of the Secretary-General of 19 March 1978, approved by resolution 426 (1978), and calls upon all parties concerned to cooperate fully with the Force for the full implementation of its mandate;*

4. *Reiterates that the Force should fully implement its mandate as defined in resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978) and all other relevant resolutions;*

5. *Requests the Secretary-General to continue consultations with the Government of Lebanon and other parties directly concerned on the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Council thereon.*

Decision of 21 May 1985 (2581st meeting): resolution 563 (1985)

At its 2581st meeting on 21 May 1985, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) of 13 May 1985²⁸ in its agenda.

The report described the activities of UNDOF for the period from 17 November 1984 to 13 May 1985. It noted that the Force had continued to perform its functions effectively, with the cooperation of both parties (the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel), although restrictions on movement and inspection were placed on UNDOF teams in certain areas by both sides. The Secretary-General indicated that during the period under review the situation in the Israel-Syria sector had remained quiet, but that, despite the present quiet in the sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continued to be potentially dangerous and was likely to remain so unless and until a comprehensive, just and durable peace settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem could be reached, as called for by the Council in its resolution 338 (1973). In the prevailing circumstances, the Secretary-General considered the continued presence of UNDOF in the area to be essential. He therefore recommended that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, until 30 November 1985, and pointed out that the Governments concerned had given their consent.

At the 2581st meeting, on 21 May 1985, the President drew attention to a draft resolution, which had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.²⁹ He then put the draft resolution to the vote. It was adopted unanimously as resolution 563 (1985).³⁰ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force,

Decides:

(a) *To call upon the parties concerned to implement immediately Security Council resolution 338 (1973);*

(b) *To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 30 November 1985;*

(c) *To request the Secretary-General to submit, at the end of this period, a report on the developments in the situation and the measures taken to implement resolution 338 (1973).*

²⁸S/17177.

²⁹S/17202, adopted without change as resolution 563 (1985).

³⁰For the vote, see S/PV.2581; see also chap. IV of the present Supplement.

²⁶For details, see chap. III of the present Supplement.

²⁷For the vote, see S/PV.2575; see also chap. IV of the present Supplement.

Decision of 21 May 1985: statement by the President

At the same meeting, the President, on behalf of the Security Council, made the following complementary statement regarding resolution 563 (1985):³¹

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 26:

"Despite the present quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached."

That statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council.

The representatives of China, the United States of America, Australia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, France, Denmark and Egypt made statements.

Decision of 24 May 1985: statement by the President

On 24 May 1985, after consultations with the members of the Security Council, the President issued the following statement on behalf of the members of the Council on the situation in Lebanon:³²

The members of the Security Council express their serious concern at the heightened violence in certain parts of Lebanon in the past few days.

They take note of and fully support the statement issued on 22 May 1985 by the Secretary-General, which also refers to the situation in and around the Palestinian refugee camps, and his appeal to all concerned to make every possible effort to put an end to violence involving the civilian population.

They reaffirm that the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon must be respected.

In response to their humanitarian concern, they strongly appeal for restraint, in order to alleviate the sufferings of civilians in Lebanon.

Decision of 31 May 1985 (2582nd meeting): resolution 564 (1985)

By a letter dated 30 May 1985 addressed to the President of the Security Council,³³ the representative of Egypt requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the continued escalation of violence involving the civilian population in and around Beirut, affecting the safety and security of the Palestinians in the refugee camps.

At its 2582nd meeting, on 31 May 1985, the Council included the letter in its agenda. The Council considered the item at the same meeting. Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council decided to invite the following, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote: the representatives of Lebanon, Malta and the Syrian Arab Republic.³⁴ At the same meeting, the Council decided by vote and in accordance with previous practice to invite the representative of the PLO to participate in the deliberations without the right to vote.³⁴

At the same meeting, the President drew attention to a draft resolution, which had been prepared in the course of

the Council's consultation,³⁵ and put it to the vote; it was adopted unanimously as resolution 564 (1985).³⁶ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Recalling the statement made by the President on 24 May 1985 on behalf of the members of the Council on the heightened violence in certain parts of Lebanon,

Alarmed at the continued escalation of violence involving the civilian population, including Palestinians in refugee camps, resulting in grievous casualties and material destruction on all sides,

1. *Expresses anew* its deepest concern at the heavy costs in human lives and material destruction affecting the civilian population in Lebanon, and calls on all concerned to end acts of violence against the civilian population in Lebanon and, in particular, in and around Palestinian refugee camps;

2. *Reiterates* its calls for respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon;

3. *Calls upon* all parties to take necessary measures to alleviate the suffering resulting from acts of violence, in particular by facilitating the work of United Nations agencies, especially the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, and non-governmental organizations, including the International Committee of the Red Cross, in providing humanitarian assistance to all those affected and emphasizes the need to ensure the safety of all the personnel of these organizations;

4. *Appeals* to all interested parties to cooperate with the Lebanese Government and the Secretary-General with a view to ensuring the implementation of this resolution, and requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council thereon;

5. *Reaffirms* its intention to continue to follow the situation closely.

After the vote, several representatives made statements. The representative of Egypt summed up the situation in the following way: the need to look for practical means, in accordance with the mandate of the Council, to ensure the protection, security, tranquillity and welfare of the Palestinian people, in the context of the full, unprejudiced, undiminished sovereignty of Lebanon. The representative of Lebanon argued that his Government had opposed the Council's dealing with the situation in and around the Palestinian camps, because that was an internal matter since the camps were located on Lebanese territory. He added that the convening of the Council to consider such a situation constituted blatant interference in Lebanon's internal affairs. He further argued that, in accordance with Article 52 of the Charter, the Council should have encouraged efforts at the regional and internal levels to deal with the situation. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics supported the representative of Lebanon by expressing his delegation's regret over the fact that the position of the Government of Lebanon had not been taken into account by those who had initiated the convening of the Council's meeting. The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic stated that, in the light of Lebanon's objection, the convening of the Council on a situation inside Lebanon was in direct contravention of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

The representatives of France, Malta, the United States of America and Australia, as well as the representative of the PLO, also spoke.

³¹S/17206.

³²S/17215.

³³S/17228.

³⁴For the vote (10 to 1, with 4 abstentions), see S/PV.2582; for further details, see chap. III of the present *Supplement*.

³⁵S/17232, adopted without change as resolution 564 (1985).

³⁶For the vote, see S/PV.2582; for further details, see chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

Decision of 17 October 1985 (2623rd meeting): resolution 575 (1985)

At its 2623rd meeting, on 17 October 1985, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL of 10 October 1985³⁷ in its agenda.

The report of the Secretary-General contained an account of developments relating to UNIFIL for the period from 12 April 1985 to 10 October 1985. The Secretary-General noted in his report that the greater part of the UNIFIL area had been relatively quiet since its evacuation by the Israeli forces, while, in contrast, the situation in the "security zone" had been very tense owing to frequent attacks by Lebanese resistance groups on Israeli troops and the Lebanese irregulars associated with them. He was convinced that UNIFIL was an extremely important factor in whatever peace and normality existed in southern Lebanon and that, if UNIFIL were to disappear, the ensuing cycle of violence could well develop into a new and serious international crisis. He therefore concluded that, especially in the light of the request of the Government of Lebanon,³⁸ it was his duty to recommend a further extension of the mandate of UNIFIL for a period of six months. He cautioned, however, that such an extension should not be understood to mean that UNIFIL would be allowed to become an open-ended commitment for the troop-contributing countries and for the United Nations if the requisite conditions for the effective operation of the Force continued to be absent.

The report gave a detailed description of the Israeli plan for a unilateral redeployment of Israeli forces in three phases, which had been announced by the Government of Israel in January 1985. Between February and April 1985, Israeli forces had evacuated several areas, in particular Sidon, Nabatiyah, Bekaa and Tyre. At the end of the second phase, the Israeli forces were redeployed in a strip of land north of the international border extending from the Mediterranean Sea to the Hasbaya area, with a depth varying between about 2 kilometres at its narrowest point and about 10 kilometres at its widest. In accordance with the Israeli plan, that strip of land, which extended into part of the UNIFIL area, was to be maintained as a "security zone" where the "South Lebanese Army (SLA)" and other local militias armed and controlled by the Israeli forces were to function with the latter's backing, after the completion of the third and last phase of the Israeli redeployment. The Secretary-General further observed that, owing to the "security zone" declared by Israel, UNIFIL had not been able to extend its deployment to the international border and that, in the part of its area of deployment that overlaps with the "security zone", UNIFIL found itself confronted with many positions manned by the IDF or the "SLA" or both. The full implementation of Security Council resolution 561 (1985) was therefore not achieved.

The Secretary-General observed in his report that the situation in Lebanon south of the Litani river was not only unsatisfactory but also dangerous. He was convinced that, if the Israeli presence in the "security zone" were to continue for long, violence would inevitably escalate and spread. Making a recommendation to the Council on UNIFIL posed a dilemma to him. On the one hand, he agreed

that the conditions in which UNIFIL could fully perform its functions or completely fulfil its mandate did not exist, and the situation was most likely to deteriorate further. On the other hand, the presence of UNIFIL was important and had contributed to keeping the level of violence limited to some extent. The Secretary-General felt that there was a good chance of re-establishing peace and security in Lebanon south of the Litani if the correct actions were taken by all.

Following the adoption of the agenda, the President invited the representatives of Lebanon and Israel, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.²⁶

At the same meeting, the President put to a vote a draft resolution, which had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.³⁹ It received 13 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), and was adopted as resolution 575 (1985).⁴⁰ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978), 501 (1982), 508 (1982), 509 (1982) and 520 (1982), as well as all its resolutions on the situation in Lebanon,

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon of 10 October 1985 and taking note of the observations expressed therein,

Taking note of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General of 3 October 1985,

Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,

1. *Decides* to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further interim period of six months, that is, until 19 April 1986;
2. *Reiterates* its strong support for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;
3. *Re-emphasizes* the terms of reference and general guidelines of the Force as stated in the report of the Secretary-General of 19 March 1978, approved by resolution 426 (1978), and calls upon all parties concerned to cooperate fully with the Force for the full implementation of its mandate;
4. *Reiterates* that the Force should fully implement its mandate as defined in resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978) and all other relevant resolutions;
5. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue consultations with the Government of Lebanon and other parties directly concerned on the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Security Council thereon.

Following the vote, the representative of China stated that the Israeli authorities should be held responsible for the abnormal situation in southern Lebanon and that the "security zone" set up there by Israel constituted the basic obstacle to the functioning of UNIFIL. He called on the Council to take effective measures to dismantle the "security zone" and to bring about the total withdrawal of Israeli troops from southern Lebanon, allowing the recovery of Lebanese sovereignty over the area and the restoration of international peace and security.

The representative of France stated that UNIFIL was caught between two hostile forces and continued to be prevented, in contravention of Council resolutions, from deploying its personnel up to the international border, as pro-

³⁷S/17557.

³⁸S/17526.

³⁹S/17567.

⁴⁰For the vote, see S/PV.2623; see also chap. IV of the present Supplement.

vided for in the UNIFIL mandate. He underlined the need for comprehensive implementation of Council resolutions 425 (1978) and 427 (1978).

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics argued that Israel defiantly refused to implement the resolutions of the Council on southern Lebanon and UNIFIL and that it was well known who was standing behind Israel and who was preventing the Council from ensuring implementation of its resolutions. He stated that the United States of America would do well to bear in mind the fact that such action seriously undermined the Council's prestige and effectiveness.

Statements were also made by the representatives of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Denmark and the United States of America.

The representative of Lebanon reiterated Lebanon's position on the need to implement relevant Council resolutions, the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory and the restoration of Lebanese authority over all Lebanese territory. He called on the Council to assume its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and to ensure the implementation of its resolutions.

The representative of Israel reiterated that Israel's only interest in the Lebanese situation was to ensure the security of its population in the north of Israel against the terrorist attacks they had experienced since the early 1970s owing to the collapse of Lebanon's effective sovereignty and its domination, first by the PLO and then by the Syrian Arab Republic. He asserted that in his Government's view, UNIFIL had no useful role to play and that the only possibility for maintaining security in the area was through the maintenance of the status quo.

Decision of 21 November 1985 (2630th meeting): resolution 576 (1985)

At its 2630th meeting, on 21 November 1985, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF of 13 November 1985⁴¹ in its agenda.

The report of the Secretary-General described the activities of UNDOF for the period from 14 May 1985 to 13 November 1985. It noted that UNDOF had continued, with the cooperation of all parties, to fulfil the tasks entrusted to it. The Secretary-General indicated, however, that the problem of restrictions on the freedom of movement still existed. He reiterated that despite the present quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continued to be potentially dangerous and was likely to remain so unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem could be reached, as called for by the Security Council in its resolution 338 (1973). In the prevailing circumstances, the Secretary-General considered the continued presence of UNDOF in the area to be essential. Noting that the Governments concerned had given their consent, he recommended that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, until 31 May 1986.

At the same meeting, the President drew attention to a draft resolution, which had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.⁴² He then put the draft resolu-

tion to the vote; it was unanimously adopted as resolution 576 (1985).⁴³ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force,

Decides:

(a) To call upon the parties concerned to implement immediately Security Council resolution 338 (1973);

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 31 May 1986;

(c) To request the Secretary-General to submit, at the end of this period, a report on the developments in the situation and the measures taken to implement resolution 338 (1973).

At the same meeting, the President, on behalf of the Council, made the following complementary statement regarding resolution 576 (1985):⁴⁴

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 25:

"Despite the present quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached."

That statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council.

Decision of 17 January 1986 (2642nd meeting): rejection of a draft resolution

By a letter dated 6 January 1986 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁴⁵ the representative of Lebanon requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the acts of aggression of the Israeli occupying forces against a number of Lebanese villages in the period between 29 December 1985 and 7 January 1986.

At its 2640th meeting, on 13 January 1986, the Council included the letter in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council decided to invite the following, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote: the representatives of Lebanon, Israel, the Syrian Arab Republic and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya;⁴⁶ at the 2641st meeting, the representatives of Qatar and Saudi Arabia; and at the 2642nd meeting, the representative of Morocco.⁴⁶ The Council considered the item at its 2640th and 2642nd meetings, on 13 and 17 January 1986.

At the 2640th meeting, the representative of Lebanon stated that despite the repeated warnings by his Government⁴⁶ and by the Secretary-General,⁴⁷ Israel had escalated its acts of aggression and illegal practices in the south of Lebanon, directly through the IDF or indirectly through the "SLA". He added that, in view of that deliberate escalation, Lebanon had decided to call upon the Council to convene in order to assume its responsibilities and to fulfil its mandate in its capacity as the primary authority charged with preserving international peace and security. He then provided a detailed account of IDF/SLA operations against

⁴²S/17642.

⁴³For the vote, see S/PV.2630; see also chap. IV of the present Supplement.

⁴⁴S/17653.

⁴⁵S/17717.

⁴⁶Ibid.

⁴⁷S/17684.

⁴¹S/17628.

Lebanese villages and towns in the south in the period between 29 December 1985 and 7 January 1986. He argued that the shelling, air raids and naval attacks had preceded the launching of two Katyusha rockets on Qiryat Shemona (in northern Israel), and had coincided with the signing of the agreement between the Lebanese factions to restore Lebanon to normalcy, indicating Israel's premeditated intention to impede the peace process in Lebanon. Israel's rejection of the implementation of Council resolutions calling for total Israeli withdrawal, its insistence on maintaining a "security zone" within Lebanon and its support and manipulation of illegal puppet forces all constituted the direct and main cause for the deteriorating situation in southern Lebanon, which posed a threat to the security of the region and the world at large. He called on the Council to condemn Israel's acts of aggression, to reaffirm the necessity of implementing previous Council resolutions and to call upon Israel to cease its arbitrary practices against the civilian population of southern Lebanon.

At the 2640th and 2642nd meetings, the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Congo, Madagascar, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Bulgaria, Morocco, China and the United Arab Emirates made statements supporting the Lebanese position and arguments. The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic argued that the Council should ensure the implementation of its resolutions on Lebanon by imposing sanctions against Israel in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

At the 2640th meeting, the representative of Israel described the situation in Lebanon as a state of chaos where the Government of Lebanon had lost effective control over the internal situation everywhere in the country. He stated that Lebanon should have requested a meeting of the Council to consider the terrorist actions against Lebanese Jews and others. He added that terrorism in Lebanon was financed and controlled by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Syrian Arab Republic, which he called the "occupier of Lebanon". He stated that south Lebanon was relatively the most tranquil part of the country, but it was going to be used as a launching pad for Syria-directed terrorism against Israel and that preventing that from happening was Israel's only interest in south Lebanon. What was needed, he said in conclusion, was a serious dialogue between the parties to enable people on both sides of the border to live in peace. Until Lebanon adopted a similar policy, Israel would continue to do what was necessary to protect its security.

At the same meeting, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics also spoke. The representatives of the United States of America and Israel exercised their right of reply.

At the 2642nd meeting, on 17 January 1986, the representative of Denmark stated that his Government had repeatedly warned that the threat or use of force was bound to lead to a further deterioration of the situation in south Lebanon. He reiterated support for the restoration of Lebanon's full sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity and stressed the need of a total Israeli withdrawal. He stated that the "security zone" and the presence of IDF in southern Lebanon, which were contrary to Council resolutions, would not provide Israel with the security it was seeking for its northern population centres.

At the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland summa-

rized the situation by stating that the Government of Israel held the view that cross-border attacks on its territory from Lebanon were unacceptable and that the members of the Council could not disagree with that. He added that the Council equally could not and did not accept that Israel could flout the Charter of the United Nations by invading and occupying another State or any part of its territory. He stated that the continued Israeli policy of refusal to withdraw from Lebanese territory, allowing for restoration of the authority of the Government of Lebanon as called for by Council resolutions, was tragically misconceived. He concluded by arguing that the Council should not restrict itself to the negative course of condemning those at fault, but should try to take a positive view of the situation through the use of UNIFIL, which was already there.

At the 2640th meeting, the President drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by Lebanon.⁴⁸ At the 2641st meeting, a revised text of the draft resolution was submitted by Lebanon,⁴⁹ and at the 2642nd meeting, the President drew attention to a further revised draft submitted by Lebanon.⁵⁰ At the same meeting, the representative of the United Arab Emirates requested, in accordance with rule 38 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, that the revised draft resolution submitted by Lebanon be put to the vote. Under the preambular part, the Council would have, *inter alia*, reaffirmed previous relevant resolutions and recalled the relevant provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Fourth Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949. Under the operative part of the draft resolution, the Council would have: (a) strongly deplored the Israeli acts of violence as well as abusive practices and measures against the civilian population in southern Lebanon; (b) reaffirmed the urgent need to implement the provisions of Council resolutions on Lebanon demanding withdrawal of Israeli forces to the internationally recognized borders of Lebanon; (c) reiterated its call for strict respect for the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized borders; (d) demanded that Israel desist forthwith from its practices and measures against the civilian population in southern Lebanon; and (e) decided to keep the situation under review and requested the Secretary-General to report to the Council as appropriate. In its original form, paragraph 1 referred to condemnation of Israeli aggression, practices and measures. In the first revision the same paragraph referred to condemnation of the Israeli acts of aggression as well as abusive practices and measures.

At the 2642nd meeting, statements were made by Denmark, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Morocco, Israel and China.

At the same meeting, the President put the draft resolution to the vote. It received 11 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions, and was not adopted, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Security Council.⁵¹

Prior to the vote, the representative of Australia stated that his delegation would abstain because the draft resolution was not balanced. The representative of the United

⁴⁸S/17730.

⁴⁹S/17730/Rev.1.

⁵⁰S/17730/Rev.2.

⁵¹For the vote, see S/PV.2642; see also chap. IV of the present Supplement.

States declared that, for the same reason, her delegation would vote against it. A statement was also made by France. After the vote the representative of Lebanon responded that the draft resolution was balanced and that to condemn or deplore all acts of violence would equate the aggressor with the national resistance movement.

Decision of 18 April 1986 (2681st meeting): resolution 583 (1986)

At its 2681st meeting, on 18 April 1986, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL of 9 April 1986⁵² in its agenda.

The report contained an account of the developments relating to UNIFIL from 11 October 1985 to 9 April 1986. The Secretary-General noted in his report that the situation in the "security zone" established in southern Lebanon by the IDF with the help of the SLA had considerably deteriorated as a result of the increase in the level of violence between the IDF and SAL on the one hand and the various resistance groups on the other. The Secretary-General argued that despite the fact that the original conditions laid down in resolution 425 (1978) had not been fully met, the presence of UNIFIL would be essential. He had, therefore, recommended a six-month extension, taking account of the request of the Government of Lebanon contained in its letter of 3 April 1986.⁵³

The Secretary-General described in his report the attacks and ambushes launched by armed resistance groups against the IDF and the SLA in the "security zone", as well as the search operations that had been carried out by IDF/SLA personnel in that part of the zone that overlapped the UNIFIL area of deployment. The report provided a comprehensive summary of all the incidents as well as the casualties incurred by the various parties, including UNIFIL. The report stated that during some of these operations, UNIFIL personnel had monitored the situation as closely as possible and had tried to prevent acts of violence against the local population. Throughout the period, UNIFIL had maintained close contact with the Lebanese authorities in Beirut and Lebanese local authorities in the south, as well as with the Israeli military authorities. The report referred briefly to visits that had been paid by Mr. Urquhart, Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs, and by his successor, Mr. Goulding, to UNIFIL headquarters in January and March 1986, during which both officials had held discussions with Lebanese and Israeli officials, as well as with other interested parties.

Although the Secretary-General recommended the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL, he pointed out in his report that the decision facing the Council on whether to extend the mandate was a difficult one and required the Council to make a thorough and careful assessment both of the situation confronting UNIFIL and of the Council's own readiness to fulfil the conditions that had been identified in 1978 as being necessary for the Force to be effective.

Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council invited the representative of Lebanon, at his request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.²⁶ The Council considered the item at its 2681st meeting, on 18 April 1986. At the beginning of that meeting, the Presi-

dent drew the Council's attention to the text of a draft resolution that had been prepared during consultations by the Council.⁵⁴

At the same meeting, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that the situation required the active cooperation of all who sincerely wanted a reliable defence of the sovereign rights of Lebanon against Israeli encroachment and who saw the importance of the consolidation of international support for the cause of the liberation of Lebanon from Israeli occupation. He announced that his country shared the opinion of Lebanon about the need to retain the presence of UNIFIL in Lebanon and that his delegation had decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution. He declared his country's willingness to take part in the financing of the Force, provided that that decision would not be considered as having a retroactive effect or a recognition of "indebtedness" for preceding years.

The representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland described the statement made by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as marking an important change in Soviet policy and that meant that the Soviet Union was fully in favour of resolution 425 (1978), implying that the Soviet Union would be willing not only to give the Force its full political support and to meet, from then on, its assessed share of the cost of UNIFIL, but also to recognize and pay its assessed shares from previous years.

Before the vote, the President, speaking in his capacity as representative of France, expressed his country's concern at the deterioration of the situation in the field and at the Force's inability to fulfil its complete mandate as defined by Council resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978). He enumerated the objectives of those resolutions as: (a) to confirm the withdrawal of the Israeli forces; (b) to restore international peace and security; and (c) to assist the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area. He further added that France could no longer accept a virtually automatic renewal of the Force for six months, and that his delegation had suggested a shorter mandate in order to induce the countries concerned to reflect and to consider the situation.

A statement was also made by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

At the same meeting the draft resolution was voted upon, receiving 15 votes in favour and was adopted unanimously as resolution 583 (1986).⁵⁵ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978), 501 (1982), 508 (1982), 509 (1982) and 520 (1982), as well as all its resolutions on the situation in Lebanon,

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon of 9 April 1986, and taking note of the observations expressed therein,

Taking note of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General of 1 April 1986,

Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,

1. *Decides* to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further interim period of three months, that is, until 19 July 1986;

⁵²S/17965.
⁵³S/17968.

⁵⁴S/18019, adopted without change as resolution 583 (1986).

⁵⁵See S/PV.2681; see also chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

2. Reiterates its strong support for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;

3. *Re-emphasizes* the terms of reference and general guidelines of the Force as stated in the report of the Secretary-General of 19 March 1978, approved by resolution 426 (1978), and calls upon all parties concerned to cooperate fully with the Force for the full implementation of its mandate;

4. *Reiterates* that the Force should fully implement its mandate as defined in resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978) and all other relevant resolutions;

5. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue consultations with the Government of Lebanon and other parties directly concerned on the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Council thereon by 19 June 1986.

After the vote, the representative of Australia stated that although the word "peacekeeping" was not mentioned in the Charter, the peacekeeping role had evolved in response to the needs of a world troubled by conflict. He added that the interests of regional peace would be better served by the deployment of UNIFIL in accordance with the mandate that had been conferred on it by the Council.

The representative of Denmark stated that his country fully understood Israel's legitimate concern over the security of the northern borders, but at the same time his country believed that the "security zone" was neither a legitimate nor an effective means of meeting Israel's security concerns and that the security zone not only contravened resolution 425 (1978), but was also likely to build further resentment against Israel among the local population and to encourage use of the area as a base for attacks across its border.

The representative of Lebanon stated that the oft-repeated request for the renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL had not been based on a desire to make the mandate permanent but on other essential reasons, namely: (a) the Force should be enabled to discharge the mandate given it by the Council under its resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978); (b) the presence of the Force in southern Lebanon constituted a commitment by the international community and the Council to Lebanon and its legitimate right to recover its sovereignty and authority over its entire territory; and (c) the presence of UNIFIL in southern Lebanon was an essential factor for stabilization and the best available option for ensuring peace, stability and security, in the absence of the total implementation of Council resolution 425 (1978) and other relevant resolutions.

Statements were also made by the representatives of Bulgaria, Ghana, the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Lebanon, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and France.

Decision of 29 May 1986 (2687th meeting): resolution 584 (1986)

At its 2687th meeting, on 29 May 1986, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF of 14 May 1986 in its agenda.⁵⁶

The report of the Secretary-General described the activities of UNDOF for the period from 14 November 1985 to 14 May 1986. The Secretary-General noted that UNDOF continued, with the cooperation of all parties, to fulfil the tasks entrusted to it by the Council in its resolutions 350 (1974).

However, the problem of restrictions on the freedom of movement of the Force still existed. Despite the prevailing quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continued to be potentially dangerous and was likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem could be reached, as called for by Council resolution 338 (1973). The Secretary-General considered the continued presence of UNDOF in the area to be essential. He therefore recommended that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, until 30 November 1986, and pointed out that both Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic had agreed to the extension.

At the same meeting, the President drew attention to a draft resolution, which had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.⁵⁷ He then put the draft resolution to the vote; it was adopted unanimously as resolution 584 (1986).⁵⁸ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force,

Decides:

(a) To call upon the parties concerned to implement immediately Security Council resolution 338 (1973);

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 30 November 1986;

(c) To request the Secretary-General to submit, at the end of this period, a report on the developments in the situation and the measures taken to implement resolution 338 (1973).

At the same meeting, the President, on behalf of the Council, made the following complementary statement regarding resolution 584 (1986):⁵⁹

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 25:

"Despite the present quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached."

That statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council.

Decision of 6 June 1986: statement by the President

On 6 June 1986, following consultations, the President of the Security Council issued the following statement on behalf of the members of the Council:⁶⁰

The members of the Security Council are gravely concerned at the continuing intensification of the fighting in Beirut, especially in and around the Palestinian refugee camps, with its high toll of casualties and material destruction.

The members of the Security Council appeal to all concerned to use their influence in bringing about the cessation of the fighting in order to enable the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East as well as other humanitarian organizations to mount emergency operations for the benefit of the populations concerned, including the Palestinian refugees towards whom the international community has a particular responsibility.

They reaffirm that the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon must be respected.

⁵⁷S/18109.

⁵⁸See S/PV.2687; see also chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

⁵⁹S/18111.

⁶⁰S/18138.

⁵⁶S/18061.

The members of the Security Council endorse the Secretary-General's appeal to all parties concerned to exercise utmost restraint and to renew their efforts to end the present bloodshed.

Decision of 18 July 1986 (2699th meeting): resolution 586 (1986)

At its 2699th meeting, of 18 July 1986, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL of 16 July 1986 in its agenda.⁶¹

The report contained an account of developments relating to UNIFIL from 10 April to 10 July 1986. The report stated that, in some parts of the UNIFIL area and the "security zone" maintained by Israel, there had been a decline in the number of violent incidents, while in others the level of hostilities had remained the same or increased. What had remained clear was that the continuing presence of IDF in southern Lebanon, quite apart from being contrary to resolution 425 (1978) and many other decisions of the Council, was not an answer to the problem of international peace and security in the area. The report further argued that the IDF presence had escalated the level of violence. The report gave a list of the incidents that had taken place and the casualties suffered, especially by UNIFIL personnel. It referred briefly to the visits of Mr. Goulding, Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs, to the area in April and May/June, during which he had held discussions with government leaders and senior officials in Lebanon and Israel, as well as other interested parties.

The Secretary-General stated in his report that he still believed that the presence of UNIFIL would be essential. He had, therefore, recommended a six-month extension, taking account of the request of the Government of Lebanon contained in the letter of 7 July 1986.⁶²

Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council invited the representatives of Lebanon and Israel, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.⁶³ The Council considered the item at its 2699th meeting, on 18 July 1986.

At the same meeting, the Council voted on a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.⁶³ The draft was adopted unanimously as resolution 586 (1986).⁶⁴ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978), 501 (1982), 508 (1982) and 520 (1982), as well as all its resolutions on the situation in Lebanon,

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon of 17 June and 10 July 1986 and taking note of the observations expressed therein,

Taking note of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General of 7 July 1986,

Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,

1. *Decides* to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further interim period of six months, that is, until 19 January 1987;

2. *Reiterates* its strong support for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;

3. *Re-emphasizes* the terms of reference and general guidelines of the Force as stated in the report of the Secretary-General of 19 March 1978, approved by resolution 426 (1978), and calls upon all parties concerned to cooperate fully with the Force for the full implementation of its mandate;

4. *Reiterates* that the Force should fully implement its mandate as defined in resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978) and all other relevant resolutions;

5. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue consultations with the Government of Lebanon and other parties directly concerned on the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Security Council thereon.

After the vote, several Council members underlined the useful role played by UNIFIL. The representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland stated that an essential component of any solution to the tense and unhappy situation in southern Lebanon was the completion of the withdrawal of Israeli forces to the international boundary. He added that the Council looked to the Israeli Government to take full account of the Council's unanimous wish to secure a rapid end to the present situation in which Israeli forces, and others controlled by them, occupied Lebanese territory and prevented the exercise of Lebanese sovereignty. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics observed that, unfortunately, one could once again conclude that the Council's demands, which had been clearly formulated in UNIFIL's mandate, had remained unfulfilled because of Israel's stubborn refusal to withdraw its troops from the entire territory of Lebanon and that UNIFIL had so far been deprived of any opportunity to carry out functions entrusted to it under resolution 425 (1978). The representative of Lebanon stated that the continued grave and volatile situation in southern Lebanon resulted from Israel's refusal to implement the resolutions of the Council, which called for Israel's complete and unconditional withdrawal from Lebanese territory, the deployment of international forces within internationally recognized borders and the exercise of sovereignty and authority by the Government of Lebanon over all its territories. The representative of Israel stated that although his Government viewed UNIFIL as a positive force because it introduced a measure of stability, his Government was convinced that UNIFIL could not protect northern Israel from attacks across the Lebanese border. He stated that Israel was interested in protecting its northern border, and it took actions against terrorist concentrations and attacks that emanated from southern Lebanon because the Government of Lebanon had no effective control over any parts of its territory, including the south.

The representatives of France and the United States of America also spoke.

Decision of 5 September 1986 (2705th meeting): statement by the President

By a letter of 4 September 1986 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁶⁵ the representative of France requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the deteriorating situation in the area of operation of UNIFIL in southern Lebanon.

At its 2705th meeting, on 5 September 1986, the Council included the letter in its agenda. The Council considered the item at the same meeting. The Council decided to invite

⁶¹S/18164 and Add.1.

⁶²S/18202.

⁶³S/18226, adopted without change as resolution 586 (1986).

⁶⁴See S/PV.2699; see also chap. IV of the present Supplement.

⁶⁵S/18318.

the representative of Lebanon, at his request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.⁶⁶

At the same meeting, the Secretary-General stated that the Council was meeting in very difficult and grievous circumstances. He reminded the Council that he had had the opportunity to inform the members of the series of violent incidents that had taken place in the UNIFIL zone between 11 and 22 August 1986, during which two Lebanese and one member of the Irish contingent had been killed and several soldiers of the French contingent had been wounded. He added that, despite UNIFIL efforts to re-establish calm in the region and the cooperation, to that effect, of the Government of Lebanon and leaders of the Amal movement, a serious incident had occurred on 4 September 1986. Three French soldiers had been killed by a remote-control bomb near the village of Joya in the sector of the French contingent. The Secretary-General stated that he had vigorously condemned the cowardly attack and had sent a mission of inquiry to Lebanon headed by Mr. Goulding, Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs. He declared his intention to do everything possible to avoid a recurrence of the recent incidents, to strengthen the security of the members of UNIFIL and to enable the Force to carry out its mandate. He pointed out, however, that UNIFIL could carry out its mandate only if all the parties involved extended to it the required cooperation and if it benefited from the confidence and unreserved support of the Council.

At the same meeting, the President read out the following statement that he had been authorized to make on behalf of the members of the Council following consultations that had been held among the members:⁶⁶

The members of the Security Council express their deep sorrow at the grave and distressing attacks which killed several members of the Irish and French contingents of the United Nations Force in Lebanon. These attacks come after various serious incidents in the recent past, in particular those of 11 and 12 August, in the course of which a number of members of the Force were injured. The members of the Council express their indignation at such resort to deliberate violence, which places in jeopardy the safety of the members of the Force.

They convey their sympathy to the afflicted families and pay tribute to the qualities of composure, courage and self-sacrifice manifested collectively by all the members of UNIFIL, in service of the ideals of peace of the Organization.

Given the worsening of the situation in the zone in which the Force operates, the members of the Security Council consider it essential to adopt with all urgency measures aimed at the effective reinforcement of the security of the members of the Force and request the Secretary-General to undertake all necessary steps to that effect.

The members of the Security Council express their appreciation to the Secretary-General for his immediate dispatch of a mission led by the Under-Secretary-General which is to carry out, in consultation with the Lebanese Government, an in-depth examination of the measures to be taken to enable the Force to carry out its mandate, as laid down in Council resolution 425 (1978), effectively in the necessary conditions of security.

They invite the Secretary-General to submit to the Council, as soon as possible, the report which he will prepare following the mission.

The members of the Council unanimously express their confidence in the Secretary-General and the Commander of the Force in the current difficult circumstances.

The representative of France stated that his delegation had requested an urgent meeting of the Council because of the rapid deterioration of the situation in southern Lebanon

and several serious incidents in which, over a period of one month, members of several contingents of UNIFIL had fallen victim. He noted that, despite persistent efforts, UNIFIL was still not in a position to carry out its mission securely and effectively. He called for the urgent adoption of measures aimed at strengthening the security of all members of UNIFIL. He proposed that a general review be undertaken dealing with all the substantive problems preventing UNIFIL from accomplishing its mission.

The representative of Ghana stated that the major cause of the cycle of violence in the UNIFIL area of operation was the so-called security zone militarily demarcated by Israel and the presence of Israeli-sponsored armed groups in southern Lebanon. He noted that the way to eliminate such tragic incidents was for Israel to withdraw its troops from Lebanon in order to enable UNIFIL to fulfil its mandate. The representative of Lebanon underlined the keenness of his Government to enable UNIFIL to fulfil the mandate that had been entrusted to it under Council resolution 425 (1978). The President stated, in his capacity as the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, that it was necessary to assert that it was the Council's direct duty to work for the implementation, as soon as possible, of its resolution 425 (1978) on the basis of which UNIFIL had been created.

Decision of 23 September 1986 (2708th meeting): resolution 287 (1986)

By a letter dated 18 September 1986 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁶⁷ the representative of France requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the situation of UNIFIL in the light of the Secretary-General's special report⁶⁸ on the subject of 18 September 1986.

The report of the Secretary-General contained the findings and recommendations of the mission of inquiry led by the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs, who had been sent by the Secretary-General to southern Lebanon following a series of serious incidents in mid-August and again in early September in the UNIFIL area of deployment, in which three French soldiers had been killed by a remote-control bomb. The report stated that Mr. Goulding had visited the area from 5 to 15 September and had held consultations with the Force Commander and his staff and with the various parties concerned. The report described the conditions under which UNIFIL was operating and the security measures that had already been taken, and gave a detailed account of the incidents of mid-August and early September against UNIFIL contingents as well as incidents involving the IDF and their allies, the SLA.⁶⁹

The Secretary-General pointed out in his report that the mission had reported that many of the dangers to which UNIFIL personnel had been exposed resulted from a discrepancy between its terms of reference and the situation on the ground. The Force was supposed to use its efforts to prevent the recurrence of fighting and to ensure that its area of operations would not be utilized for hostile activities of any kind. The report noted, however, that that requirement had been based on the assumption that Israel would withdraw its forces and that UNIFIL would operate

⁶⁶S/18320

⁶⁷S/18353.

⁶⁸S/18348.

⁶⁹*ibid.*, paras. 5-10.

with the full cooperation of all the parties concerned. Israel's refusal to withdraw its forces had invalidated that assumption since UNIFIL had come into existence.

The report outlined the various additional security measures that had been adopted to improve the security of UNIFIL personnel, especially the French contingent.⁷⁰ The Secretary-General recognized, however, that UNIFIL was widely dispersed in some 214 positions throughout southern Lebanon and that security measures of the kind described in the report could provide only partial protection against determined attacks. The Governments of Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic had expressed to the mission unequivocal support for resolution 425 (1978) and for the continued presence of UNIFIL, and had called for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from southern Lebanon. The Government of Israel had reaffirmed to the mission the position it had previously communicated to the United Nations that the continued Israeli military presence in Lebanon was to ensure the security of northern Israel, a task that UNIFIL could not carry out. They had given the mission no indication that there would be any early change in Israel's position or that they would withdraw their forces in accordance with resolution 425 (1978).

The Secretary-General concluded, after listing all the alternative amendments to the mandate of UNIFIL, that changes in the mandate or terms of reference of UNIFIL would be unlikely to resolve the difficulties encountered by the Force. As regards the means available to the Force, the Secretary-General suggested that some useful changes should be made, including the redeployment of UNIFIL. It should also be consolidated by having fewer, stronger and better located positions and through the supply of armoured personnel carriers to two battalions in order to give them better protection while on the move. As regards armament, the Force Commander recommended that UNIFIL should not be provided with weapons heavier than the ones it had at that time. Despite the intolerable situation facing UNIFIL, the Secretary-General stated in his report that he could not recommend to the Council the withdrawal of the Force as its presence was still essential. He reiterated that the solution lied in complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory and the deployment of UNIFIL to the international frontier. He recommended that the members of the Council should take urgent action to unblock the impasse and make substantial progress towards implementation of resolution 425 (1978), thus ensuring the security of UNIFIL personnel.

At its 2706th meeting, on 19 September 1986, the Council included the letter and the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The Council considered the item at its 2706th, 2707th and 2708th meetings, on 19, 22 and 23 September 1986. It decided to invite the representatives of Israel, Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.²⁶ At its 2708th meeting, the Council also extended an invitation under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure to the Permanent Observer for the League of Arab States to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.²⁶

At the 2706th meeting, the Secretary-General briefed the Council on the latest incidents in southern Lebanon, intro-

duced his special report and underlined the main recommendations in the report. The representative of France made statements.

At the 2707th meeting, on 22 September 1986, the representative of Israel described the report of the Secretary-General as unbalanced and as distorting the true picture of the situation in southern Lebanon. He argued that the real culprit in the violent attacks against UNIFIL were Hezbollah and its backers in the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Syrian Arab Republic, and not Israel. He asserted that Israel would not withdraw from the "security zone" as it had been the only stable defence against attacks from southern Lebanon.

At the same meeting, the representative of Lebanon stated that, while insisting on the need for the adoption of the report of the Secretary-General to ensure the safety of UNIFIL and of effective measures to enable it to fulfil its mandate, he called upon all members of the Council to take a unanimous decision so that they might not individually or collectively bear the responsibility of the failure of that most important peacekeeping operation.

A statement was made by Mr. Clovis Maksoud.

The representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland stated that the Security Council was confronting an extremely complicated situation. He believed that the central issue confronting the Council was the call contained in paragraph one of resolution 425 (1978) for strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. He noted that the Council should reaffirm that paragraph and should work to bring it about. It was necessary not only for the Government of Israel, but also for other Governments, to act as had been called for in resolution 425 (1978) in order to give effect to paragraph 1 of that resolution.

At the same meeting, speaking in exercise of the right of reply, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic stated that he did not need to clarify what had already been clear in the report: that what was happening in southern Lebanon was the result of the continued Israeli occupation of Lebanese territory, in contravention of resolution 425 (1978). He called upon the Council to force Israel to implement that resolution and to withdraw its forces beyond the internationally recognized borders.

The right of reply was exercised by Israel and Lebanon.

At the 2708th meeting, on 23 September 1986, the President drew attention to the draft resolution submitted by France.⁷¹

The representative of the United Arab Emirates stated that the weakness of the central government in Lebanon could not be a justification for occupation since occupation was illegal regardless of the justification and methods used to maintain it.

The representative of Israel referred to the draft resolution that had been submitted by France and suggested that it should not be adopted. He argued that the draft resolution had not addressed the central problem of the inability of the Government of Lebanon to establish authority or sovereignty over Lebanon's territory; that it had not addressed the responsibility of Hezbollah in the growth of

⁷⁰*Ibid.*, paras. 16 and 17.

⁷¹S/18356, adopted as resolution 678 (1986).

terrorism against UNIFIL; and that it had given the Secretary-General an impossible task to perform in 21 days.

The President, speaking in his capacity as the representative of the Soviet Union, stated that the reasons underlying the dangerous situation in southern Lebanon, could be found in Israel's continuing obstinate refusal to withdraw its troops from Lebanese territory. He accused the United States of backing Israel, thus preventing the aggressor from being called to heel, and preventing the implementation of the Council decisions.

A further statement was also made by Mr. Clovis Mak-soud.

Before the vote statements were made by the representatives of the United Kingdom, China, Denmark, Bulgaria, Australia and Ghana.

At the same meeting, the draft resolution was voted upon, receiving 14 votes in favour with 1 abstention (United States of America), and was adopted as resolution 587 (1986),⁷² the text of which reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978), as well as its resolutions 511 (1982), 519 (1982) and 523 (1982) and all the resolutions relating to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon,

Recalling the mandate entrusted to the Force by resolution 425 (1978) and the guidelines of the Force set forth in the report of the Secretary-General dated 19 March 1978 and approved in resolution 426 (1978),

Further recalling its resolutions 508 (1982), 509 (1982) and 520 (1982), as well as all its other resolutions relating to the situation in Lebanon,

Solemnly reaffirming that it firmly supports the unity, territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries,

Deeply grieved over the tragic loss of human life and indignant at the harassment and attacks to which the soldiers of the Force are being subjected,

Recalling in this connection the statement made on 5 September 1986 by the President of the Council on its behalf,

Expressing its concern at the new obstacles to the freedom of movement of the Force and at the threats to its security,

Noting with regret that the Force, whose mandate has been renewed for the twenty-first time, has so far been prevented from fulfilling the task entrusted to it,

Recalling its resolutions 444 (1979), 450 (1979), 459 (1979), 474 (1980), 483 (1980) and 488 (1981), in which it expressed its determination, in the event of continuing obstruction of the mandate of the Force, to examine practical ways and means to secure full and unconditional implementation of resolution 425 (1978),

Emphasizing its conviction that this deterioration of the situation constitutes a challenge to its authority and its resolutions,

1. *Condemns in the strongest terms* the attacks committed against the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon;
2. *Expresses indignation* at the support which such criminal actions may receive;
3. *Pays homage* to the courage, spirit of discipline and composure of the soldiers of the Force;
4. *Takes note* of the report of the Secretary-General prepared after the recent mission by his representative in the region, particularly the paragraphs relating to the security of the Force and the withdrawal of Israeli military forces from southern Lebanon;
5. *Takes note* of the preliminary security measures decided on by the Secretary-General and requests him to take any further measures

needed to enhance the security of the men of the Force in their peace mission;

6. *Urges* all the parties concerned to cooperate unreservedly with the force in the fulfilment of its mandate;

7. *Again calls* for an end in southern Lebanon to any military presence which is not accepted by the Lebanese authorities;

8. *Requests* the Secretary-General to make the necessary arrangements for a deployment of the Force to the southern border of Lebanon, and solemnly calls on all the parties concerned to cooperate in the achievement of that objective;

9. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to it within twenty-one days on the application of this resolution.

After the vote, the representative of the United States explained that they had abstained in the vote because the draft resolution had focused exclusively on the redeployment of UNIFIL to the southern borders of Lebanon, ignoring the critical factor that had prevented the fulfilment of the Force's mandate: the absence of agreement among the parties concerned on security arrangements that would have protected their respective interests. He asserted that it was not Israel that was killing and wounding the soldiers of UNIFIL and that the resolution adopted did not reflect that fact.

Decision of 31 October 1986 (2719th meeting): statement by the President

Pursuant to Security Council resolution 587 (1986) of 23 September 1986 which had requested the Secretary-General to report to the Council within 21 days on its implementation, the Council met on 31 October to consider the Secretary-General's report.⁷³

The Secretary-General observed in his report that attacks against UNIFIL personnel during the period covered (18 September–13 October 1986) had markedly decreased and that no further lives had been lost. The report, nevertheless, gave a detailed account of the few incidents that had taken place, including attacks on the French contingent, the operations of the IDF and SLA, as well as clashes between various armed groups in southern Lebanon. It also gave an account of the implementation of UNIFIL security measures and procedures as proposed in the Secretary-General's previous report⁷⁴ as well as the financial requirements to implement all those proposals. The report also described the Secretary-General's efforts to implement the request included in paragraph 8 of Security Council resolution 587 (1986) that he make all the necessary arrangements for the deployment of UNIFIL to the southern border of Lebanon. The Secretary-General reported that the Israeli authorities had informed him that at that time Israel could not agree to complete the withdrawal of its forces from Lebanese territory, but it remained ready to give serious consideration to concrete proposals by the United Nations that would take into account their concern over the security of their northern border. The Lebanese authorities had, on the other hand, reaffirmed their insistence on the immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Lebanese territories in accordance with Council resolution 425 (1978). They had further restated that if such withdrawal were achieved they would ensure that there would be no return to the situation that had existed in southern Lebanon before 1982.

⁷³S/18396.

⁷⁴S/18487.

⁷²S/PV.2708; see also chap. IV of the present Supplement.

At its 2719th meeting, on 31 October 1986, the Security Council included the Secretary-General's report in its agenda and considered the item at the same meeting. The President (United Arab Emirates) was authorized, after consultations among members, to make the following statement on behalf of the members of the Council:⁷⁵

The members of the Security Council have noted with appreciation the report submitted by the Secretary-General in conformity with Security Council resolution 587 (1986) requesting him to take any further measures needed to enhance the security of the men of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and to make the necessary arrangements for a deployment of the Force to the southern border of Lebanon.

They express their gravest concern that the basic objectives of Council resolution 425 (1978) have not been achieved.

The members of the Council take note of the consultations initiated by the Secretary-General with the parties concerned and others with a view to the implementation of the mandate of the Force. While they regret that the consultations aimed at implementing resolution 425 (1978) have thus far failed to yield practical results, the members of the Council request the Secretary-General actively to pursue his contacts.

They note the new security measures decided upon since the adoption of the resolution. They request the Secretary-General to suggest any other steps he may deem necessary for increased security in connection with the movements of the Force indispensable for the fulfilment of its mandate. They approve the proposals submitted by the Secretary-General in his report and his intention to seek the approval of the General Assembly for necessary budgetary appropriation. In that connection, they call on all countries to assume their financial responsibilities towards the Force and on the Secretary-General to continue his efforts to expedite the reimbursement of the advances of funds made by the contributor countries.

They note with interest the instructions given by the Secretary-General to the Commander of the Force to keep under continuous review all the possibilities of varying the size and deployment of contingents if that would strengthen their security without jeopardizing the effectiveness of the Force. They request the Secretary-General to study these possibilities in consultation with the contributing countries and to put appropriate measures into effect.

In that regard, they have noted with satisfaction the intention expressed by the Lebanese authorities to deploy a regular unit of their army in the zone of the Force to work in close liaison with it in accordance with the provisions of resolution 425 (1978).

Once again, the members of the Security Council urge all the parties concerned to give full support to the Force in the fulfilment of its mandate and also call for an end to any military presence in southern Lebanon which is not accepted by the Lebanese authorities. They call on the Secretary-General to intensify his efforts to secure the full and effective implementation of resolution 425 (1978).

Decision of 26 November 1986 (2722nd meeting): resolution 590 (1986) and statement by the President

At its 2722nd meeting, on 26 November 1986, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF dated 12 November 1986⁷⁶ in its agenda.

The report described the activities of UNDOF for the period from 15 May to 12 November 1986. The Secretary-General noted in his report that UNDOF had continued to perform its functions effectively, with the cooperation of the parties concerned. During the period covered, the situation in the Israel-Syria sector had remained quiet and there had been no serious incidents. The report also gave a detailed account of the composition, rotation, deployment and the activities of the Force. The Secretary-General

noted that the continued presence of UNDOF in the area was essential and he had, therefore, recommended that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, until 31 May 1987. He indicated that both Syria and Israel had given their consent to the proposed extension.

At the same meeting, the Council voted on a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.⁷⁷ It was adopted unanimously as resolution 590 (1986).⁷⁸ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force,

Decides:

(a) To call upon the parties concerned to implement immediately Security Council resolution 338 (1973);

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 31 May 1987;

(c) To request the Secretary-General to submit, at the end of this period, a report on the developments in the situation and the measures taken to implement resolution 338 (1973);

Following the adoption of resolution 590 (1986), the President was authorized to make the following complementary statement on behalf of the Council:⁷⁹

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 24:

Despite the present quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached.

That statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council.

Decision of 2 December 1986: statement by the President

On 2 December 1986, following consultations, the President issued the following statement on behalf of the members of the Security Council:⁸⁰

The members of the Security Council, mindful of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon, express their serious concern at the current escalation of violence there, affecting the civilian population in and around the Palestinian refugee camps. The members of the Council appeal to all concerned to exercise restraint in order to end these acts of violence. They also appeal to all concerned to take necessary measures to alleviate the suffering of the civilian population. They urge all concerned to facilitate the efforts of all United Nations agencies, particularly the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, as well as non-governmental organizations, to provide humanitarian assistance.

Decision of 15 January 1987 (2731st meeting): resolution 594 (1987)

At its 2731st meeting, on 15 January 1987, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL of 12 January 1987⁸¹ in its agenda.

The report of the Secretary-General and its addendum gave a detailed account of the activities of UNIFIL in the six-month period from 18 July 1986 to 19 January 1987.

⁷⁵S/18481, adopted without change as resolution 590 (1986).

⁷⁶See S/P.V. 2722; see also chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

⁷⁷S/18487.

⁷⁸S/18492.

⁸¹S/18581 and Corr.1 and Add.1.

⁷⁵S/18439.

⁷⁶S/18453.

The report also gave a detailed account of the redeployment of the Force that had been necessitated by the violent incidents of August and September 1986, in particular after the bulk of the French infantry battalion had been repatriated in mid-December 1986. The report listed the attacks against UNIFIL positions by the IDF, SLA and the various armed resistance groups and the casualties incurred, as well as the clashes between the Amal movement and Palestinians in and around refugee camps.

The Secretary-General noted in his report that the period under review had been a very difficult one for UNIFIL. He stated that Israel's determination to maintain its "security zone" had provoked equally determined resistance from various armed groups in Lebanon and that UNIFIL had been seriously affected by that conflict. The Secretary-General added that his efforts to achieve progress towards implementation of Council resolution 425 (1978) had again proved unsuccessful. He pointed out that the position of the parties (Israel, Lebanon and Syria) had not changed at all. He argued that despite lack of progress and despite all the problems UNIFIL faced, it nevertheless remained an important element of stability in southern Lebanon and that its withdrawal would create a critical vacuum and would lead to even greater conflict. He recommended that the Council accept the request of the Government of Lebanon that the Force's mandate be extended for a period of 6 months and 12 days (until 31 July 1987). He concluded by stating that he felt obliged to emphasize two further points of great importance: (a) if the Council accepted his recommendation it would be essential that all in a position to help should make every possible effort to work for the fulfilment of the UNIFIL mandate; and (b) if the UNIFIL situation continued to deteriorate, the Council might consider whether it would be right to ask the troop-contributing governments to keep UNIFIL in being.

At its 2731st meeting, on 15 January 1987, the Council decided to invite, at their request, the representatives of Lebanon, Ireland and Israel to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

At the same meeting, the Council voted on a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.⁸² The draft resolution was adopted unanimously as Council resolution 594 (1987).⁸³ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978), 501 (1982), 508 (1982) and 520 (1982), as well as all its resolutions on the situation in Lebanon,

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon of 12 January 1987, and taking note of the observations expressed therein,

Taking note of the letter dated 6 January 1987 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General,

Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,

1. *Decides* to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further interim period of six months, that is, until 31 July 1988;

2. *Reiterates* its strong support for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;

3. *Re-emphasizes* the terms of reference and general guidelines of the Force as stated in the report of the Secretary-General of 19 March 1978, approved by resolution 426 (1978), and calls upon all parties concerned to cooperate fully with the Force for the full implementation of its mandate;

4. *Reiterates* that the Force should fully implement its mandate as defined in resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978) and all other relevant resolutions;

5. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue consultations with the Government of Lebanon and other parties directly concerned on the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Security Council thereon.

Following the vote, representatives of several delegations made statements. The representative of France indicated that his Government agreed with the observations contained in the Secretary-General's report, in particular those concerning the implementation of resolution 425 (1978), and that France considered that UNIFIL continued to be an important element of stability in the region. The representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland stated that it was a matter of concern that no progress had been made in the implementation of resolution 425 (1978). He pointed out his agreement with the Secretary-General that the main problem continued to be Israel's refusal to complete its withdrawal from Lebanon and its retention of a "security zone" in southern Lebanon.

The representative of Israel reiterated his Government's position that it had no territorial claims on Lebanon and was solely concerned with maintaining the security of its northern border and preventing terrorist attacks from Lebanon. He confirmed that Israel remained strongly committed to working with any party in Lebanon that genuinely sought peace and tranquillity on both sides of the border. He further remarked that some believed that the solution simply lied with Israel abandoning its security arrangements in southern Lebanon while UNIFIL deployed southwards to the international border, but there was no indication that such a scenario would have prevented the intensification of terrorist attacks against Israel from southern Lebanon. He suggested that the efforts to solve the problems of UNIFIL should be based on the acceptance of the principles of trial periods and a stage-by-stage approach, beginning with an immediate and total ceasefire in the entire area for a period of at least six months. He added that once those principles were accepted and implemented by the parties concerned it would then be possible to negotiate the territorial and binding concept of a permanent solution along the lines envisaged in resolutions 242 (1967) and 388 (1973).

The representative of Lebanon called upon the Council and its members, collectively and individually, to undertake prompt and effective endeavours to implement resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978), as well as all other resolutions. He stated that while Israel bore a direct responsibility for obstructing the task of UNIFIL, the Council had the fundamental responsibility to enable the Force to carry out its mission by removing the impediments facing it. He stated that if Israel continued its obstructionist stand, it would be incumbent upon the Council to consider practical ways and means to secure the full and unconditional implementation of its resolutions.

⁸²S/18597, adopted as resolution 594 (1987).

⁸³For the vote, see S/PV.2731; see also chap. IV of the present Supplement.

Statements were also made by the representatives of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Japan, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, Ireland, Argentina and Venezuela.

Decision of 13 February 1987: statement by the President

On 13 February 1987, after consultations, the President made the following statement on behalf of the members of the Security Council:⁸⁴

The members of the Security Council, mindful of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon, express their profound concern at the continued escalation of violence in certain parts of Lebanon, affecting the civilian population, particularly in and around Palestinian refugee camps.

Deeply alarmed by the tragic suffering undergone by the civilian population, particularly inside the Palestinian refugee camps, they call on the parties concerned to observe an immediate ceasefire and to permit access to these camps for humanitarian purposes.

They also urgently appeal to all concerned to facilitate the efforts of various Governments and United Nations agencies, including the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East as well as non-governmental organizations, to provide critically needed humanitarian assistance.

Recalling their previous statements they reiterate their call for a speedy return to peace and a situation of normalcy and for the safeguarding of civilian lives in Lebanon.

Decision of 19 March 1987: statement by the President

On 19 March 1987, after consultations, the President made the following statement on behalf of the members of the Security Council:⁸⁵

The members of the Security Council, mindful of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon, note with profound concern that, in spite of their previous statements, the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon have not been receiving the necessary humanitarian assistance and that the situation in those camps remains critical.

Alarmed by the suffering of the civilian population in the camps, they therefore again urge all parties concerned urgently to facilitate the efforts of various United Nations agencies, particularly the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, as well as any other humanitarian assistance aimed at distributing food and medical supplies in the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon and, thus, at fulfilling a critically needed mission.

Recalling their previous statements, they reiterate their call for a speedy end to violence in and around the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon and a return to a durable peace and a situation of normalcy and for the safeguarding of civilian lives.

Decision of 29 May 1987 (2748th meeting): resolution 596 (1987) and statement by the President

At its 2748th meeting, on 18 May 1987, the Security Council included the Report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF of 18 May 1987⁸⁶ in its agenda.

The report described the activities of UNDOF for the period from 13 November 1986 to 17 May 1987. It also gave a detailed account of the deployment, logistics and financial aspects of the Force, as well as its functions in the maintenance of the ceasefire between Israel and Syria and its supervision of the Agreement on Disengagement with regard to the areas of separation and limitation. The report referred briefly to the implementation of Council resolu-

tion 338 (1973) and stated that the Secretary-General had continued to maintain contacts on the matter with the parties and the interested Governments.⁸⁷

The report indicated that, during the period under review, the situation in the Israel-Syria sector had remained quiet and that the Force had continued to perform its functions effectively, with the cooperation of the parties. It further noted that despite that quiet, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continued to be potentially dangerous, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem could be reached. The Secretary-General considered the continued presence of UNDOF in the area to be essential. He, therefore, recommended that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, until 30 November 1987. He noted that the Governments of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel had given their assent to the proposed extension.

At its 2748th meeting, on 29 May 1987, the Council voted on a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.⁸⁸ The draft resolution was adopted unanimously as resolution 596 (1987).⁸⁹ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force,

Decides:

(a) To call upon the parties concerned to implement immediately Security Council resolution 338 (1973);

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 30 November 1987;

(c) To request the Secretary-General to submit, at the end of this period, a report on the developments in the situation and the measures taken to implement resolution 338 (1973).

Following the adoption of the resolution on the renewal of the mandate of UNDOF, the President made the following complementary statement on behalf of the Council:⁹⁰

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 24:

"Despite the present quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached."

That statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council.

Decision of 31 July 1987 (2751st meeting): resolution 599 (1987)

At its 2751st meeting, on 31 July 1987, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL dated 24 July 1987⁹¹ in its agenda.

The report of the Secretary-General contained a detailed account of developments relating to UNIFIL for the period from 12 January to 24 July 1987. The report stated that the situation in the UNIFIL area had remained essentially un-

⁸⁴S/18691.
⁸⁵S/18756.
⁸⁶S/18868.

⁸⁷For further details, see the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in the Middle East (A/41/768-S/18427)

⁸⁸S/18881, adopted without change as resolution 596 (1987).

⁸⁹For details of the vote, see 2748; see also chap. IV of the present Supplement.

⁹⁰S/18885.

⁹¹S/18990.

changed and that Israel continued to maintain its "security zone", which was manned by the IDF and the so-called "South Lebanon Army" (SLA). The report included a detailed account of violent incidents and operations in the area between armed resistance groups and the IDF and SLA, as well as cases when UNIFIL had been affected by those hostilities. The report listed incidents where UNIFIL personnel were attacked or harassed and the casualties incurred.

The Secretary-General noted in his report that the situation in southern Lebanon remained highly unstable. He further noted that the refusal of Israel to withdraw completely and its insistence on maintaining the "security zone" continued to thwart efforts to start a process to restore international peace and stability in the area. The report indicated that the security measures and the new operating procedures that had been introduced by the Force Commander had contributed significantly to the decline in casualties. The Secretary-General appealed once more to all those involved in the hostilities in southern Lebanon to treat UNIFIL and its personnel with the respect due to those sent on a mission of peace.

The Secretary-General stated that the positions of the Governments involved had not changed. He observed that since there had been no change in the position of the Government of Israel, it had again proved impossible to make progress towards implementation of Council resolution 425 (1978). He added that the assassination of Prime Minister Rashid Karami of Lebanon in June 1987 had proved a major setback to the hopes expressed in his last report on UNIFIL that progress would be made towards national reconciliation in Lebanon.

The Secretary-General noted in conclusion the fact that it remained exceedingly difficult for UNIFIL to carry out its task of preventing hostile activity and restoring international peace and security without finding itself in confrontation with one or more of the parties. He referred to the request of the Government of Lebanon to extend the mandate of UNIFIL since the Force remained an essential element of stability in the area. He further stated that for the reasons he had given in previous reports and to avoid a vacuum, he recommended that the Council accept the Lebanese authorities' request and renew the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months (until 31 January 1988).

Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council decided to invite the representatives of Lebanon and Israel, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

At the same meeting, the President put to the vote a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.⁹² It was adopted unanimously as resolution 599 (1987).⁹³ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978), 501 (1982), 508 (1982), 509 (1982) and 520 (1982), as well as all its resolutions on the situation in Lebanon,

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon of 24 July 1987, and taking note of the observations expressed therein,

Taking note of the letter dated 16 July 1987 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General,

Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,

1. *Decides* to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further interim period of six months, that is, until 31 January 1988;

2. *Reiterates* its strong support for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;

3. *Re-emphasizes* the terms of reference and general guidelines of the Force as stated in the report of the Secretary-General of 19 March 1978, approved by resolution 426 (1978), and calls upon all parties concerned to cooperate fully with the Force for the full implementation of its mandate;

4. *Reiterates* that the Force should fully implement its mandate as defined in resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978) and all other relevant resolutions;

5. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue consultations with the Government of Lebanon and other parties directly concerned on the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Security Council thereon.

Following the vote, the representatives of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, France (the President), Lebanon and Israel made statements. The representative of the Soviet Union noted that Israel continued to disregard the demands of the Security Council to withdraw its troops. He argued that the question of guaranteeing the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon should be considered in the overall context of the attainment of a just and peaceful settlement to the Middle East conflict. He added that the focal point for such a settlement should be a plenipotentiary international conference to be held under United Nations auspices.

The representative of Lebanon, quoting from the Secretary-General's report, argued that it was Israel that was hampering the implementation of resolutions of the Security Council. He reiterated Lebanon's demand that UNIFIL be allowed to implement the Council's resolutions and fully implement the Force's mandate. In response, the representative of Israel stated that Israel had no design on Lebanese territory and that the "security zone" was a temporary arrangement until such time as the Government of Lebanon was able to take effective control of the situation in southern Lebanon and prevent the terrorist attacks against Israel across their common border.

Decision of 25 November 1987 (2769th meeting): resolution 603 (1987)

At its 2769th meeting, on 25 November 1987, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF dated 13 November 1987⁹⁴ in its agenda.

The report described the activities of UNDOF for the period from 18 May to 13 November 1987. The Secretary-General stated in his report that UNDOF had continued during that period to perform its functions effectively, with the cooperation of both parties (Israel and Syria). He noted that restrictions on the freedom of movement of the Force still existed, but that the situation in the Israel-Syria sector had remained quiet.

⁹²S/19008.

⁹³See S/PV.2151 and chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

⁹⁴S/19263.

The Secretary-General observed that, despite the quiet in the sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continued to be potentially dangerous and was likely to remain so unless and until a comprehensive peace settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem could be reached, as called for by the Council in resolution 338 (1973). In those circumstances, the Secretary-General considered the continued presence of UNDOF in the area to be essential. He therefore recommended that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, until 20 May 1988.

At the same meeting, the President drew attention to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.⁹⁵ He then put the draft resolution to the vote; it was adopted unanimously as resolution 603 (1987).⁹⁶ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force,

Decides:

(a) To call upon the parties concerned to implement immediately Security Council resolution 338 (1973);

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 31 May 1988;

(c) To request the Secretary-General to submit, at the end of this period, a report on the developments in the situation and the measures taken to implement resolution 338 (1973).

At the same meeting, the President, on behalf of the Council, made the following complementary statement regarding resolution 603 (1987):⁹⁷

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 24:

"Despite the present quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached."

That statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council.

Decision of 18 January 1988 (2784th meeting): rejection of a draft resolution

By a letter dated 7 January 1988 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁹⁸ the representative of Lebanon requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider Israel's acts of aggression against Lebanon, extending over the period since 15 December 1987.

At its 2782nd meeting, on 15 January 1988, the Council included the letter in its agenda. The Council decided to invite the following, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote: at the 2782nd meeting, the representatives of Lebanon, Israel, Jordan and Syria;⁹⁹ at the 2783rd meeting, the representatives of Kuwait, Morocco and Saudi Arabia;¹⁰⁰ and at the 2784th meeting, the representative of Mauritania.¹⁰¹ At its 2782nd meeting, the Council also extended an invitation under rule 39 of its

provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Samir Mansouri, the Acting Permanent Observer for the League of Arab States.²⁶ At its 2783rd meeting, the Council decided by a vote and in accordance with its previous practice to invite Mr. Zuhdi Terzi, the representative of the PLO, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.¹⁰² The Council considered the item at its 2782nd to 2784th meetings, on 15 and 18 January 1988.

At the 2782nd meeting, on 15 January 1988, the representative of Lebanon stated that his country was compelled to request a meeting of the Council to discuss Israel's repeated acts of aggression owing to the failure of the Council to agree in its consultations on a Presidential statement. He further stated that Israel continued to occupy Lebanese territory and had violated the territorial integrity, the airspace and the territorial waters of Lebanon in contravention of the Charter, international law and resolutions of the Council. He then gave a detailed account of Israeli military operations in southern Lebanon in the two weeks preceding the Council's meeting. He described the acts of shelling, bombardments and air raids against Lebanese villages and towns, and the naval and land siege, in particular against Sidon, Tyre and Yohmor. He referred to the Secretary-General's report of 4 December 1987,¹⁰³ which stated that Israel had constructed roads and built fences in southern Lebanon, giving itself the right to act to change the international border and to occupy territory. He argued that the pretext of maintaining security was a smokescreen for Israel's designs regarding Lebanese territory and waters. In conclusion, he called upon the Council to deplore and condemn the Israeli acts of aggression, to make Israel halt such acts and to implement Council resolutions demanding its withdrawal, to make Israel stop encroaching upon land across the border and to normalize the situation on the border.

Several speakers made statements supporting the Lebanese arguments and demands: Jordan (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);¹⁰⁴ Syria, Saudi Arabia, Algeria and LAS;¹⁰⁵ Yugoslavia, the PLO, Morocco, Kuwait (on behalf of OIC), Senegal and Mauritania.¹⁰⁶ The representative of Morocco wondered why Israel was so anxious to undermine the authority of UNIFIL and to discredit the Council's main function, namely, maintaining international peace and security. He stated that the General Assembly had identified the way to solve the Lebanese problem through settling the Middle East conflict in an international conference to guarantee the right to peaceful existence of all peoples in the region.

At the 2782nd to 2784th meetings, the representatives of Argentina, Nepal, Senegal, Zambia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland also spoke. A statement was also made by Mr. Mansouri.

At the 2782nd meeting, the President drew attention to a draft resolution submitted by Algeria, Argentina, Nepal, Senegal, Yugoslavia and Zambia.¹⁰⁷ Under the preambular part of the draft resolution, the Council would have, *inter alia*, reaffirmed previous resolutions on Lebanon, noted

⁹⁵S/19296.

⁹⁶See S/PV.2769 and chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

⁹⁷S/19301.

⁹⁸S/19415.

⁹⁹See S/PV.2782.

¹⁰⁰See S/PV.2783.

¹⁰¹See S/PV.2784.

¹⁰²For the vote (10 to 1, with 4 abstentions), see S/PV.278; for further details, see chap. III of the present *Supplement*.

¹⁰³S/19318.

¹⁰⁴See S/PV.2782.

¹⁰⁵See S/PV.2783.

¹⁰⁶See S/PV.2784.

¹⁰⁷S/19434.

with great concern the deterioration of the situation in southern Lebanon as a result of Israeli attacks and other measures, and expressed deep concern over the encroachment of land and the setting up of fences affecting the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon. Under the operative part of the draft resolution, the Council would have: (a) strongly deplored the repeated Israeli attacks against Lebanese territories and all other measures and policies against the civilian population; (b) strongly requested that Israel cease all acts of encroachment of land, construction of roads and setting up of fences that violate the border, and any attempts to occupy or change the status of Lebanese territory or to impede the return of the effective authority of the Government of Lebanon in sovereign Lebanese territory; (c) reaffirmed its call for strict respect for the sovereignty of Lebanon, its independence, unity and territorial integrity within its internationally recognized boundaries; and (d) reaffirmed the urgent need to implement the provisions of Council resolutions on Lebanon that demanded Israeli withdrawal to the internationally recognized boundaries.

At the 2783rd meeting, on 18 January 1988, the representative of Israel argued that Lebanese sovereignty was not violated by Israel but by Syria, Iran and the PLO, who were either occupying Lebanese territory or financing and controlling armed groups. He further stated that all three would join in one mission: to use Lebanon's territory as a base for terrorist attacks against Israel. Israel had no choice but to defend itself, he argued. Since the Council was condoning all Arab attacks against Israel and condemning any Israeli countermeasures, it was not the place for a serious discussion of the problems in South Lebanon and in Lebanon in general.

At the 2784th meeting, on 18 January 1988, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that Lebanon had been quite justified in placing the matter before the Council since Israel continued to occupy Lebanese territory and was refusing to put an end to its intervention in the internal affairs of Lebanon, as had been clearly demanded by Council resolutions. He stated that the Soviet Union viewed the question of guaranteeing the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon in the overall context of efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement in the Middle East through the convening of an international conference on the Middle East.

At the same meeting, the representative of Brazil stated that only through unqualified compliance with Council resolutions could peace and stability return to Lebanon. He strongly deplored the recent Israeli attacks against Lebanese territory and all other measures and practices employed against Lebanon's civilian population. The representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (the President) stated that his Government deplored Israel's actions in southern Lebanon, but equally deplored the continuing cycle of violence in the area, including the use of Lebanese territory for armed attacks against Israel.

Also at the same meeting, the President put the draft resolution to a vote; it received 13 votes to 1, with 1 abstention, and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁸See S/PV.2784; for details, see chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

Following the vote a statement was made by the representative of the United States of America.

Decision of 29 January 1988 (2788th meeting): resolution 609 (1988)

At its 2788th meeting, on 29 January 1988, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL of 22 January 1988¹⁰⁹ in its agenda.

The report of the Secretary-General contained a detailed account of developments relating to UNIFIL for the period from 25 July 1987 to 22 January 1988. The report noted that the situation in the UNIFIL area had remained essentially unchanged. Israel had continued to maintain in southern Lebanon its "security zone", manned by the IDF and the "SLA". The report also contained a detailed description of the armed clashes that took place during the period between armed resistance groups and the IDF/SLA. It also described the various operations against UNIFIL positions and personnel and the casualties suffered. The report referred to the limited redeployments of the IDF/SLA within the "security zone", the most important of which was the evacuation by the IDF/SLA of two positions on Tallet Hugban, one of which was occupied by UNIFIL while it could not occupy the other as it had been heavily mined by the IDF.

The Secretary-General observed once again that despite efforts at all levels, UNIFIL had been prevented from making further progress towards implementing fully the objective of Council resolution 425 (1978), which remained valid. According to the Israeli authorities, the report stated, the "security zone" was a temporary arrangement governed by Israeli security concerns in the light of the situation existing in southern Lebanon and the rest of the country. Israel maintained that in those prevailing circumstances, it could not allow the redeployment of UNIFIL to the border as there was no central government in Beirut able to exercise effective authority throughout the area and UNIFIL was not able to assume such responsibility. The Secretary-General observed here that UNIFIL could not implement its mandate successfully without the full cooperation of the Israeli authorities.

The Secretary-General argued that during the period under review, the level of violence in southern Lebanon had been limited to some extent, in particular because of the presence of UNIFIL. He argued once more that although UNIFIL had not been able to implement fully the mandate entrusted to it by the Council, the Force was undoubtedly an extremely important factor in whatever peace and normality existed in southern Lebanon. The Secretary-General felt he was obliged, therefore, to support the request of the Government of Lebanon for a further extension of UNIFIL mandate for a further period of six months.¹¹⁰ UNIFIL, he asserted, was an important mechanism for conflict control in a very volatile situation, which, without the Force, could quickly escalate into a wider conflict.

At the same meeting, the President put to the vote a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.¹¹¹ It was adopted unanimously as resolution 609 (1988)¹¹² and reads as follows:

¹⁰⁹S/19445.

¹¹⁰S/19440.

¹¹¹S/19461.

¹¹²See S/PV.2788 and chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) of 19 March 1978, 501 (1982) of 25 February 1982, 508 (1982) of 5 June 1982, 509 (1982) of 6 June 1982 and 520 (1982) of 17 September 1982, as well as all its resolutions on the situation in Lebanon,

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon of 22 January 1988, and taking note of the observations expressed therein,

Taking note of the letter dated 20 January 1988 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General,

Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,

1. *Decides* to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further interim period of six months, that is, until 31 July 1988;

2. *Reiterates* its strong support for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;

3. *Re-emphasizes* the terms of reference and general guidelines of the Force as stated in the report of the Secretary-General of 19 March 1978, approved by resolution 426 (1978), and calls upon all parties concerned to cooperate fully with the Force for the full implementation of its mandate;

4. *Reiterates* that the Force should fully implement its mandate as defined in resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978) and all other relevant resolutions;

5. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue consultations with the Government of Lebanon and other parties directly concerned on the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Council thereon.

Decision of 10 May 1988 (2814th meeting): rejection of a draft resolution

By a letter dated 5 May 1988 addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹¹³ the representative of Lebanon requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the Israeli act of aggression against Lebanon that started on 2 May 1988 in the form of a two pronged invasion penetrating more than 20 kilometres into Lebanese territory.

At its 2811th meeting, on 6 May 1988, the Council included the letter in its agenda. The Council decided to invite the following, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote: at the 2811th meeting, the representatives of Lebanon, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic and Tunisia;²⁶ and at the 2813th meeting: the representatives of Bahrain, Qatar and Somalia.²⁶ At its 2811th meeting, the Council also decided to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer for the League of Arab States.²⁶ At its 2814th meeting, on 10 May 1988, the Council decided by a vote and in accordance with its previous practice, to invite Mr. Zuhdi Terzi, representative of the PLO, to participate in the deliberations without the right to vote.¹¹⁴ The Council considered the item at its 2811th, 2813th and 2814th meetings, on 6, 9 and 10 January 1988.

Also at the 2811th meeting, the representative of Lebanon briefed the Council on the details of the Israeli attack on Lebanon. He stated that, on 2 May 1988, large contingents of the Israeli army had crossed Lebanon's southern international border, passing through the so-called "security zone", and penetrating 20 kilometres deep into Leba-

nese territory along two axes. The first axis had been east of the Litani River, including Argoub/Hasbaiya region, reaching the town of Ain Aata and Lebbaya. He further stated that the invasion of the eastern axis had been accompanied by patrol units of the Israeli navy along the coast between Sidon and Tyre, as well as by air raids over the area up to the suburbs of Beirut. On the second axis, west of the Litani River, the Israeli army had undertaken an intensive, concentrated bombardment of the villages of Maidoun, Ain Atini, Magdousha and the dam on Lake Karoun. He stated that the Israeli invasion was a flagrant violation of the sovereignty of Lebanon and was an act that flouted the Charter, international laws and norms and Council resolutions on southern Lebanon. He argued that any act of aggression against the sovereignty of any State was an act of aggression against international peace and security and that the Council had been entrusted with the maintenance of peace and security. He demanded that the Council: (a) ensure immediate withdrawal of the Israeli invasion forces from all Lebanese territory; (b) prevent Israel from repeating its acts of aggression; (c) condemn the Israeli invasion; (d) implement Council resolutions; and (e) enable UNIFIL to implement the mission entrusted to it by Council resolutions 425 and 426 (1978).

Several speakers addressed the Council during its deliberations on the item, repeating the arguments and supporting the demands of Lebanon: Jordan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Japan and Saudi Arabia at the 2811th meeting; the Libyan Arab Jamahiraya, Argentina, Nepal, China, Yugoslavia, Zambia, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Brazil, Senegal, Italy, Tunisia and Qatar at the 2813th meeting; and Somalia, Kuwait, the PLO, Bahrain, Algeria and the representative of LAS at the 2814th meeting. All these speakers expressed strong indignation at Israel's disregard of the norms of international conduct and urged Israel to respect the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon. The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya called on the Council to punish severely the aggressor in keeping with the Charter.¹¹⁵ The Permanent Observer for LAS argued that if Member States of the United Nations proclaimed their commitment to the national unity, integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon, then it behoved them to do everything within their power morally, diplomatically and even through deterrent measures, such as sanctions, to impose upon the Israelis the need to comply with the relevant Council resolutions.

At the same meeting, the representative of Israel stated that Israel had no territorial claims with regard to Lebanese territory and that the arrangements on Israel's northern border were designed solely to protect, defend and ensure the security of Israel's northern population centres against attacks emanating from Lebanese territory. Referring to Lebanon, the representative of Israel argued that a Government that could not prevent the abuse of its own sovereignty by terrorist groups could not then invoke that same principle of sovereignty to prevent the legitimate exercise of self-defence.

During the discussion, statements were also made by France and the Federal Republic of Germany. Mr. Maksoud also spoke.

¹¹³S/19861.

¹¹⁴For the vote (10 to 1, with 4 abstentions) see S/PV.2814; for further details, see chap. III of the present *Supplement*.

¹¹⁵See S/PV.2813, p. 11.

At the 2813th meeting, on 9 January 1988, the President drew attention to a six-Power draft resolution.¹¹⁶ Under the preambular part of the draft resolution, the Council would have, *inter alia*, reaffirmed previous resolutions on the situation in southern Lebanon, expressed deep concern over the occupation of Lebanese territory by Israeli forces and by the recent Israeli actions, causing heavy casualties, displacement of civilian population and destruction of houses and property. Under its operative part the Council would have: (a) condemned the recent invasion by Israeli forces of southern Lebanon; (b) repeated its calls for the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli forces from Lebanese territory and for the cessation of all acts that violated the sovereignty of Lebanon; (c) reaffirmed its calls for the strict respect for the sovereignty of Lebanon, its independence, unity and territorial integrity; (d) reaffirmed the urgent need to restore international peace and security through the implementation of Council resolutions on Lebanon, in particular 425 (1978) and other resolutions; (e) requested the Secretary-General to continue consultations with all parties involved implementing relevant Council resolutions and to report to the Council; and (f) decided to keep the situation under review.

At the 2814th meeting, on 10 January 1988, speaking before the vote, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland referred to the "cycle of violence" in the area and stated that attacks and counter-attacks were both unacceptable and undermined the stability of the area and the chances of achieving peace and security, but the recent Israeli action was not only a violation of Lebanon's sovereignty but also a disproportionate response. He urged Israel to complete its withdrawal in accordance with Council resolution 425 (1978).

At the same meeting, the draft resolution was put to the vote and received 14 votes to 1. It was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Security Council.¹¹⁷

Following the vote, the representative of the United States of America argued that armed Palestinian elements, supported by Hezbollah and other groups, had made repeated attempts in the preceding four months to enter Israel from Lebanon to carry out violent attacks, and for that reason the United States could not accept a resolution that did not acknowledge the well-known fact that hostile acts against Israel were originating in Lebanon.

Decision of 31 May 1988 (2815th meeting): resolution 613 (1988)

At its 2815th meeting, on 31 May 1988, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF of 20 May 1988¹¹⁸ in its agenda.

The report described the activities of UNDOF for the period from 14 November 1987 to 20 May 1988. The Secretary-General noted that UNDOF had continued to perform its functions effectively, with the cooperation of both parties (Israel and Syria). He further stated that restrictions on the freedom of movement of the Force still

existed, but that the situation in the Israel-Syria sector had remained quiet.

The Secretary-General observed that, despite the present quiet in the sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continued to be potentially dangerous and was likely to remain so unless and until a comprehensive peace settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem could be reached, as called for by the Council in resolution 338 (1973). In those circumstances, the Secretary-General considered the continued presence of UNDOF in the area to be essential. He therefore recommended that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, until 30 November 1988.

At the same meeting, the President drew attention to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.¹¹⁹ The draft resolution was adopted unanimously as resolution 613 (1988).¹²⁰ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force,

Decides:

(a) To call upon the parties concerned to implement immediately Security Council resolution 338 (1973) of 22 October 1973;

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 30 November 1988;

(c) To request the Secretary-General to submit, at the end of this period, a report on the developments in the situation and the measures taken to implement resolution 338 (1973).

At the same meeting, the President, on behalf of the Council, made the following complementary statement regarding resolution 613 (1988):¹²¹

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 24:

"Despite the present quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached."

That statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council.

Decision of 29 July 1988 (2822nd meeting): resolution 617 (1988) and resolution 618 (1988)

At its 2822nd meeting, on 29 July 1988, the Security Council decided to include the report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL of 25 July 1988¹²² in its agenda.

The report contained an account of the activities of UNIFIL and the situation in its area of operation since 27 January 1988. The report noted that the situation had remained essentially unchanged. Israel had continued to control in southern Lebanon an area manned by the IDF as the SLA, including parts of the UNIFIL area of operation. Resistance groups had continued to launch frequent operations against the IDF and the SLA, while the IDF/SLA had continued to fire from their positions or when on patrol and had launched retaliatory attacks or shelling against Lebanese villages. The Secretary-General reported that it had

¹¹⁶S/19868, submitted by Algeria, Argentina, Nepal, Senegal, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

¹¹⁷See S/PV.2814, for details, see chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

¹¹⁸S/19895.

¹¹⁹S/19911.

¹²⁰See S/PV.2815 and chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

¹²¹S/19912.

¹²²S/20053.

not been possible to make further progress towards attaining the objectives set out in Council resolution 425 (1978). The priorities of the parties concerned had also remained unchanged, leading to a continued presence of Israeli forces in southern Lebanon and the continuation of acts of resistance. He noted that while Israel had a legitimate interest in preventing its territory from being attacked from the territory of a neighbouring country, he did not think that that interest was legitimately served by maintaining Israeli military forces in Lebanon, thus infringing on Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity. The Secretary-General concluded by stating that although the situation remained unsatisfactory, he felt obliged to recommend that the Council accept the Lebanese Government's request¹²³ and renew the Force's mandate for a further period of six months.

At the same meeting, the President drew attention to two draft resolutions on the item.¹²⁴ The first draft resolution was adopted unanimously as resolution 617 (1988).¹²⁵ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) of 19 March 1978, 501 (1982) of 25 February 1982, 508 (1982) of 5 June 1982, 509 (1982) of 6 June 1982 and 520 (1982) of 17 September 1982, as well as all its resolutions on the situation in Lebanon,

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon of 25 July 1988, and taking note of observations expressed therein,

Taking note of the letter dated 13 July 1988 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General,

Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,

1. *Decides to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further interim period of six months, that is, until 31 January 1989;*

2. *Reiterates its strong support for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;*

3. *Re-emphasizes the terms of reference and general guidelines of the Force as stated in the report of the Secretary-General of 19 March 1978, approved by resolution 426 (1978), and calls upon all parties concerned to cooperate fully with the Force for the full implementation of its mandate;*

4. *Reiterates that the Force should fully implement its mandate as defined in resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978) and all other relevant resolutions;*

5. *Requests the Secretary-General to continue consultations with the Government of Lebanon and other parties directly concerned on the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Security Council thereon.*

At the same meeting, the second draft resolution was also adopted unanimously, as resolution 618 (1988).¹²⁵ It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Taking note of paragraph 23 of the Secretary-General's report on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon concerning the abduction of Lieutenant-Colonel William Richard Higgins, a military observer of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization serving with the Force,

Recalling the Secretary-General's special report on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon,

Recalling also its resolution 579 (1985) of 18 December 1985, which, inter alia, condemned unequivocally all acts of hostage-taking and abduction and called for the immediate release of all hostages and abducted persons wherever and by whomever they are being held,

1. *Condemns the abduction of Lieutenant-Colonel Higgins;*

2. *Demands his immediate release;*

3. *Calls upon Member States to use their influence in any way possible to promote the implementation of the present resolution.*

Decision of 14 December 1988 (2832nd meeting): rejection of a draft resolution

By a letter dated 9 December 1988 addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹²⁶ the representative of Lebanon requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the aggression against Lebanon's territories by Israeli naval, air and land forces on 9 December 1988.

At its 2832nd meeting, on 14 December 1988, the Council included the letter in its agenda and considered the item. At the same meeting, the Council decided to invite, at their request, the representatives of Lebanon and Israel to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.¹²⁶ The President drew attention to the six-Power draft resolution¹²⁷ that was before the Council, as well as to the letter from the representative of Lebanon¹²⁸ detailing the Lebanese complaint on the Israeli attack against the town of Na'imah and the monastery on the hills overlooking that town, as well as the Shuwayfat-Sa'diyat-Bi'wirta triangle, which was only 20 kilometres south of Beirut.

The representative of Lebanon recounted some of the details of the Israeli attacks contained in his letter and stated that Israel had accustomed all to daily violations of Lebanese sovereignty. He added that while Lebanese sovereignty was Lebanon's responsibility, it was also the responsibility of the Council. In the absence of a firm action on the part of the Council, he said, Israel would intensify its military operations against Lebanon. He further stated that Israel, since its establishment in the heart of the Middle East, had consistently pursued a policy of aggression and had considered resistance to its aggression and occupation as terrorism. He argued that, despite repeated assertions, Israel's continued occupation of part of Lebanese territory was the clearest evidence of its ambitions with regard to the territory and water resources of Lebanon, and that constituted a direct threat to peace and security in the Middle East and the world. He therefore called upon the Council to condemn Israel for its acts of aggression, compel it to implement Council resolutions and ensure its withdrawal from Lebanon.

The representative of Israel asserted that his country had no territorial claims with regard to any Lebanese territory, but was only defending and ensuring the security of its population from repeated attacks emanating from Lebanese territory. He added that Israel had no conflict with the Government or the people of Lebanon, but had, however, a conflict with those who had subverted Lebanese legiti-

¹²³S/20014.

¹²⁴S/20069, prepared in the course of Council's consultations, and S/20070 submitted by Argentina, France, Italy, Nepal, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America.

¹²⁵See S/PV.2822; see also chap. IV of the present Supplement.

¹²⁶S/20318.

¹²⁷S/20322, submitted by Algeria, Argentina, Nepal, Senegal, Yugoslavia and Zambia; not adopted owing to a negative vote by a permanent member.

¹²⁸S/20317.

macy for their own ends, particularly the PLO and its factions. He stated that the Council should note that the presence of armed terrorists in Lebanon was the root cause of the problem and should condemn it rather than condemn those who defended themselves from acts of terrorism.

The representative of Senegal read out a statement in his capacity as the coordinator of the non-aligned countries members of the Council. The statement asserted that the group was firmly convinced that violation of the territorial integrity, national sovereignty and independence of a State posed grave threats to international peace and security. The group, he added, condemned the Israeli aggression against Lebanon and believed it should not be tolerated and should arouse an appropriate reaction from the Council. The statement called upon the Council to adopt the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned group.

The representatives of France, Italy and Brazil condemned the Israeli attack on Lebanon and called for the implementation of Council resolutions in order to preserve the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

At the same meeting, the non-aligned draft resolution was put to the vote. Under the preambular part of the draft resolution, the Council would, *inter alia*, have reaffirmed past resolutions on the situation in Lebanon; noted with grave concern the continuing deterioration of the situation in southern Lebanon and the repeated Israeli attacks and practices against the civilian population; been deeply concerned with the recent attack against Lebanese territory by Israel. Under the operative part, the Council would have (a) strongly deplored the recent Israeli attack; (b) strongly requested that Israel cease immediately all attacks; (c) reaffirmed its call for strict respect for the sovereignty of Lebanon, its independence, unity and territorial integrity

within its internationally recognized boundaries; (d) reaffirmed the urgent need to implement the provisions of the Council resolutions on Lebanon, in particular 425 (1978) and 426 (1978), and 509 (1982), which demanded that Israel withdraw to the internationally recognized borders; (e) requested the Secretary-General to continue consultations with the parties concerned on the implementation of Council resolutions on Lebanon and to report to the Council; and (f) decided to keep the situation in Lebanon under review.

At the same meeting, the Council voted on the draft resolution by 14 to 1. The draft resolution was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Security Council.¹²⁹

Following the vote, the representative of the United States of America said that her country remained committed to supporting Lebanon's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, and had repeatedly called for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon, consistent with Council resolution 425 (1978). She pointed out that her delegation had opposed the draft resolution because it had criticized the actions of one party while ignoring the attacks and reprisals that had originated on the other side of the border. She further stated that in requesting that Israel cease all attacks against Lebanese territory regardless of provocation, the draft resolution would deny to Israel its inherent right to defend itself.

¹²⁹See S/PV.2832; for further details, see chap. IV of the present Supplement.

3. THE SITUATION BETWEEN IRAN AND IRAQ

By a letter dated 24 February 1985,¹ the representative of Iraq requested a meeting of the Security Council to discuss the report of the mission dispatched by the Secretary-General on prisoners of war in Iran and Iraq in January 1985,² at the request of Iraq³ and following consultations with the Governments of both countries.

At its 2569th meeting, on 4 March 1985, the Council included the letter from Iraq in its agenda without objection, and considered the matter in the course of that meeting.

At the same meeting, the Council decided to invite the representatives of Iraq, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Yemen,

at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.⁴ The Council also decided to extend an invitation to Mr. Chedli Klibi, Secretary-General of the League of Arab States (LAS), under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure.⁵

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq contended that the Iranian authorities were murdering or subjecting to other forms of persecution and torture Iraqi prisoners of war whom the Islamic Republic of Iran believed to be affiliated with political institutions in Iraq. He further accused the Islamic Republic of Iran of employing religious and sectarian methods by dividing prisoners of war according to their religious beliefs, and of launching an intensive psychological campaign to turn them into agents of the Islamic Republic of Iran. His Government's objective in calling for the Council meeting was to find a mechanism to implement the recommendations made in the report on prisoners of war. In this regard, he believed that the Security Council should force the Islamic Republic of Iran to allow the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) to resume its work in the Islamic Republic of Iran, seek the exchange of prisoners who were disabled and sick, followed by those who had been in cap-

¹S/16980.

²S/16962. Since the period covered by the previous volume of the Supplement, the Secretary-General also submitted the following: report of the Secretary-General in pursuance of Security Council resolution 552 (1984), in connection with the letter dated 21 May 1984 from the representatives of Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates to the President of the Security Council (S/16877 and Add.1); note by the Secretary-General on the report of the United Nations Team in Tehran concerning an inspection carried out on 7 and 8 January 1985 (S/16897); and note by the Secretary-General on the report of the United Nations Team in Baghdad concerning an inspection carried out on 28 January 1985 (S/16920).

³S/16799.

⁴For details, see chap. III of the present Supplement.

⁵S/PV.2569, p. 3.