

established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait. The Council rejects in toto these threats, allegations and attacks.

Having heard all the interventions in the debate, the Council reiterates its full support for the statement made by the President of the Council on its behalf at the opening of the 3139th meeting.

In the view of the Council, while there have been some positive steps, the Government of Iraq has not yet complied fully and unconditionally with its obligations, must do so and must immediately take the appropriate actions in this regard.

Decision of 24 November 1992: statement by the President

On 24 November 1992, following consultations among the members of the Security Council, the

President of the Council made the following statement on their behalf:⁴⁹⁸

The members of the Security Council held informal consultations on 24 November 1992 pursuant to paragraphs 21 and 28 of resolution 687 (1991) and paragraph 6 of resolution 700 (1991).

After hearing all the opinions expressed in the course of the consultations, the President concluded that there was no agreement that the necessary conditions existed for a modification of the regimes established in paragraph 20 of resolution 687 (1991), as referred to in paragraph 21 of that resolution; in paragraphs 22 to 25 of that resolution, as referred to in paragraph 28 of that resolution and in paragraph 6 of resolution 700 (1991).

⁴⁹⁸ S/24843.

23. The situation in the Middle East

Decision of 30 January 1989 (2843rd meeting): resolution 630 (1989)

On 24 January 1989, pursuant to resolution 617 (1988) of 29 July 1988, the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on the United Nations Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) for the period from 26 July 1988 to 24 January 1989.¹ He observed that the Force's ability to carry out the tasks that the Council had assigned to it in 1978 was still blocked. Israel continued to refuse to withdraw its forces from Lebanon, and the "security zone" it controlled in southern Lebanon had become a focus of attack, both by those aiming to attack Israel itself and by those with the aim of liberating Lebanese territory from foreign occupation. Attempts by armed elements to infiltrate Israel, which had increased substantially during 1988, and retaliatory air and commando raids

by Israel, often far to the north of the UNIFIL area of operation, meant that international peace and security were a long way from being restored. The failure to elect a new President of the Republic and the subsequent existence of two rival governments in Beirut had prevented UNIFIL from making any progress towards fulfilment of its third task, which was to assist the Government in ensuring the return of its effective authority in southern Lebanon. The Secretary-General added that another negative factor had been the continuing harassment of UNIFIL personnel by various armed groups in the area. UNIFIL had endeavoured to provide protection and security to the civilian population, protesting against forced expulsions of Lebanese civilians from their homes in the Israeli-controlled area by the so-called "South Lebanon Army", control, and forced recruitment of local men to that army. UNIFIL had also pursued its efforts to provide humanitarian assistance in its area of operation. The Secretary-General reported further that the Lebanese authorities on both sides in Beirut had stressed their hope that the Security Council would renew the UNIFIL mandate for a further period of six months, and that Lebanon had submitted a request for an extension of the Force's mandate. The Syrian authorities also supported an extension. The Israeli authorities continued to take the position that Israel's presence in Lebanon was a temporary arrangement, which was necessary for ensuring the security of

¹ S/20416 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1 and Add.2. UNIFIL was established by the Security Council in 1978, by resolution 425 (1978) of 19 March 1978. It was entrusted with confirming the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory; restoring international peace and security; and assisting the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area. It was later also authorized, by resolution 511 (1982), to provide protection and humanitarian assistance to the local population. The mandate of UNIFIL was extended by subsequent resolutions, including resolution 617 (1988).

northern Israel so long as the Government of Lebanon was not able to exercise effective authority and prevent its territory from being used to launch attacks against Israel. They did not consider that UNIFIL, as a peacekeeping force, could assume that responsibility.

The Secretary-General acknowledged that, given the negative developments thus described, and in particular the continuing inability of UNIFIL to carry out its original mandate, it was understandable that questions had been asked about whether the Force should be maintained at its current strength. He presented four countervailing considerations that he thought the Council would wish to take into account in considering Lebanon's request for a mandate extension: the Council's conviction that a solution to the problems of southern Lebanon lay in the full implementation of resolution 425 (1978); the valuable role played by UNIFIL in controlling the level of violence in southern Lebanon; the Force's humanitarian support to the population in its area of operation; and its role — as seen by the people of Lebanon as a whole — as a symbol of the international community's commitment to the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of their country. On the basis of those arguments, the Secretary-General recommended that the Council should accede to Lebanon's request and renew the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months.

At its 2843rd meeting, on 30 January 1989, the Security Council included the Secretary-General's report in its agenda. At the same meeting, the President (Malaysia) drew the attention of the Council members to a letter dated 19 January 1989 from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General by which the Government of Lebanon requested the Security Council to extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months.² The Government was convinced that, in spite of the difficult conditions in southern Lebanon due to the continuing occupation by Israel in the so-called "security zone", the presence of UNIFIL continued to be highly necessary, and constituted an important factor of stability and an international commitment to the upholding of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon. The Government reaffirmed the terms of the UNIFIL mandate, as laid down in resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978) and all

other relevant resolutions, and stressed the need to enable UNIFIL to implement that mandate.

The President also drew the attention of the Council members to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.³ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 630 (1989), which reads:

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 24 and 27 January 1989, and taking note of the observations expressed therein,

Taking note of the letter dated 19 January 1989 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 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 with the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Security Council thereon.

**Decision of 31 March 1989 (2851st meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 2851st meeting, held on 31 March 1989 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council included in its agenda the item entitled "The situation in the Middle East".

² S/20410.

³ S/20429.

Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Senegal) stated that, following consultations among the members of the Council, she had been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁴

The members of the Security Council express their grave concern at the recent deterioration of the situation in Lebanon, which has left many victims among the civilian population and caused considerable material damage.

In view of the threat that this situation poses to peace, security and stability in the region, they express encouragement and support for all ongoing efforts to find a peaceful solution to the Lebanese crisis, notably those made by the Ministerial Committee of the League of Arab States led by Sheikh Sabah Al-Ahmad Al-Jaber Al-Sabah, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait.

They urge all the parties to put an immediate end to the confrontations, to respond favourably to the appeals launched for an effective ceasefire and to avoid any action that might further heighten the tension.

They reaffirm their support for the full sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon.

The members of the Security Council also stress the importance of the role of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and reaffirm their resolve to continue to keep the evolution of the situation in Lebanon under close review.

**Decision of 24 April 1989 (2858th meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 2858th meeting, held on 24 April 1989 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council renewed its consideration of the item. After the adoption of the agenda, the President (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that, following consultations among the members of the Council, he had been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁵

The members of the Security Council, gravely concerned by the sufferings caused to the civilian population by the worsening situation in Lebanon, reaffirm their statement of 31 March 1989, in which, in particular, they urged all parties to respond favourably to the appeals for an effective ceasefire.

They reiterate their full support for the action of the Ministerial Committee of the League of Arab States led by Sheikh Sabah Al-Ahmad Al-Jaber Al-Sabah, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait, in order to put an end to the loss of

⁴ S/20554.

⁵ S/20602.

human lives, to alleviate the sufferings of the Lebanese people and to achieve an effective ceasefire indispensable for a settlement of the Lebanese crisis.

They invite the Secretary-General, in collaboration with the Ministerial Committee of the League of Arab States, to make all possible efforts and to make all contacts which could be deemed useful for these same purposes.

**Decisions of 30 May 1989 (2862nd meeting):
resolution 633 (1989) and statement by the
President**

On 22 May 1989, pursuant to resolution 624 (1988) of 30 November 1988, the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) for the period from 18 November 1988 to 22 May 1989, and on the implementation of resolution 338 (1973).⁶ He stated that, in accordance with its mandate and in cooperation with the parties, UNDOF had continued to supervise the observance of the ceasefire between Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic and to supervise the area of separation to ensure that there were no military forces within it. During the period under review, the situation in the Israel-Syria sector had remained quiet and there had been no serious incidents. The search for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East and, in particular, the efforts undertaken to implement resolution 338 (1973) had been dealt with in his report on the situation in the Middle East,⁷ submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 42/209 B of 11 December 1987. The Secretary-General observed 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.⁸ He continued to hope that determined efforts would be made by all concerned to tackle the problem in all its aspects, with a view to arriving at a just and durable peace settlement, as called for by the Council in its resolution 338 (1973). In the prevailing

⁶ S/20651. UNDOF was established by the Council by resolution 350 (1974) of 31 May 1974, to supervise the observance of the ceasefire in the Golan Heights, as called for by the Agreement on Disengagement between Israeli and Syrian Forces of 31 May 1974. Its mandate was extended by subsequent resolutions, including resolution 624 (1988).

⁷ A/43/867-S/20294.

⁸ S/20651, para. 24.

circumstances, the Secretary-General considered the continued presence of UNDOF in the area to be essential. He therefore recommended, with the agreement of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel, that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, until 30 November 1989.

At its 2862nd meeting, on 30 May 1989, the Security Council included the Secretary-General's report in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (United Kingdom) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁹ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 633 (1989), which reads:

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 1989;

(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, following the adoption of resolution 633 (1989), the President of the Council made the following statement:¹⁰

In connection with the resolution just adopted on the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, I have been authorized to make the following complementary statement on behalf of the Security Council:

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.

⁹ S/20656.

¹⁰ S/20659.

**Decisions of 31 July 1989 (2873rd meeting):
resolution 639 (1989) and statement by the
President**

On 21 July 1989, pursuant to resolution 630 (1989), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on UNIFIL for the period from 25 January to 21 July 1989.¹¹ He regretted that, after another difficult period, UNIFIL remained unable to implement its mandate under resolution 425 (1978). The Force had again been unable to make progress towards deployment to the international border. Israel, maintaining the policy described in previous reports, had kept its forces in Lebanon and strengthened its hold on the so-called "security zone" where positions occupied by its own forces and those of the South Lebanon Army had increased by 18.5 per cent during the period under review. At the same time, there had been an increase both in attempts by armed elements to infiltrate Israel and in attacks by the Israeli Air Force on targets in Lebanon well to the north of the UNIFIL area. International peace and security had therefore not been restored. UNIFIL efforts relating to its third task — to assist the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area — would also remain frustrated as long as the tragic situation in Beirut remained unresolved.

At the same time, however, UNIFIL had certain positive achievements to its credit, such as its significant role in controlling the level of violence in its area of operation and in providing humanitarian assistance to the people of southern Lebanon. Its presence also had a symbolic value: it underlined the conviction of the Security Council and the international community that the solution to the problems of southern Lebanon lay in the full implementation of resolution 425 (1978), and symbolized the international community's commitment to the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon. The Secretary-General pointed out, however, that the cost of those contributions was high. UNIFIL and its personnel were exposed to considerable dangers, and the Force had suffered loss of life and other casualties during the current mandate period as a result of harassment of its personnel by various armed groups in the area. He stated that significant efforts had been undertaken to improve further the security of UNIFIL personnel and facilities, and renewed his appeal to the

¹¹ S/20742.

parties concerned to cooperate with the Force with a view to enhancing the security of its members and helping them carry out their tasks. Meanwhile, by a letter dated 13 July 1989 addressed to the Secretary-General,¹² the representative of Lebanon had conveyed his country's request to the Council to extend the UNIFIL mandate for a further period of six months, adding that the renewal of the Force's mandate was "a desideratum for both Government and people of Lebanon and one which clearly and self-evidently enjoys the consensus of all leaders and all classes of the people". The Secretary-General observed that, as a result of that request, the Council was faced with a complex decision. On the one hand, there were the frustrations and dangers which resulted from the fact that UNIFIL was prevented from carrying out its mandate. On the other hand, there was the positive contribution of UNIFIL and the considerable distress that would be caused in Lebanon if the Council were to make any substantial change in the Force's strength or deployment. He believed that the prevailing view among the members of the Council was that due weight should be given to the latter consideration and that this was not the moment to make radical changes, especially when international efforts were under way to resolve the wider Lebanese crisis. The Secretary-General accordingly recommended that the Council extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months, until 31 January 1990, in accordance with Lebanon's request.

At its 2873rd meeting, on 31 July 1989, the Council included the Secretary-General's report in its agenda. Following the adoption of agenda, the President (Yugoslavia) drew the attention of the Council members to the above-mentioned letter of 13 July 1989 from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General in which the Government of Lebanon requested the Council to extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further six-month period, and to take action for the implementation of the resolutions it had adopted on the matter since 1978.¹³

The President also drew the attention of the Council members to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.¹⁴ The draft resolution was then put to

the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 639 (1989), which reads:

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 21 July 1989, and taking note of the observations expressed therein,

Taking note of the letter dated 13 July 1989 from the 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 1990;

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 with the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Security Council thereon.

At the same meeting, after the adoption of resolution 639 (1989), the President stated that, following consultations among the members of the Council, he had been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:¹⁵

The members of the Security Council note with deep regret and sorrow that, during the current mandate period, the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon has suffered additional loss of life and other casualties as a result of various serious incidents in the area of its deployment, including the harassment of its personnel by various armed groups and forces.

The members of the Council convey in this regard their deep-felt sympathy and condolences to the Governments of Ireland, Norway and Sweden and, through them, to the bereaved

¹² S/20733.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ S/20755.

¹⁵ S/20758.

families of the victims and pay tribute to the valiant action, courage and self-sacrifice manifested by all the members of the Force, in service of the ideals of peace in the region.

They take note with great concern of reports appearing today that Lieutenant Colonel Higgins may have been murdered in Lebanon and, should these reports prove to be true, express their outrage that such a cruel and criminal act should be committed against an officer who serves the United Nations on a peacekeeping mission in Lebanon. They draw attention to Security Council resolution 638 (1989) adopted this morning, condemn all acts of hostage-taking and abduction and demand the immediate safe release of all hostages and abducted persons wherever and by whomever they are being held.

Given the serious situation in the zone of Force operations, the members of the Council consider it important to reaffirm their profound concern over the safety and security of Force personnel, who are exposed to constant threats and danger.

The members of the Council note with appreciation that, as stated in the latest Secretary-General's report on the Force, "significant efforts have been undertaken to improve further the security of Force personnel and facilities" during the current mandate period.

They call upon all parties to do their utmost in order to ensure the effective reinforcement of the security of the members of the Force and to enable the Force to carry out its mandate, as laid down in Security Council resolution 425 (1978).

**Decision of 15 August 1989 (2875th meeting):
statement by the President**

By a letter dated 15 August 1989 addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹⁶ the Secretary-General, in the exercise of his responsibility under the Charter of the United Nations, requested an urgent meeting of the Council. In his opinion, the current crisis in Lebanon posed a serious threat to international peace and security. He stressed that the United Nations had a responsibility to prevent further bloodshed in the country and to support the wider efforts, led by the League of Arab States, for a resolution of the conflict. As a step in that direction, the Secretary-General believed that an effective ceasefire was imperative. What was required was a concerted effort by the Council as a whole to impress upon the parties to the conflict that there was an immediate need to halt all military activities and to adhere to a ceasefire so that

¹⁶ S/20789.

the efforts of the Tripartite Committee of Arab Heads of State¹⁷ might continue unimpeded.

At its 2875th meeting, on 15 August 1989, the Council included the Secretary-General's letter in its agenda. At the same meeting, following consultations among the members of the Council, the President (Algeria) made the following statement on behalf of the Council:¹⁸

In response to the urgent appeal addressed to the Security Council by the Secretary-General in his letter of 15 August 1989, the Council met immediately and, without prejudice to any subsequent action by it, adopted the following statement:

Deeply concerned at the further deterioration of the situation in Lebanon, the Security Council profoundly deplores the intensification of the shelling and the bitter fighting in recent days. It expresses its great disquiet at the loss of human lives and the untold sufferings that it causes to the Lebanese people.

The Council reaffirms its statement of 24 April 1989 and urgently appeals to all the parties to put an immediate end to all operations and to all firing and shelling on land and at sea. It firmly appeals to all the parties to observe a total and immediate ceasefire. It also appeals to them to do everything possible to secure the consolidation of the ceasefire, the opening of the lines of communication and the lifting of the sieges.

The Council expresses its full support for the Tripartite Committee of the Arab Heads of State in the efforts it is making with a view to putting an end to the trials of the Lebanese people through the establishment of an effective and definitive ceasefire and the putting into effect of a plan for the settlement of the Lebanese crisis in all its aspects by guaranteeing the full sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon. It appeals to all States and to all the parties likewise to support the efforts of the Tripartite Committee.

In this context, the Council invites the Secretary-General to pursue all appropriate contacts, in liaison with the Tripartite Committee, in order to ensure observance of the ceasefire, and to keep it informed on the matter.

**Decision of 20 September 1989 (2884th
meeting): statement by the President**

At its 2884th meeting, held on 20 September 1989 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council resumed consideration of the item entitled "The situation in the Middle East: letter dated 15 August 1989 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council". The President (Brazil) stated that,

¹⁷ The Tripartite Committee comprised the Kings of Morocco and Saudi Arabia and the President of Algeria.

¹⁸ S/20790.

following consultations among the members of the Council, he had been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council.¹⁹

The members of the Security Council, recalling their statement of 15 August 1989, welcome the resumption of the work of the Tripartite High Arab Committee set up to resolve the Lebanese crisis.

In this regard, they once again express to the Tripartite High Committee full support in its efforts to stop the bloodshed and to establish an atmosphere conducive to ensuring security, stability and national reconciliation in Lebanon.

They strongly urge respect for the appeal by the Tripartite High Committee for an immediate and comprehensive ceasefire, the implementation of the security arrangements and the establishment of the necessary conditions for national reconciliation in Lebanon.

They express their full support to the Tripartite High Committee in its action to put into effect a plan for the settlement of the Lebanese crisis in all its aspects by guaranteeing the full sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon.

The members of the Security Council welcome the contacts maintained by the Secretary-General of the United Nations since 15 August 1989 with the members of the Tripartite High Committee and invite him to pursue these contacts and to keep the Council informed.

**Decision of 7 November 1989 (2891st meeting):
statement by the President**

At its 2891st meeting, held on 7 November 1989 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council renewed its consideration of the item. The President (China) stated that, following consultations among the members of the Council, he had been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:²⁰

The members of the Security Council recall their statements of 15 August and 20 September 1989, in which they have expressed their full support for the Tripartite High Committee of Arab Heads of State in its action for the implementation of a settlement plan for the Lebanese crisis in all its aspects by guaranteeing the full sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon.

In this spirit, they welcome the election of the President of the Lebanese Republic and the ratification of the Taif Agreement by the Lebanese Parliament. The members of the Council pay particular tribute to the high sense of responsibility and to the courage of the Lebanese members of Parliament. An

¹⁹ S/20855.

²⁰ S/20953.

essential stage has thus been accomplished on the road to restoring the Lebanese State and establishing renovated institutions.

In the aftermath of this constitutional election, the members of the Council call upon all Lebanese to stand resolutely by their President with a view to uniting the aspirations of the Lebanese people to achieve peace, dignity and harmony.

At this historic moment, the members of the Security Council urge all sectors of the Lebanese people, including the armed forces, to come to the support of their President in order to achieve the goals of the Lebanese people which are the restoration of the unity, independence and sovereignty of Lebanon on its entire territory, so that Lebanon can reassume its role as a leading centre of civilization and culture for the Arab nation and for the world.

**Decision of 22 November 1989 (2894th
meeting): statement by the President**

At its 2894th meeting, held on 22 November 1989 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council renewed its consideration of the item. The President (China) stated that, following consultations among the members of the Council, he had been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:²¹

The members of the Security Council express their deep indignation and dismay over the assassination of Mr. René Moawad, President of the Lebanese Republic, earlier today in Beirut. They express their sympathy and condolences to the family of the late President, to the Prime Minister and to the Lebanese people.

The members of the Council strongly condemn this cowardly, criminal and terrorist act for what it is, an attack upon the unity of Lebanon, the democratic processes and the process of national reconciliation.

The members of the Council recall their statement of 7 November 1989, and reaffirm their support for the efforts undertaken by the Tripartite High Committee of the League of Arab States and for the Taif Agreement. These remain the only basis for guaranteeing the full sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon.

The members of the Council reiterate their call of 7 November to all sectors of the Lebanese people to continue the process of achieving the goals of the restoration of the Lebanese State and the establishment of renovated institutions that had started with the election of President Moawad and the appointment of Prime Minister Salim al-Hoss. Democratic Lebanese institutions must be strongly supported and the

²¹ S/20988.

process of national reconciliation must go forward. This is the only way that Lebanese national unity can be fully restored.

The members of the Council solemnly reaffirm their support for the Taif Agreement, ratified by the Lebanese Parliament on 5 November 1989. In this regard, they urge all Lebanese people to exercise restraint, to rededicate themselves to the urgent task of national reconciliation and to demonstrate their commitment to democratic processes.

The members of the Security Council are convinced that all those who seek to divide the people of Lebanon through such cowardly, criminal and terrorist acts of violence cannot, and will not, succeed.

Decisions of 29 November 1989 (2895th meeting): resolution 645 (1989) and statement by the President

On 22 November 1989, pursuant to resolution 633 (1989), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on UNDOF for the period from 23 May to 21 November 1989, and on the measures taken to implement resolution 338 (1973).²² He stated that UNDOF had continued, with the cooperation of the parties, to perform its functions effectively. During the period under review, the situation in the Israel-Syria sector had remained quiet and there had been no serious incidents. The search for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East and, in particular, the efforts undertaken to implement resolution 338 (1973) had been dealt with in his report on the situation in the Middle East,²³ submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 43/54 A of 6 December 1988. The Secretary-General observed 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.²⁴ He continued to hope that determined efforts would be made by all concerned to tackle the problem in all its aspects, with a view to arriving at a just and durable peace settlement, 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, with the agreement of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel, that

²² S/20976.

²³ A/44/737-S/20971.

²⁴ S/20976, para. 24.

the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, until 30 May 1990.

At its 2895th meeting, on 29 November 1989, the Security Council included the Secretary-General's report in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (China) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.²⁵ The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 645 (1989), which reads:

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 31 May 1990;

(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, following the adoption of resolution 645 (1989), the President made the following statement:²⁶

In connection with the resolution just adopted on the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, I have been authorized to make the following complementary statement on behalf of the Security Council:

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 27 December 1989 (2903rd meeting): statement by the President

At its 2903rd meeting, held on 27 December 1989 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council renewed its

²⁵ S/20996.

²⁶ S/20998.

consideration of the item. The President (Colombia) stated that, following consultations among the members of the Council, he had been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:²⁷

Recalling their statements of 7 November 1989 and 22 November 1989, and relevant Security Council resolutions, the members of the Council reaffirm their full support for the efforts undertaken by the Tripartite High Committee of the League of Arab States and for the Taif Agreement. These remain the only basis for guaranteeing the full sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon.

In this regard, the members of the Council welcome the election of Elias Hrawi as successor to the late René Moawad as President of the Lebanese Republic and the appointment of the Lebanese Government led by the Prime Minister Salim al-Hoss.

The members of the Council reaffirm the urgency of continuing the process of national reconciliation and political reform embodied in the Taif Agreement, and they express their deep concern over obstacles that have delayed progress in achieving these goals.

The members of the Council support President Hrawi's efforts in implementation of the Taif Agreement to deploy Lebanese Government forces to restore central government authority over all Lebanese territory.

The members of the Security Council reiterate their call on the Lebanese people, and in particular all Lebanese Government officials, civilian and military, to support their President and the constitutional process initiated at Taif to achieve peacefully the restoration of the unity, independence and sovereignty of Lebanon on its entire territory.

**Decision of 31 January 1990 (2906th meeting):
resolution 648 (1990)**

On 25 January 1990, the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on UNIFIL for the period from 22 July 1989 to 25 January 1990.²⁸ He stated that UNIFIL was still unable to implement the mandate given to it by the Council in resolution 425 (1978). Israel, maintaining the policy outlined in previous reports, had again increased the positions occupied in southern Lebanon by the Israel Defense Forces and the de facto forces. It had also further strengthened its hold on what UNIFIL referred to as the "Israel controlled area" — the so-called "security zone" — by introducing there some elements of a civilian administration in which a leading role was

given to the de facto forces. At the same time attempts by armed elements to infiltrate Israel and air and ground attacks by the Israeli forces on targets in Lebanon well to the north of the UNIFIL area had continued. The Secretary-General observed, however, that there had been positive developments in Lebanon, including the election of a new President and the appointment of a new Government committed to deploying Lebanese Government forces to restore central government authority over all Lebanese territory, in implementation of the Taif Agreement. He stated that UNIFIL stood ready to play its part in assisting the restoration of the Government's authority in southern Lebanon, including deployment of units of the Lebanese Army there. He accordingly recommended that the Council accede to Lebanon's request, and extend the UNIFIL mandate for a further period of six months. In making that recommendation, however, he also drew the Council's attention to the fact that there had been no easing of the difficulties faced by UNIFIL, such as loss of life and other casualties as well as continuing harassment.

At its 2906th meeting, on 31 January 1990, the Security Council included the Secretary-General's report in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Côte d'Ivoire) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a letter dated 11 January 1990 from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General.²⁹ The Government of Lebanon requested the Council to extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further six-month period and to take action for the implementation of the resolutions it had adopted on the matter since 1978. It contended that the renewal of the Force's mandate was of particular significance at a time when the new constitutionally elected government, with the support of the international community, had embarked on the realization of one of the most important national goals, namely extending central government authority over all Lebanese territory.

The President also drew the attention of the Council members to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.³⁰ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 648 (1990), which reads:

²⁷ S/21056.

²⁸ S/21102.

²⁹ S/21074.

³⁰ S/21117.

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 January 1990, and taking note of the observations expressed therein,

Taking note of the letter dated 11 January 1990 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission 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 1990;

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 with the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Security Council thereon.

**Decisions of 31 May 1990 (2925th meeting):
resolution 655 (1990) and statement by the
President**

On 22 May 1990, pursuant to resolution 645 (1989), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on UNDOF for the period from 22 November 1989 to 21 May 1990, and on the implementation of resolution 338 (1973).³¹ He stated that UNDOF had continued to perform its functions effectively, with the cooperation of the parties. During the period under review, the situation in the Israel-Syria sector had remained quiet and there had been no serious incidents. The search for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East and, in particular, the efforts undertaken to implement resolution 338 (1973) had

been dealt with in his report on the situation in the Middle East,³² submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 43/54 A. The Secretary-General observed 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.³³ He continued to hope that determined efforts would be made by all concerned to tackle the problem in all its aspects, with a view to arriving at a just and durable peace settlement, 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, with the agreement of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel, that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, until 30 November 1990.

At its 2925th meeting, on 31 May 1990, the Security Council included the Secretary-General's report in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Finland) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.³⁴ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 655 (1990), which reads:

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 its 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 1990;

(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 Security Council resolution 338 (1973).

³² A/44/737-S/20971.

³³ S/21305, para. 24.

³⁴ S/21325.

³¹ S/21305.

At the same meeting, following the adoption of resolution 655 (1990), the President made the following statement:³⁵

In connection with the resolution just adopted on the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, I have been authorized to make the following complementary statement on behalf of the Security Council:

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.

**Decisions of 31 July 1990 (2931st meeting):
resolution 659 (1990) and statement by
the President**

On 24 July 1990, pursuant to resolution 648 (1990), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on UNIFIL for the period from 26 January to 24 July 1990.³⁶ He stated that Israel's attitude to the situation in southern Lebanon and to the UNIFIL mandate remained unchanged. Israel continued to build up the de facto forces, the so-called "South Lebanon Army", and to improve their ability to reinforce quickly the strength of the Israel Defense Forces inside Lebanon. A consequence of that policy was that the Israeli-controlled area was becoming increasingly separated from the rest of Lebanon. Although hostile incidents in the UNIFIL area were fewer during the current mandate period than in the corresponding period in 1989, the Israel Defense Forces and the de facto forces had carried out many air and artillery attacks on targets to the north of the UNIFIL area. For its part, UNIFIL had continued its efforts to prevent its area of operation from being used for hostile activities, achieving a high degree of calm in those parts that lay outside the Israeli-controlled area. Recent months had seen a noteworthy increase in economic activity in those parts, with UNIFIL establishing some new positions close to the edge of the Israeli-controlled area in order to foster the confidence necessary for investment. UNIFIL had also continued to press the Israeli authorities to end the shelling of civilian targets by the de facto forces and to withdraw those forces

from certain positions that were most frequently responsible for such firing and that attracted attacks by armed elements. In carrying out its duties, the Force had again suffered fatalities, leading the Secretary-General to reiterate his appeal to the parties to cooperate with it, respect its international and neutral status and avoid exposing its members to danger. He concluded that, although it had not yet been possible for UNIFIL to carry out in full its mandate, the Force continued to make an important contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security in a volatile area. He accordingly recommended that the Council accept the request of the Government of Lebanon and extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months.

At its 2931st meeting, on 31 July 1990, the Council included the Secretary-General's report in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Malaysia) drew the attention of the members of the Council to two letters dated 16 July 1990 and 25 July 1990 from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General.³⁷ In his letter of 16 July 1990, the representative of Lebanon conveyed his Government's request that the mandate of UNIFIL be extended for a further period of six months. At a time when it had patiently embarked on a policy of extending its authority over its national territory, the Government was persuaded that the presence of UNIFIL in southern Lebanon remained essential. However, renewal of its mandate should not be considered as an alternative to the fulfilment of its original mandate. Israel had continued its daily acts of aggression against the civilians of southern Lebanon, and had been engaged in the process of linking the economic and administrative infrastructure of southern Lebanon to its own. That "creeping annexation" should be stopped through the immediate implementation of resolution 425 (1978). In his letter of 25 July 1990, the representative of Lebanon informed the Secretary-General that the Israeli occupation forces were building a road in the Kawkaba region, where UNIFIL was stationed. Despite the attempts of UNIFIL to stop them, the Israelis had finished the road by force, injuring a member of UNIFIL. Strongly condemning such practices, the Government of Lebanon called on the international community to take all necessary steps to put an end to the Israeli practices and acts of aggression.

³⁵ S/21338.

³⁶ S/21406 and Corr.1 and Add.1.

³⁷ S/21396 and S/21409.

The President also drew the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.³⁸ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 659 (1990), which reads:

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 24 and 26 July 1990, and taking note of the observations expressed therein,

Taking note of the letter dated 16 July 1990 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 1991;

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 with the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Security Council thereon.

At the same meeting, the President stated that, following consultations among the members of the Council, he had been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:³⁹

The members of the Security Council have noted with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, submitted in conformity with resolution 648 (1990) of 31 January 1990.

They reaffirm their commitment to the full sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. In this context, they assert that any State shall refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

As the Security Council extends the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further interim period on the basis of resolution 425 (1978) of 19 March 1978, the members of the Council again stress the need for the implementation of that resolution in all its aspects. They express their appreciation for the continuing efforts of the Secretary-General and his staff in this regard. They reiterate their full support for the Taif Agreement and for the efforts of the Lebanese Government to extend its authority over all Lebanese territory.

The members of the Security Council take this opportunity to commend the troops of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and the troop-contributing countries for their sacrifices and commitment to the cause of international peace and security under difficult circumstances.

Decision of 24 September 1990: letter from the President of the Security Council to the Secretary-General

By a letter dated 24 September 1990, the President of the Security Council informed the Secretary-General as follows:⁴⁰

The members of the Security Council agreed, during their consideration in consultations on 31 July 1990 of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon on the occasion of the renewal of the mandate of the Force to request that a review of the scale and deployment of the Force be carried out by the Secretariat in the light of the performance of its functions since its establishment in 1978 and with a view to fully implementing resolution 425 (1978) of 19 March 1978. The Council is mindful of the great benefit that the presence of the Force continues to contribute to Lebanon. The members of the Council also agreed that the review should be carried out during the interim period of six months for which the mandate of the Force was extended on 31 July 1990, that is, prior to the expiration on 31 January 1991 of the current mandate.

The members of the Council were of the view that such a review would accord with the spirit of the statement made by the President on behalf of the Council at the 2924th meeting, held on 30 May 1990, in connection with the Council's consideration of the item entitled "United Nations peacekeeping operations", and would provide the Council with a basis on which to assess

³⁸ S/21411.

³⁹ S/21418.

⁴⁰ S/21833.

whether existing arrangements for the Force should be maintained or changed.

Decisions of 30 November 1990 (2964th meeting): resolution 679 (1990) and statement by the President

On 23 November 1990, pursuant to resolution 655 (1990), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on UNDOF for the period from 22 May to 23 November 1990, and on the implementation of resolution 338 (1973).⁴¹ He stated that UNDOF had continued to perform its functions effectively, with the cooperation of the parties. During the period under review, the situation in the Israel-Syria sector had remained quiet and there had been no serious incidents. The search for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East and, in particular, the efforts undertaken to implement resolution 338 (1973) would be dealt with in his report on the situation in the Middle East,⁴² to be submitted shortly pursuant to General Assembly resolution 44/40 A of 4 December 1989. The Secretary-General observed 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.⁴³ He continued to hope that determined efforts would be made by all concerned to tackle the problem in all its aspects, with a view to arriving at a just and durable peace settlement, 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, with the agreement of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel, that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, until 31 May 1991.

At its 2964th meeting, on 30 November 1990, the Security Council included the Secretary-General's report in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (United States) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁴⁴ The draft resolution

was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 679 (1990), which reads:

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 its 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 31 May 1991;

(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, after the adoption of resolution 679 (1990), the President made the following statement:⁴⁵

In connection with the resolution just adopted on the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Force, I have been authorized to make the following complementary statement on behalf of the Security Council:

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 23: "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.

Decisions of 30 January 1991 (2975th meeting): resolution 684 (1991) and statement by the President

On 23 January 1991, pursuant to resolution 359 (1990), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on UNIFIL for the period from 25 July 1990 to 22 January 1991,⁴⁶ and on the results of a review of the scale and deployment of UNIFIL,⁴⁷ carried out in accordance with the request made by the members of the Council on 31 July 1990.⁴⁸ The review concluded that the scale and deployment of UNIFIL were determined by two main factors: the Council's commitment to resolution 425 (1978) as the correct solution to the problem of southern Lebanon; and the

⁴¹ S/21950 and Corr.1.

⁴² A/45/726-S/21947.

⁴³ S/21950, para. 23.

⁴⁴ S/21972.

⁴⁵ S/21974.

⁴⁶ S/22129.

⁴⁷ S/22129/Add.1 of 28 January 1991.

⁴⁸ S/21833.

interim tasks that the Force had carried out with the Council's approval (controlling the level of hostilities in its present area of deployment and providing humanitarian support to the civilian population) until it was enabled to carry out its original tasks of confirming the withdrawal of Israeli forces, restoring international peace and security and assisting the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area. The review took note of the fact that UNIFIL faced certain difficulties and dangers owing to the anomaly that arose from giving a peacekeeping force a mandate to prevent its area from being used for hostile activities when those activities included resistance to an occupation against which the Security Council had repeatedly pronounced itself. It was clear that the solution to that anomaly must lie in the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory, accompanied by the progressive assumption by the Lebanese Army of responsibility for security in the present area of deployment of UNIFIL. Finally, the review recommended that, for the time being, there should be no substantive change in the Force's function or in its deployment but that certain measures should be taken to streamline the Force which would produce a saving of some 10 per cent in its military strength.⁴⁹

In his report, the Secretary-General informed the Council of recent consultations with the Lebanese authorities on the implementation of their decision relating to the deployment of the army to the south. He had welcomed the idea of the progressive deployment of the army to southern Lebanon as a necessary first step in the restoration of the Government's effective authority there. UNIFIL stood ready to cooperate with the Lebanese Army when it reached the UNIFIL area and to begin progressively transferring to it responsibility for security. Meanwhile, Israel's attitude to the situation in southern Lebanon and to the UNIFIL mandate remained as described in previous reports. The Israeli authorities continued to build up the de facto forces in the Israeli-controlled area and to increase the military positions held by them and the Israel Defense Forces. For its part, UNIFIL continued, to the best of its ability and in accordance with its mandate, to prevent its area of operation from being used for hostile activities. Hostile activities in the UNIFIL area had again declined during the current mandate, but the Israel Defense Forces and the de facto forces had carried out many air and artillery attacks on

targets to the north of the UNIFIL area. A high degree of calm and tranquillity prevailed in those parts of the UNIFIL area that lay outside the Israeli-controlled area and economic activity continued to increase there. In order to foster the confidence necessary for such investment, UNIFIL had established further new positions close to the edge of the Israeli-controlled area. The Secretary-General concluded that, although it had not yet been possible for UNIFIL to carry out in full the mandate given to it in 1978, the Force continued to make an important contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security in a volatile area. He accordingly recommended that the Council accept the request of the Government of Lebanon and extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months, until 31 July 1991.

At its 2975th meeting, on 30 January 1991, the Council included the Secretary-General's report on UNIFIL in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Zaire) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a letter dated 14 January 1991 from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General, conveying his Government's request to the Security Council to extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months.⁵⁰ He stated that some major constructive developments had taken place since the last renewal of the Force's mandate: a Government of national unity had been formed; the army had assumed complete control of the Greater Beirut area; and the Council of Ministers had decided to further deploy the Lebanese Army in certain regions in the south and the western Bekaa adjacent to the area occupied by Israel. That would serve as a prelude to the full implementation of resolution 425 (1978), when the Government and the Lebanese Army, with the help of UNIFIL, would extend the Government's authority over the entire south up to the internationally recognized boundaries. In Lebanon's view, the time had come for the Council not to tolerate any more Israel's continuous occupation of Lebanese land and to demand the prompt implementation of resolution 425 (1978), which Israel consistently flouted under the pretext of its security and in violation of the Charter of the United Nations.

The President also drew the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior

⁴⁹ S/22129/Add.1, para. 59.

⁵⁰ S/22079.

consultations.⁵¹ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 684 (1991), which reads:

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 of 23 and 28 January 1991 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, and taking note of the observations expressed therein, and without prejudice to the views of the Member States thereon,

Taking note of the letter dated 14 January 1991 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 period of six months, that is, until 31 July 1991;

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 with the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Security Council thereon.

At the same meeting, after the adoption of resolution 684 (1991), the President stated that, following consultations among the members of the Council, he had been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁵²

The members of the Security Council have noted with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon submitted in conformity with Security Council resolution 659 (1990) of 31 July 1990.

They reaffirm their commitment to the full sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. In this context, they assert that any State shall refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

As the Council extends the mandate of the Force for a further interim period on the basis of resolution 425 (1978) of 19 March 1978, the members of the Council again stress the need for the implementation of that resolution in all its aspects. They express their appreciation for the continuing efforts of the Secretary-General and his staff in this regard. They reiterate their full support for the Taif Agreement and for the recent efforts of the Lebanese Government to extend its authority over all Lebanese territory.

The members of the Council take this opportunity to commend the troops of the Force and the troop-contributing countries for their sacrifices and commitment to the cause of international peace and security under difficult circumstances.

**Decisions of 30 May 1991 (2990th meeting):
resolution 695 (1991) and statement by
the President**

On 21 May 1991, pursuant to resolution 679 (1990), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on UNDOF for the period from 24 November 1990 to 20 May 1991, and on the implementation of resolution 338 (1973).⁵³ He stated that UNDOF had continued to perform its functions effectively, with the cooperation of the parties. During the period under review, the situation in the Israel-Syria sector had remained quiet and there had been no serious incidents. The search for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East and, in particular, the efforts undertaken to implement resolution 338 (1973) had been dealt with in his report on the situation in the Middle East,⁵⁴ submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 44/40 A. The Secretary-General observed 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.⁵⁵ He continued to hope that determined efforts would be made by all concerned to tackle the problem in all its aspects, with a view to arriving at a just and durable peace settlement, as called for by the Council in its resolution

⁵¹ S/22170.

⁵² S/22176.

⁵³ S/22631 and Add.1.

⁵⁴ A/45/726-S/21947.

⁵⁵ S/22631, para. 23.

338 (1973). In the prevailing circumstances, the Secretary-General considered the continued presence of UNDOF in the area to be essential. He therefore recommended, with the agreement of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel, that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, until 30 November 1991.

At its 2990th meeting, on 30 May 1991, the Council included the Secretary-General's report in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (China) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁵⁶ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 695 (1991), which reads:

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 its 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 1991;

(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, following the adoption of resolution 695 (1991), the President made the following statement:⁵⁷

In connection with the resolution just adopted on the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Force, I have been authorized to make the following complementary statement on behalf of the Security Council:

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 23: "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.

⁵⁶ S/22650.

⁵⁷ S/22657.

**Decisions of 31 July 1991 (2997th meeting):
resolution 701 (1991) and statement by
the President**

On 21 July 1991, pursuant to resolution 684 (1991), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on UNIFIL for the period from 23 January to 20 July 1991.⁵⁸ In Lebanon, outside the Israeli-controlled area, progress in the implementation of the Taif Agreement had continued. The Government of Lebanon had, in particular, declared its intention to dissolve and disarm all Lebanese and non-Lebanese militias by 30 September 1991. Significant steps in this regard had been taken in parts of southern Lebanon outside the UNIFIL area of operation. Important progress had also been achieved in the deployment of the Lebanese Army in southern Lebanon, as part of the Government's plans for the return of its effective authority in the area. UNIFIL had continued to discuss with the Lebanese authorities arrangements for the progressive transfer to the Lebanese Army of responsibility for security in the areas currently controlled by UNIFIL. It was envisaged that the transfer would proceed in parallel with movement by UNIFIL southwards towards the border and the progressive withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Israeli-controlled area, thus bringing about the implementation of resolution 425 (1978). Israel, while taking note of the efforts of the Government of Lebanon to restore its authority in southern Lebanon, was not at present prepared to modify the security arrangements which, in spite of resolution 425 (1978), it had established on Lebanese territory. Nor did it consider that UNIFIL, as a peacekeeping force, could replace those arrangements. In the meantime, although UNIFIL endeavoured to prevent its area from being used for hostile activities, recent weeks had seen a significant increase both in resistance operations inside the Israeli-controlled area and in harassment of villages to the north of it, by the Israel Defense Forces and de facto forces inflicting death, injury and material loss on the civilian population. UNIFIL did all it could to protect civilians but its ability to do so was limited when they were the subject of deliberate attack. Moreover, the Force itself continued to be exposed to many dangers. The Secretary-General believed, however, that the Council would again judge that, although it had not yet been possible for UNIFIL to carry out in full the mandate given to it in 1978, the

⁵⁸ S/22829.

Force continued to make an important contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security in a volatile area. In addition, recent positive developments in Lebanon had improved the prospects of its being able to carry out that part of its mandate which required it to assist the Government in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area. He accordingly recommended that the Council accept the request of the Government of Lebanon and extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months, until 31 January 1992. The Secretary-General also recalled the main recommendations made in the Secretariat's review of the scale and deployment of UNIFIL, which he believed to be on the right lines, and noted that the Council had not yet taken formal action on them.

At its 2997th meeting, on 31 July 1991, the Council included the Secretary-General's report in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Cuba) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a letter dated 15 July 1991 from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General, conveying his Government's request that the Security Council extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months.⁵⁹ He stated that, since the last renewal of the Force's mandate, the Government had extended its authority beyond the Greater Beirut area towards the north, east and south and, in accordance with the timetable of the Taif Agreement, militias previously operating in those areas had been disbanded and their weapons turned in to the Lebanese Army. One exception to Lebanon's success remained, however; that was in the southern most region of the country, where Israel imposed its reign of terror over the civilian population. The Government was sparing no effort to extend its sovereignty over southern Lebanon, in fulfilment of Security Council resolution 425 (1978). Israel, however, had amplified its refusal to withdraw from southern Lebanon and had intensified its aggressions by extending its attacks beyond the occupied zone. Senior Israeli officials were declaring publicly that they had no intention of withdrawing from the so-called "security zone" and would continue to strengthen Israel's proxy militia there. Lebanon insisted that it was no longer acceptable that the occupation of southern Lebanon be allowed to stand, in violation of the Charter as well as numerous Security

⁵⁹ S/22791.

Council resolutions, and demanded the prompt implementation of resolution 425 (1978).

The President also drew the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁶⁰ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 701 (1991), which reads:

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 21 July 1991, and taking note of the observations expressed therein,

Recalling the report of the Secretariat team of 28 January 1991, and without prejudice to the views of Member States thereon,

Taking note of the letter dated 15 July 1991 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 1992;

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 with the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Security Council thereon.

At the same meeting, after the adoption of resolution 701 (1991), the President stated that, following consultations among the members of the

⁶⁰ S/22857.

Council, he had been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁶¹

The members of the Security Council have noted with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon submitted in conformity with resolution 684 (1991) of 30 January 1991.

They reaffirm their commitment to the full sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. In this context, they assert that any State shall refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

As the Council extends the mandate of the Force for a further interim period on the basis of resolution 425 (1978) of 19 March 1978, the members of the Council again stress the need for the implementation of that resolution in all its aspects. They express their appreciation for the continuing efforts of the Secretary-General and his staff in this regard. They reiterate their full support for the Taif Agreement and commend the Lebanese Government for the recent successful deployment of its army in the Sidon and Tyre regions in the process of extending its authority over all Lebanese territory.

The members of the Council take this opportunity to commend the troops of the Force and the troop-contributing countries for their sacrifices and commitment to the cause of international peace and security under difficult circumstances.

Decisions of 29 November 1991 (3019th meeting): resolution 722 (1991) and statement by the President

On 22 November 1991, pursuant to resolution 695 (1991), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on UNDOF for the period from 21 May to 20 November 1991, and on the implementation of resolution 338 (1973).⁶² He stated that UNDOF had continued to perform its functions effectively, with the cooperation of the parties. During the period under review, the situation in the Israel-Syria sector had remained generally quiet and there had been only one serious incident. The search for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East and, in particular, the efforts undertaken to implement resolution 338 (1973) had been dealt with in his report on the situation in the Middle East,⁶³ submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 45/83 A of 13 December 1990. The Secretary-General observed

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.⁶⁴ He continued to hope that determined efforts would be made by all concerned to tackle the problem in all its aspects, with a view to arriving at a just and durable peace settlement, 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, with the agreement of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel, that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, until 31 May 1992.

At its 3019th meeting, on 29 November 1991, the Council included the Secretary-General's report in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Romania) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁶⁵ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 722 (1991), which reads:

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 its 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 31 May 1992;

(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, following the adoption of resolution 722 (1991), the President made the following statement:⁶⁶

In connection with the resolution just adopted on the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, I have been authorized to make the following complementary statement on behalf of the Security Council:

⁶¹ S/22862.

⁶² S/23233 and Corr.1.

⁶³ A/46/652-S/23225.

⁶⁴ S/23233, para. 24.

⁶⁵ S/23250.

⁶⁶ S/23253.

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.

**Decisions of 29 January 1992 (3040th meeting):
resolution 734 (1992) and statement by
the President**

On 21 January 1992, pursuant to resolution 701 (1991), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on UNIFIL for the period from 21 July 1991 to 21 January 1992.⁶⁷ He observed that the period under review had been more difficult than preceding ones both for UNIFIL and for the inhabitants of southern Lebanon. Hostilities between Lebanese resistance groups and the Israel Defense Forces/de facto forces had intensified and the number of casualties had increased. UNIFIL had continued to do its best to prevent its area of deployment from being used for hostile activities and to protect civilians caught up in the conflict, although its ability to do the latter was limited by the amount of firing directed at UNIFIL itself. Hostilities in the UNIFIL area had generally focused on certain Israel Defense Forces/de facto forces positions that were close to population centres and in areas where UNIFIL was deployed. The Secretary-General endorsed the proposal made by his predecessor to the Government of Israel that the Israel Defense Forces/de facto forces be withdrawn from these positions, which would then be taken over by UNIFIL: such a move would have a beneficial effect and the proposal merited an early and positive response. He remarked further that the Lebanese Army’s forthcoming assumption of responsibility for a part of the UNIFIL area of operation was encouraging, and would certainly contribute to internal stability and to the restoration of the Government’s authority in the area. Israel’s general attitude to the situation in southern Lebanon and to the UNIFIL mandate remained, however, as described in previous reports. The Israeli authorities had recently added that, following the beginning of the Arab-Israeli peace talks, all problems between Israel and Lebanon — including the interpretation and implementation of resolution 425 (1978) and subsequent resolutions of the Security

⁶⁷ S/23452.

Council — should be dealt with in the bilateral talks in the framework of the peace process. Meanwhile, Israel continued to maintain the de facto forces and to consolidate its hold over the Israeli-controlled area, which was increasingly being separated from the rest of Lebanon. The Secretary-General concluded that, while the situation had remained difficult and UNIFIL was still far from being able to carry out its mandate, the Force’s contribution to stability in this very volatile region remained important. It was all the more valuable at a time when Arabs and Israelis were engaged in peace negotiations. He therefore recommended that the Council accept the request of the Government of Lebanon and extend the mandate of UNIFIL for another period of six months, until 31 July 1992. He also urged the Council to approve the recommendations summarized in paragraph 59 of the review of the scale and deployment of UNIFIL,⁶⁸ submitted to the Council by his predecessor on 28 January 1991. Like his predecessor, he considered the recommendations to be on the right lines: they would permit a reduction of some 10 per cent in the military strength of UNIFIL without affecting the Force’s operational capability to carry out the tasks assigned to it by the Security Council.⁶⁹

At its 3040th meeting, on 29 January 1992, the Security Council included the Secretary-General’s report in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (United Kingdom) drew the attention of the members of the Council to the following letters addressed to the Secretary-General: two letters dated 17 January 1992 and 21 January 1992 from the representative of Lebanon;⁷⁰ and a letter dated 27 January 1992 from the representative of Israel.⁷¹

In his letter of 17 January 1992, the representative of Lebanon transmitted his Government’s request for an extension of the UNIFIL mandate for a further period of six months. He stated that, since the last renewal of the Force’s mandate, some major constructive developments had taken place, which had further strengthened the position of the Lebanese Army and internal security forces in the south: the Army had confiscated all heavy and medium weapons and banned all forms of armed presence in areas under its control; deployment of the Lebanese

⁶⁸ S/22129/Add.1.

⁶⁹ S/23452, para. 33.

⁷⁰ S/23435 and S/23453.

⁷¹ S/23479.

Army had proceeded smoothly in areas in the south, in coordination with UNIFIL; and consultations were under way to ascertain the best way in which the Lebanese Army could take over additional areas from UNIFIL. Israel, however, had amplified its refusal to withdraw from southern Lebanon despite the participation of both countries in the Arab-Israeli peace conference, which had begun in Madrid and proceeded to Washington. As a pretext for perpetuating its occupation of the south, Israel sought to destabilize Lebanon so as to prevent the Lebanese Army from keeping law and order. Calling the attention of the Council to the gravity of the increase in hostilities in southern Lebanon, the Government of Lebanon implored the Council to take new and unprecedented steps to bring an end to the violence, through the prompt implementation of its resolution 425 (1978), which would enable the Government to extend its authority over the entire south of the country and up to its internationally recognized boundaries. In his letter of 21 January 1992, the representative of Lebanon stated that Israel had continued its attacks on villagers and their property in the south of the country. As a result, at least 80 per cent of the villagers had fled and one of the villages had been incorporated into Israel's so-called "security zone". The Government condemned these latest acts of aggression, and alerted the international community to the fact that Israel was seeking to extend the zone which it occupied in Lebanese territory, even as it participated in the Middle East peace negotiations under way in Washington. It reserved its right to call on the Security Council to consider ways and means of putting an end to Israel's constant, unwarranted, attacks in southern Lebanon, in the light of the threat they posed to international peace and security.

In his letter of 27 January 1992, the representative of Israel drew attention to the escalation of terrorist activities in southern Lebanon since the deployment of the Lebanese Army in the area. He stated that the Government of Lebanon had done nothing to halt or prevent the activities of Hizbullah and other terrorist organizations, which continued to use civilian centres as bases of operation. On the contrary, it had tacitly and explicitly encouraged them to continue with their acts of terrorism. The Government of Lebanon had thus demonstrated its unwillingness to abide by its international obligations to prevent activities within its territory directed towards organizing, instigating, assisting and

participating in acts of violence and terror across Israel's northern border. Such obligations were part of the Charter of the United Nations and other related international norms and declarations, particularly the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.⁷² Drawing attention to the 35,000 Syrian troops and hundreds of Iranian Revolutionary Guards stationed on Lebanese soil, the representative asserted that Syrian interference in Lebanese internal affairs made a mockery of Lebanon's sovereignty and was a clear violation of its territorial integrity and political independence. He maintained that his Government's position regarding southern Lebanon remained unchanged. Israel had no territorial claims on any part of Lebanese territory. However, Lebanon had failed to carry out its international obligations and to prevent the use of its territory for acts of terrorism against Israel. The latter had therefore found it necessary to undertake security functions and patrols in a narrow zone of the south of Lebanon, aimed at detecting and preventing the organization of terrorist activities and access by terrorist elements to Israel's northern border areas. Such security arrangements were essential and would be maintained as long as there existed a threat that acts of violence and terror would continue to emanate unimpeded from Lebanon. In conclusion, the representative asserted that the appropriate forum for the resolution of outstanding issues between the two countries lay in the bilateral negotiations which had been taking place within the framework of the peace process.

The President also drew the attention of the Council members to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁷³ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 734 (1992), which reads:

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,

⁷² General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV) of 24 October 1970.

⁷³ S/23483.

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon of 21 January 1992, and taking note of the observations expressed therein,

Recalling the addendum of 28 January 1991 to the Secretary-General's report of 22 January 1991,

Taking note of the letter dated 17 January 1992 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 1992;

2. *Approves* the overall objective of the Secretary-General, as set out in paragraph 33 of his report of 21 January 1992 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, aimed at promoting the greater effectiveness of the Force;

3. *Approves in particular* the recommendations summarized in paragraphs 59 (c) (i) and (ii) of the addendum of 28 January 1991 to the report of the Secretary-General of 22 January 1991;

4. *Invites* the Secretary-General to consider further, in consultation with the troop-contributing countries, how to achieve the overall objective referred to in paragraph 2 above, and to take action on the objectives in paragraphs 2 and 3 above;

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

6. *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;

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

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

At the same meeting, after the adoption of resolution 734 (1992), the President stated that, following consultations among the members of the Council, he had been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁷⁴

The members of the Security Council have noted with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon of 21 January 1992 submitted

in conformity with Council resolution 701 (1991) of 31 July 1991.

The members of the Council reaffirm their commitment to the full sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. In this context, they assert that any State shall refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

As the Council extends the mandate of the Force for a further interim period on the basis of resolution 425 (1978) of 19 March 1978, the members of the Council again stress the need for the implementation of that resolution in all its aspects. They reiterate their full support for the Taif Agreement and commend the Lebanese Government for its successful efforts to deploy units of its army in the south of the country in full coordination with the Force. The members of the Council urge all the parties concerned to support the Force fully.

The members of the Council express their concern over the continuing violence in southern Lebanon and urge all parties to exercise restraint.

The members of the Council take this opportunity to express their appreciation for the continuing efforts of the Secretary-General and his staff in this regard and commend the Force's troops and troop-contributing countries for their sacrifices and commitment to the cause of international peace and security under difficult circumstances.

Decision of 19 February 1992 (3053rd meeting): statement by the President

By a letter dated 17 February 1992 addressed to the President of the Security Council,⁷⁵ the representative of Lebanon requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the latest acts of aggression by Israel against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and its continuous occupation of southern Lebanon and part of the Bekaa. Those aggressions and the occupation, he stated, constituted "a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and Security Council resolutions" and posed a grave threat to international peace and security.

At its 3053rd meeting, on 19 February 1992, the Council included the letter from the representative of Lebanon in its agenda. The President (United States) stated that, following consultations among the members of the Council, he had been authorized to

⁷⁵ S/23604.

⁷⁴ S/23495.

make the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁷⁶

The members of the Council are deeply concerned about the renewed and rising cycle of violence in southern Lebanon and elsewhere in the region. The Council deplores in particular the recent killings and the continued violence, which threatens to claim additional lives and to destabilize the region further.

The members of the Council call upon all those involved to exercise maximum restraint in order to bring such violence to an end.

The members of the Council reaffirm their commitment to the full sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries, as set out in resolution 425 (1978) of 19 March 1978. In this context, they assert that any State shall refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

The members of the Council express their continued support for all efforts to bring peace to the region on the basis of resolutions 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 and 338 (1973) of 22 October 1973. The members of the Council urge all the parties concerned to work vigorously to enhance the ongoing peace process.

**Decisions of 29 May 1992 (3081st meeting):
resolution 756 (1992) and statement by
the President**

On 19 May 1992, pursuant to resolution 722 (1991), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on UNDOF for the period from 21 November 1991 to 19 May 1992, and on the implementation of resolution 338 (1973).⁷⁷ He stated that UNDOF had continued to perform its functions effectively, with the cooperation of the parties. During the period under review, the situation in the Israel-Syria sector had remained generally quiet and there had been no serious incidents. The search for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East and, in particular, the efforts undertaken to implement resolution 338 (1973) had been dealt with in his report on the situation in the Middle East,⁷⁸ submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 45/83 A. The Secretary-General observed 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.⁷⁹ He continued to hope that determined efforts would be made by all concerned to tackle the problem in all its aspects, with a view to arriving at a just and durable peace settlement, 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, with the agreement of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel, that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, until 30 November 1992.

At its 3081st meeting, on 29 May 1992, the Council included the Secretary-General's report in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Austria) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁸⁰ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 756 (1992), which reads:

The Security Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General of 19 May 1992 on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force,

Decides:

- (a) To call upon the parties concerned to implement immediately its 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 1992;
- (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, after the adoption of resolution 756 (1992), the President made the following statement:⁸¹

In connection with the resolution just adopted on the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, I have been authorized to make the following complementary statement on behalf of the Security Council:

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General of 19 May 1992 on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 20: "Despite the present quiet in the

⁷⁶ S/23610.

⁷⁷ S/23955.

⁷⁸ A/46/652-S/23225.

⁷⁹ S/23955, para. 20.

⁸⁰ S/24026.

⁸¹ S/24030.

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.

**Decisions of 30 July 1992 (3102nd meeting):
resolution 768 (1992) and statement by
the President**

On 21 July 1992, pursuant to resolution 734 (1992), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on UNIFIL for the period from 22 January to 21 July 1992.⁸² He observed that, during this period, the situation in southern Lebanon had been marked by a continuously high level of firing, and that UNIFIL had been severely hampered in carrying out its tasks by the amount of firing directed at its personnel. At the same time, a source of encouragement had been the Lebanese Army’s assumption of responsibility for a part of the UNIFIL area of operation, which represented a further important step towards the restoration of the Government’s authority in southern Lebanon. Meanwhile, Israel’s general attitude to the situation in southern Lebanon and to the UNIFIL mandate remained as described in previous reports. In summary, UNIFIL had once again been prevented from carrying out its mandate, and the parties to the conflict in southern Lebanon continued to be locked in a vicious cycle. In the absence of the cooperation which was essential to the success of any peacekeeping operation, the efforts of UNIFIL had merely succeeded in limiting the consequences of the parties’ actions, something upon which they seemed to have come to rely. The Force’s contribution to stability in the region remained nevertheless important, particularly at a time of negotiation. The Secretary-General therefore recommended that the Council accept the request of the Government of Lebanon and extend the Force’s mandate for another period of six months, until 31 January 1993.

At its 3102nd meeting, on 30 July 1992, the Council included the Secretary-General’s report in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Cape Verde) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a letter dated 15 July 1992 from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General, transmitting his Government’s request that the Council extend the UNIFIL mandate

for a further period of six months.⁸³ He stated that, since the last renewal of the Force’s mandate, the Government of Lebanon had continued to consolidate the peace, national unity and security which were necessary for lasting stability. In that context, it had established plans for displaced persons; in conformity with the principles and timetable of the Taif Agreement, it had taken the decision to collect all light weapons — a process under way in different regions of the country; and it had taken the decision to conduct in the coming weeks the nation’s first parliamentary elections in 20 years. Moreover, UNIFIL had handed over part of one of its sectors to the Lebanese Army, enabling UNIFIL to strengthen its own deployment elsewhere in its area of operation. Israel, on the other hand, was doing everything in its power to undermine the process of consolidating national unity. Despite the participation of both countries in the Arab-Israeli peace conference, Israel had intensified its efforts to destabilize and terrorize Lebanon. In perpetuating its occupation of the south, Israel had subjected Lebanese citizens to daily air raids and bombardments. The Lebanese Government drew the Council’s attention to Israel’s “perpetual state of attack” against Lebanon, and its flagrant routine incursions beyond the area under its occupation. It urged the Council to take new and vigorous steps to bring an end to Israel’s reign of terror, through the prompt implementation of resolution 425 (1978) and galvanization of the mechanism set out in resolution 526 (1978), which would enable the Lebanese Government to extend its authority over the entire south of the country up to its internationally recognized boundaries. The time had come for the Council to institute a timetable for the implementation of resolution 425 (1978).

The President also drew the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council’s prior consultations.⁸⁴ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 768 (1992), which reads:

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,

⁸² S/24341.

⁸³ S/24293.

⁸⁴ S/24360.

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General of 21 July 1992 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and taking note of the observations expressed therein,

Taking note of the letter dated 15 July 1992 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 1993;

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) and 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 with the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Security Council thereon.

At the same meeting, after the adoption of resolution 768 (1992), the President stated that, following consultations among the members of the Council, he had been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁸⁵

The members of the Council have noted with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon of 21 July 1992 submitted in conformity with resolution 734 (1992) of 29 January 1992.

The members of the Council reaffirm their commitment to the full sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. In this context, they assert that any State shall refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

As the Council extends the mandate of the Force for a further interim period on the basis of resolution 425 (1978) of 19 March 1978, the members of the Council again stress the urgent need for the implementation of that resolution in all its aspects. They reiterate their full support for the Taif Agreement and for the continued efforts of the Lebanese Government to consolidate peace, national unity and security in the country.

⁸⁵ S/24362.

The members of the Council commend the Lebanese Government for its successful efforts to deploy units of its army in the south of the country in full coordination with the Force.

The members of the Council express their concern over the continuing violence in southern Lebanon, regret the loss of civilian life and urge all parties to exercise restraint.

The members of the Council take this opportunity to express their appreciation for the continuing efforts of the Secretary-General and his staff in this regard and commend the Force's troops and troop-contributing countries for their sacrifices and commitment to the cause of international peace and security under difficult circumstances.

Decisions of 25 November 1992 (3141st meeting): resolution 790 (1992) and statement by the President

On 19 November 1992, pursuant to resolution 756 (1992), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on UNDOF for the period from 20 May to 19 November 1992, and on the implementation of resolution 338 (1973).⁸⁶ He stated that UNDOF had continued to perform its functions effectively, with the cooperation of the parties. During the period under review, the situation in the Israel-Syria sector had remained generally quiet and there had been no serious incidents. The search for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East and, in particular, the efforts undertaken to implement resolution 338 (1973) had been dealt with in his report on the situation in the Middle East,⁸⁷ submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 46/82 A of 16 December 1991. The Secretary-General observed 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.⁸⁸ He continued to hope that determined efforts would be made by all concerned to tackle the problem in all its aspects, with a view to arriving at a just and durable peace settlement, 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, with the

⁸⁶ S/24821.

⁸⁷ A/47/672-S/24819.

⁸⁸ S/24821, para. 20.

agreement of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel, that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, until 31 May 1993.

At its 3141st meeting, on 25 November 1992, the Council included the Secretary-General's report in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Hungary) drew the attention of the members of the Council to a draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁸⁹ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 790 (1992), which reads:

The Security Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General of 19 November 1992 on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force,

Decides:

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

⁸⁹ S/24842.

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 31 May 1993;

(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, after the adoption of resolution 790 (1992), the President made the following statement:⁹⁰

In connection with the resolution just adopted on the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, I have been authorized to make the following complementary statement on behalf of the Security Council:

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General of 19 November 1992 on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 20: "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.

⁹⁰ S/24846.

24. The situation in the occupied Arab territories

Decision of 17 February 1989 (2850th meeting): rejection of a draft resolution

By a letter dated 8 February 1989 addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹ the representative of Tunisia, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States, requested an immediate meeting of the Council to consider the situation in the "occupied Palestinian territory".

By a letter dated 9 February 1989 addressed to the President of the Security Council,² the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People supported that request.

At its 2845th meeting, on 10 February 1989, the Council included the two letters in its agenda. The Council considered the item at its 2845th, 2846th, 2847th, 2849th and 2850th meetings, on 10, 13, 14 and 17 February 1989.

¹ S/20454.

² S/20455.

Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council invited the following to participate in the discussion: the representatives of Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia and Yemen; and, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States. At its subsequent meetings, the Council also invited the following to participate in the discussion: at the 2846th meeting, the representatives of Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Lebanon, Pakistan, Qatar, the Sudan and Zimbabwe; at the 2847th meeting, the representatives of Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nicaragua, Turkey and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, Mr. A. Engin Ansay, Permanent Observer of the Organization of the Islamic Conference; at the 2849th meeting, the representatives of India, Cuba, the Lao People's