

<sup>46</sup> 2560th mtg. See also the statements by India (*ibid.*) and by the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid (*ibid.*).

<sup>47</sup> 2560th mrg.

<sup>48</sup> For the vote, see *ibid.* See also chap. IV of the present Supplement.

<sup>49</sup> 2560th mtg. See also the explanation of the vote by the United States (*ibid.*), which had abstained in view of some "excesses" of language in the text of the resolution.

<sup>50</sup> S/16860. OR. 39th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1984.

<sup>51</sup> S/16860, adopted without change as resolution 558 (1984).

<sup>52</sup> 2564th mtg.

<sup>53</sup> For the vote, see *ibid.* See also chap. IV of the present Supplement.

### 3. ITEMS RELATING TO THE MIDDLE EAST

#### A. THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

**Decision** of 19 March 1981 (2266th meeting): President's statement

In a letter dated 3 March 1981, the representative of Lebanon requested a meeting of the Council to address itself to the continuing problem of repeated Israeli aggression against Lebanon. In previous letters,\* he had informed the Council about particular acts of aggression against Lebanon which he charged had been committed by Israeli forces.

At its 2265th meeting, on 9 March 1981, the Council included the letter dated 3 March 1981 from Lebanon in the agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President of the Council invited the representatives of Israel and Lebanon, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.<sup>3</sup> The Council considered the item at the 2265th and 2266th meetings, on 9 and 19 March 1981.

The representative of Lebanon stated that his Government was not waiting for the expiration of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) to submit its grievances and ask for action, as a novel situation had developed in the south since the last Council debate on 17 December 1980, involving repeated acts of violence, which had become constant, and continued warfare, which comprised a threat to international peace and security as well as to the safety of UNIFIL. The results of the well-pondered policy of so-called pre-emptive strikes by Israel were: (a) an escalation of military and paramilitary operations to an ever-ascending level of intensity; (b) the disruption of the fabric of civilian life in south Lebanon; and (c) a general state of disintegration and terror beyond the Lebanese borders and in the whole Middle East. He deplored the danger of UNIFIL being destroyed as a credible deterrent and pointed to the stability of the operation of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF).

He quoted extensively from a statement by President Sarkis to the third summit meeting of the Islamic Conference and, in view of the tremendous danger, appealed to the Council to initiate a mechanism for peace in Lebanon and on the internationally recognized border with Israel, because only such a step could create the conditions for the peace-keeping enterprise to succeed. He concluded in expressing his hope that the Council could reach that type of action-oriented resolution.<sup>4</sup>

The representative of the Soviet Union recalled how often the Council had been forced to meet in connection with incessant acts of aggression by Israel

against Lebanon. He rejected the Israeli attempts to justify those aggressive actions against Lebanon by means of assertions that they were carrying out so-called pre-emptive strikes against Palestinians as blatant defiance of international law and of numerous decisions of the Council and the General Assembly designed to protect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon. The Israeli policy could only be described as international State terrorism, which relied on the support of those who were paying lip-service to opposition against such terrorism.

He called for a return to collective efforts, within the framework of an international conference, to find a just and comprehensive settlement. In view of Israel's continued banking on force, the Council should adopt a resolution condemning the acts of aggression by Israel and calling for an end to such aggression; the Council should also oblige the Israeli authorities to observe and respect strictly the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and to cease all intervention in that State's internal affairs.<sup>5</sup>

During consultations among members of the Council on 16 March 1981, the Secretary-General made a statement that was issued on the same day as a special report.<sup>6</sup> The Secretary-General reported that, even as the Council was considering the complaint brought by the Government of Lebanon on the violence of 2 and 3 March, further hostilities had broken out in southern Lebanon and had made the situation in the UNIFIL area extremely tense. On the morning of 16 March, the *de facto* forces located in the south had fired 24 tank rounds into the village of Al-Qantara, in the Nigerian battalion sector of UNIFIL, killing a Nigerian captain and a corporal and injuring 11 Nigerian soldiers. The *de facto* forces had threatened to resume shelling unless the platoon of Lebanese soldiers was withdrawn from Al-Qantara, and that threat had been carried out when 10 tank rounds were fired into a village in the Netherlands battalion area.

The Secretary-General also informed the Council that the Commander of UNIFIL had made it clear to the *de facto* forces that there was no question of withdrawing the Lebanese platoon, which had been located in Al-Qantara since April 1979 in implementation of the UNIFIL mandate as set out in resolution 425 (1978). He added that the United Nations had been in touch with the Israeli authorities, urging them to make all possible efforts to bring an end to the irresponsible behaviour of the *de facto* forces. He noted that in recent months UNIFIL had also had to contend with constant efforts by various factions of armed elements to the north and west to infiltrate its area of operation and had sustained casualties in the process.

The Secretary-General declared that one of the most important principles upon which UNIFIL was established was the full co-operation of all the parties concerned, but it had been all too clear throughout the history of UNIFIL, and was again underlined by the tragic events in question, that co-operation had not been forthcoming. Therefore, all possible efforts should be made to impress upon all armed groups in the area that provocation, harassment and military offensives against UNIFIL could not and would not be accepted.

At its 2266th meeting, on 19 March 1981, the Council included the special report of the Secretary-

General, together with the letter dated 3 March 1981 from the representative of Lebanon, in its agenda.

At that meeting, the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council members:

The members of the Security Council are deeply shocked and outraged at the report received about the repeated attacks on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and the continuing killing of peace-keeping soldiers in southern Lebanon.

These renewed barbaric acts against a peace-keeping force are a direct defiance of the authority of the Security Council and a challenge to the mission of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security which cannot be tolerated.

The Council condemns these outrageous actions by the so-called *de facto* forces which have caused the death and injury of Force personnel present in Lebanon under international mandate. In strongly condemning these latest outrageous acts of the so-called *de facto* forces, the Council calls on all those who share in the responsibility for this tense situation to put an end to any act which might increase the threat to international peace and security and to put an end to military assistance to any forces which interfere with the Force in the exercise of its mandate.

The Council addresses a serious warning to all the forces responsible for these dangerous acts violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon, preventing the full deployment of the Force, including the deployment of the Lebanese armed forces in the area, and severely hampering the Force in the fulfilment of the mandate as expressed in resolution 425 (1978), which states:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Taking note of the letters from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon and from the Permanent Representative of Israel,*

*"Having heard the statements of the Permanent Representatives of Lebanon and Israel,*

*"Gravely concerned at the deterioration of the situation in the Middle East and its consequences to the maintenance of international peace,*

*"Convinced that the present situation impedes the achievement of a just peace in the Middle East,*

1. *"Calls for strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;*

2. *"Calls upon Israel immediately to cease its military action against Lebanese territorial integrity and withdraw forthwith its forces from all Lebanese territory;*

3. *"Decides, in the light of the request of the Government of Lebanon, to establish immediately under its authority a United Nations interim force for southern Lebanon for the purpose 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 force to be composed of personnel drawn from Member States;*

4. *"Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Council within twenty-four hours on the implementation of the present resolution."*

The Council emphasizes that it is essential that the Force receive the full co-operation of all parties to enable it to carry out its mandate in the entire area of operation up to the internationally recognized boundaries, thus contributing to full implementation of resolution 425 (1978).

The Council calls for the immediate release of Lebanese military personnel and of all those persons who were kidnapped by the so-called *de facto* forces during the recent hostilities.

The Council extends its sympathy and deep-felt condolences to the Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria and the families of the victims.

The Council also commends the valiant action and the courage, under the most adverse circumstances, of the commanders and soldiers of the Force and expresses full support for their efforts.

The President then announced that the date of the next Council meeting to continue consideration of the item would be fixed in consultation with the Council members and adjourned the meeting.

**Decision** of 22 May 1981 (2278th meeting): resolution 485 (1981)

At its 2278th meeting, on 22 May 1981, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF dated 20 May 1981<sup>8</sup> in its agenda.

In the report, covering the period from 21 November 1980 to 20 May 1981, the Secretary-General informed the Council that with the co-operation of both parties the Force had continued to carry out the tasks assigned to it and had been able to contribute to the maintenance of the cease-fire. He cautioned that the prevailing quiet was precarious and that until further progress could be made towards a just and lasting peace the situation in the Israel-Syria sector, and in the Middle East as a whole, would remain unstable and potentially dangerous. Therefore, the continued presence of UNDOF was essential not only to maintain quiet but to provide an atmosphere conducive to further efforts towards the achievement of peace. With the agreement of the Governments of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel, the Secretary-General recommended to the Council that it extend the mandate of UNDOF for a further period of six months.

At the 2278th meeting, the President put the draft resolution<sup>9</sup> which was before the Council to the vote: it received 14 votes in favour, with 1 member not participating in the vote,<sup>10</sup> and was adopted as resolution 485 (1981). It reads as follows:

*The Security Council,*

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

*Decides:*

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

(b) *To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 30 November 1981;*

(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 485 (1981), the President made the following complementary statement on behalf of the members of the Council:

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 26, that "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". This statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council."

**Decision** of 19 June 1981 (2289th meeting): resolution 488 (1981)

At its 2289th meeting, on 19 June 1981, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL dated 15 June 1981<sup>12</sup> in its agenda.

In his report, covering the period from 12 December 1980 to 15 June 1981, the Secretary-General noted that, despite intensive efforts made both at United Nations Headquarters and in the field, the basic situation had remained essentially the same and that the activities of armed elements (mainly the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and the Lebanese National Movement), the *de facto* forces (Christian and related militias) and the Israel Defence Forces (IDF) in and near the UNIFIL area of operation had continued and, on occasion, intensified.

The Secretary-General observed that since its establishment, UNIFIL had encountered serious difficulties in fulfilling its mandate and that the parties had not, so far, found it possible to extend to the Force the full co-operation that it required. Despite the many difficulties that it had had to face, UNIFIL had continued in its endeavours to consolidate its position and, in co-operation with the Lebanese Government, to strengthen and make more effective the Lebanese presence, both civilian and military, in its area of operation.

The Secretary-General indicated that **although** the Force had not yet been able to **fulfil** the man **date** in the way intended by the Council, he had no doubt that its presence and activities in southern Lebanon were an indispensable element in maintaining peace, not only in the area but in the Middle East as a whole. In his view, it would be disastrous if UNIFIL were to be removed at a time when the international community was witnessing with acute anxiety the tensions and conflicts in that vital area of the world. For those reasons, the Secretary-General recommended to the Council that the mandate of UNIFIL be extended for a further period of six months.

Following the adoption of the agenda, the President of the Council invited the representatives of Israel and Lebanon, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to **vote**.<sup>3</sup>

The President then drew attention to a **draft** resolution," which had been drawn up in the course of consultations among members of the Council, and proposed to put it to the vote. The draft resolution was adopted by 12 votes in favour, none against, with 2 abstentions,, as resolution 488 (1981); one member did not participate in the **voting**.<sup>14</sup> The resolution reads as follows:

*The Security Council.*

*Recalling* its resolutions 425 ( 1978), 426 ( 1978), 427 ( 1978), 434 (1978), 444 (1979), 450 (1979), 459 (1979), 467 (1980), 474 (1980) and 483 (1980),

*Recalling* the statement made by the President of the Security Council at the 2266th meeting, on 19 March 1981.

*Noting with concern* the violations of the relevant Security Council resolutions which had prompted the Government of Lebanon repeatedly to ask the Council for action, and particularly its complaint of 3 March 1981,

*Recalling* the terms of reference and general guidelines of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, as **stated** in the report of the Secretary-General of 19 March 1978 confirmed by resolution 426 (1978), and particularly:

(a) That the Force "must be able to function as an integrated and efficient military unit".

(b) That the Force "must enjoy the freedom of movement and communication and other facilities that are necessary for the performance of its tasks",

(c) That the Force "will not use force **except** in **self-defence**",

(d) That "**self-defence** would include resistance to attempts by forceful means to prevent it from discharging its duties under the mandate of the Security Council",

*Having studied* the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon of 16 June 1981, and taking note of the conclusions and recommendations expressed therein,

*Convinced* that the deterioration of the present situation has serious consequences for international security in the Middle East and impedes the achievement of a just, comprehensive and durable peace in the area.

1. *Reaffirms* its repeated call upon all concerned for the strict respect for the political independence, unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and reiterates the Council's determination to implement resolution 425 (1978) and the ensuing resolutions in the totality of the area of operation assigned to the

## Chapter VIII. Maintenance of international peace and security

United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon up to the international-ly recognized boundaries;

2. *Condemns* all actions contrary to the provisions of the above-mentioned resolutions that have prevented the full implementation of the mandate of the Force, causing death, injury and destruction to the civilian population as well as among the peace-keeping force;

3. *Supports* the efforts of the Government of Lebanon in the civilian and military fields of rehabilitation and reconstruction in southern Lebanon. and supports, in particular, the deployment of substantial contingents of the Lebanese army in the area of operation of the Force;

4. *Decides* to renew the mandate of the Force for another period of six months, that is. until 19 December 1981;

5. *Requests* the Secretary-General to assist the Government of Lebanon in establishing a joint phased programme of activities to be carried out during the present mandate-of the Force, aimed at the total implementation of resolution 425 (1978), and to report periodically-to the Security Council;

6. *Commends* the efforts of the Secretary-General and the performance of the Force, as well as the support of the troop contributing Governments and of all Member States who have assisted the Secretary-General, his staff and the Force in discharging their responsibilities under the mandate;

7. *Decides* to remain seized of the question and reaffirms its determination, in the event of continuing obstruction of the mandate of the Force, to examine practical ways and means to secure its unconditional fulfilment.

Following the adoption of the resolution, the Secretary-General informed the Council about grave developments involving the seizure of a number of UNIFIL soldiers by armed elements who had infiltrated into the UNIFIL area of operation and attacked Fijian troops. Two soldiers had been killed; others had been forcibly detained and subsequently released. The Secretary-General added that the fresh attacks underlined the difficulties encountered by UNIFIL. He assured the Council that he would do everything to assist in the implementation of the Council's resolution and expressed hope that the members of the Council would continue to make every effort to ensure that the parties heeded the opinion of the **Council**.<sup>15</sup>

The representative of Lebanon stated that the most recent incidents should give rise to measures to protect the peace-keepers, to ensure their safety and to enforce respect for their mission. He expressed concern that UNIFIL was in danger of becoming a static fixture of the political panorama, because its structure as a conflict control mechanism was not always commensurate with the magnitude of the **conflicts** confronting it, therefore hampering its effectiveness. He emphasized once a **ain** the ultimate objective of UNIFIL, namely, **complete** Israeli **with-drawal** and the restoration of Lebanon's effective **authority** and sovereignty. He described resolution 488 (1981) as an important decision since it provided for a phased programme of activities **to** be carried out **jointly** by UNIFIL and the Government of Lebanon. In order to contribute to the success of the programme, his Government would draw up a practical plan of action that would help to measure whether the current peace-keeping operation in southern Lebanon was indeed **useful**.<sup>16</sup>

The representative of France indicated his **Government's** support for the Secretary-General's proposals and appealed to all the parties concerned to observe the cease-fire called for by the Council and to make every effort to enable the consolidation of the UNIFIL zone of operations. He also praised the endeavours of the Secretary-General to reactivate the

Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission and asked for those efforts to be **pursued**.<sup>17</sup>

The representative of Ireland stressed that peace-keeping forces should have no enemies and condemned those who refused to recognize that principle and whose actions led to senseless killings. He agreed with the Secretary-General that UNIFIL performed an important function as a conflict control mechanism and constituted an indispensable element in maintaining peace in the Middle East as a whole. He also referred to the humanitarian efforts by UNIFIL in conjunction with other United Nations programmes and praised the United Nations Force as a remarkable and hopeful development in world **affairs**.<sup>18</sup>

The representative of the German Democratic Republic criticized Israel for its refusal to respect the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon and for its **continued** employment of the **Haddad** militia in the south of Lebanon. He restated the principle that United Nations forces were bound exclusively by decisions of the Council and reiterated his delegation's reservations with regard to the formulation of the UNIFIL mandate, its composition and its **financing**.<sup>19</sup>

The representative of the Soviet Union also expressed reservations regarding the mandate, composition and financing of UNIFIL, emphasized the need to defend Lebanon as the victim of Israeli **aggression** and recommended that Israel should **defray** the expenditures arising from its armed **aggression** against Lebanon.<sup>\*\*</sup>

The representative of Israel denounced the PLO as responsible for the death of the Fijian soldiers and charged that only on two occasions, when PLO involvement was not suspected, had the Council pronounced itself on the killing of UNIFIL **soldiers**.<sup>21</sup>

The representative of Japan appealed to the parties to refrain from the use of force and to seek to solve the problems through peaceful means. He added that in the light of the principles of the Charter, terrorist actions must not be condoned as a means of settling international **disputes**.<sup>22</sup>

In conclusion, the President noted the deep sorrow shared by all Council members over the loss of two United Nations soldiers in Lebanon as well as all those who had died in the cause of **peace**.<sup>23</sup>

On 25 June 1981, following consultations among the members of the Council, the President made the following **statement**:<sup>24</sup>

As a result of consultations among the members of the Security Council I have been authorized to issue the following statement.

At the end of the 2289th meeting of the Council, I made a statement to note the deep sorrow shared by all members of the Council over the loss of two United Nations soldiers in Lebanon, as well as all those others who have fallen in fulfilment of their duty in the cause of peace.

I also said that I was certain that I spoke on behalf of the Council when I conveyed our condolences to the Government and people of Fiji as well as to the families of the victims.

As President of the Council, I wish to condemn the killing on 19 June 1981 by so-called armed elements of two Fijian peace-keeping soldiers of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon.

This **outrage** against members of a peace-keeping force is a direct **defiance** of the authority of the Council and a challenge to the mission of the Force, as stipulated in resolution 425 (1978).

In this connection, I am encouraged to learn that a group has already been established to investigate these events and that in the meantime appropriate steps are being taken by all concerned, in cooperation with the command of the Force, to prevent a recurrence of such incidents,

I also commend the valiant action and the courage, under the most adverse circumstances, of the soldiers of the Force and express full support for their efforts.

**Decision** of 17 July 1981 (2292nd meeting): President's statement

**Decision** of 21 July 1981 (2293rd meeting): resolution 490 (1981)

In a letter dated 17 July 1981,<sup>25</sup> the representative of Lebanon requested an urgent meeting of the Council to discuss the deteriorating situation in southern Lebanon and the attacks committed by Israel against civilian targets in the city of Beirut. He had already referred to these developments in a previous letter dated 13 July 1981.<sup>26</sup> In two letters dated 15 and 16 July 1981, the representative of Israel had informed the Council of rocket attacks by the PLO against towns in northern **Israel**.<sup>27</sup>

At its 2292nd meeting, on 17 July 1981, the Council considered the letter of the same date from the representative of Lebanon.<sup>27</sup> Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council invited, at their request, the representatives of Israel, Jordan and Lebanon to participate in the deliberations without the right to **vote**.<sup>3</sup> At the same meeting, the Council decided, by a vote and in accordance with its previous **practice**, to invite the representative of the PLO to participate without the **right to vote**.<sup>28</sup> The Council further decided to extend an invitation to Mr. Clovis Maksoud, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of **procedure**.<sup>29</sup>

The Secretary-General opened the deliberations by reporting renewed violence in the south of Lebanon involving shelling by Palestinian groups, various air strikes against Beirut and other targets by IDF and the **de facto** forces. He deeply deplored the extensive civilian casualties in Lebanon and in Israel caused by these outbursts of violence. He referred to the various communications the Governments of Lebanon and Israel, as well as the PLO, had sent to him regarding these hostilities and pointed out that the area controlled by UNIFIL had been tense but quiet. He emphasized **that** all acts of violence that resulted in civilian casualties should be deplored and called upon all the parties to revert immediately to the **cease-fire**.<sup>30</sup>

The representative of Lebanon condemned the Israeli policy of pre-emptive strikes against Lebanon, which had resulted in loss of lives and other **hardships** for the Lebanese people. He presented details about the Israeli attacks and indicated that some 300 **people** had been killed and about 800 wounded. The **civilian** nature of the targets and the large number of women and children killed revealed the dimensions of the tragedy. He underlined his Government's aim at that point to reactivate the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission that had been set up in 1949 and asked for the Council's **support** in that respect. Moreover, he urged the **Council** to bring about the immediate cessation of hostilities, to prevent further deterioration and to create the atmosphere that would enable UNIFIL to play to the fullest its role as a conflict control **mechanism**.<sup>31</sup>

The representative of Israel stated that the outrages perpetrated by the PLO had resulted in loss of life and considerable damage to property and that plans were ready to escalate these criminal designs. The PLO control over a large part of Lebanon was a means of assuring the freedom of operation to

continue its acts of terror against Israel. He added that since his Government had brought the terrorist actions to the attention of the Security Council to no avail, it had decided to exercise its right to self-defence, enshrined in Article 51 of the Charter, against the attackers. Israel felt that as much as it deplored the harm to innocent Lebanese civilians, the real problem was how to put an end to international terrorism in general and, more specifically, how to end the PLO terror against the land and people of Israel. The representative suggested as a first step the removal of all foreign armies and terrorists from Lebanese territory.)\*

The representative of Jordan referred to the large air raid over Beirut by Israeli planes and asked whether the killing of hundreds of innocent civilians as a result of large-scale bombing could be seen as a legitimate act of self-defence. He called upon the Council to make its decision on the basis of the Charter and to act decisively against such blatant aggression.<sup>33</sup>

The representative of the PLO recounted the most recent Israeli attacks against targets in Lebanon and informed the Council of a request to the Secretary-General to use his good offices to put an end to those attacks. He appealed once again to the Security Council and to the Secretary-General to use all the means available to bring peace to the Middle East and to enable the Palestinians to return to their homes.<sup>34</sup>

The representative of the Soviet Union condemned the Israeli intervention in the internal affairs of Lebanon and its large-scale armed aggression in southern Lebanon resulting in an increasing number of Lebanese and Palestinian victims. He charged that the United States Government had encouraged and supported the Israeli policy against the Arab States. He concluded that his Government considered it the duty of the Council strongly to condemn Israel for the acts of armed aggression against Lebanon and to demand an end to such acts.<sup>35</sup>

At the conclusion of the 2292nd meeting, the President of the Council read out the following statement:<sup>36</sup>

The President of the Security Council and the members of the Council, after hearing the report of the Secretary-General, express their deep concern at the extent of the loss of life and the scale of the destruction caused by the deplorable events that have been taking place for several days in Lebanon.

They launch an urgent appeal for an immediate end to all armed attacks and for the greatest restraint so that peace and quiet may be established in Lebanon and a just and lasting peace in the Middle East as a whole.

At the beginning of the 2293rd meeting, on 21 July 1981, the President of the Council issued additional invitations to the representatives of Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Mauritania, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yemen, at their request, to participate in the debate without the right to vote.<sup>37</sup> He also drew attention to the text of a draft resolution<sup>37</sup> sponsored by Ireland, Japan and Spain.

The Secretary-General informed the Council members that his military aides in the area had been involved in efforts to secure the acceptance of a cease-fire by Israel and the PLO, but that shelling had resumed while those efforts were still being pursued.<sup>38</sup>

The representative of Spain then introduced draft resolution S/14604, which the delegations of Ireland, Japan and Spain had prepared in order to recall the

appeal issued at the end of the 2292nd meeting and to call once again for an immediate cessation of all armed attacks. He expressed appreciation to the non-aligned members and other delegations for having contributed suggestions and observations regarding the text of the draft resolution. He then read out the text and proposed that it be adopted without discussion.<sup>39</sup>

At the 2293rd meeting, on 21 July 1981, the draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 490 (1981).<sup>40</sup> It reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Reaffirming the urgent appeal made by the President and the members of the Security Council on 17 July 1981, which reads as follows:

"The President of the Security Council and the members of the Council, after hearing the report of the Secretary-General, express their deep concern at the extent of the loss of life and the scale of the destruction caused by the deplorable events that have been taking place for several days in Lebanon.

"They launch an urgent appeal for an immediate end to all armed attacks and for the greatest restraint so that peace and quiet may be established in Lebanon and a just and lasting peace in the Middle East as a whole."

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General in this respect,

1. Calls for an immediate cessation of all armed attacks;
2. Reaffirms its commitment to the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;
3. Requests the Secretary-General to report back to the Security Council on the implementation of the present resolution as soon as possible and not later than forty-eight hours from its adoption.

Following the adoption of the resolution, the representative of Tunisia stated that the Israeli policy of defiance and *faits accomplis* proved that Israel had not accepted the conclusions endorsed by the United Nations. Under the circumstances, it was the duty of the Council to take effective action in the face of the uncontrollable excesses of the Israeli Government. The representative of Tunisia doubted that Israel would abide by any measure decided upon by the Council unless the Council strengthened its decision by a combination of sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.<sup>41</sup>

The representative of France stressed the urgent need for the Council's unanimous call for an immediate cease-fire and condemned vigorously any resort to so-called pre-emptive actions that could not be justified by any interpretation of Article 51 and merely resulted in a further cycle of violence.<sup>42</sup>

The representative of the United Kingdom also rejected the policy of pre-emptive strikes as a factor leading to further acts of retaliation and prolonging the suffering in Lebanon. He called for a policy of restraint to be exercised on all sides and emphasized that peace could be achieved only if the right to existence of all States in the region, including Israel, was acknowledged by the entire international community and if the need for Palestinian self-determination was seen as central to stability in the Middle East.<sup>43</sup>

The representative of Egypt took issue with the Israeli claim that it had acted in self-defence and stated once again that the scope of self-defence in international law and in conformity with Article 51 of the Charter could not be distorted to provide any country with a free hand to kill innocent civilians at will. Self-defence could not be invoked unless an armed attack had occurred. The border incidents that Israel had reported to the Council did not warrant

massive retaliation, but should have been settled through involvement of UNIFIL or the United Nations Troop Supervision Organization (UNTSO). The Egyptian representative added that even before the advent of the Charter of the United Nations the exercise of self-defence was subject to certain limitations: as United States Secretary of State Webster had pointed out, situations that gave rise to acts of self-defence were to be instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means, and no moment for **deliberation**; legitimate self-defence implied the adoption of measures proportionate to the seriousness of the attack and justified by the seriousness of the danger. In the light of those norms, the response to minor border incidents should consist in a protest lodged with the Council, not a full-scale attack on innocent civilians. He also discussed the question of retaliation or reprisal and, invoking several General Assembly and Council decisions, pointed out that actions of military reprisal could not be tolerated and were inadmissible. The representative of Egypt warned that the contemporary legal order was at stake and that the world threatened to return to the law of the jungle, in which the use of force was the order of the day. He recalled the Geneva Conventions of 1949 to which Israel was a party, and appealed to all parties to end violence and bloodshed. He concluded by reiterating that peace could be pursued in the Middle East, if Israel and the Palestinian people recognized each other and their corresponding rights, and urged the Government of Israel to renounce its **aggressive practices**.<sup>44</sup>

Mr. Clovis Maksoud, who had been invited under rule 39, pointed out that LAS supported the application of appropriate sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter in order to render a repetition of the strikes against Lebanon **impossible**.<sup>45</sup>

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic rejected Israel's claim that its recent actions against Lebanon had been carried out in exercise of its right of self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter and suggested that the victims of Israel's **aggressive acts** were being denied their right to **self-defence**. He welcomed the fact that the overwhelming majority of the International community had rejected the Israeli notion of pre-emptive self-defence and joined in the call for the strict application of sanctions under Chapter VII of the **Charter**.<sup>46</sup>

**Decision** of 23 November 1981 (2311th meeting): resolution 493 (1981)

At its 2311th meeting, on 23 November 1981, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF dated 20 November 1981<sup>47</sup> in its agenda.

In the report, covering the period from 21 May to 20 November 1981, the Secretary-General informed the Council that with the cooperation of both parties the Force had continued to carry out the tasks assigned to it and had been able to contribute to the maintenance of the cease-fire. He cautioned that the prevailing quiet was precarious and that until further progress could be made towards a just and lasting peace the **situation** in the Israel-Syria sector, and in the Middle East as a whole, would remain unstable and potentially **dangerous**. Therefore, the continued presence of UNDOF was essential not only to maintain quiet but to provide an atmosphere conducive to further efforts towards the achievement of peace. With the agreement of the Governments of the

Syrian Arab Republic and Israel the Secretary-General recommended that the Council extend the mandate of UNDOF for a further period of six months.

At the 2311th meeting, the President put the draft **resolution**<sup>48</sup> which was before the Council to the vote: it received 14 votes in favour, with 1 member not participating in the **vote**,<sup>49</sup> and was adopted as resolution 493 (1981). It reads as follows:

*The Security Council.*

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

*Decides.*

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

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 31 May 1982;

(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 493 (1981), the President made the **following** complementary statement on behalf of the members of the Council:

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 27, that "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". This statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council.<sup>50</sup>

**Decision** of 18 December 1981 (2320th meeting): resolution 498 (1981)

At its 2320th meeting, on 18 December 1981, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL dated 11 December 1981<sup>51</sup> in its agenda.

In his report, **covering** the period from 16 June to 10 December 1981, the **Secretary-General** noted that, despite intensive efforts made both at United Nations Headquarters and in the field, the basic situation preventing the **fulfilment** of the mandate of UNIFIL had remained the same and that the activities of armed elements, the **de facto** forces and IDF in, and near the UNIFIL area of operation had **continued**.

The **Secretary-General** gave an account of the **serious outbreak** of hostilities in mid-July affecting areas outside UNIFIL control and resulting in a considerable influx of people from other parts of Lebanon into the UNIFIL area. He referred specifically to the resumption of attacks against targets in southern Lebanon by Israeli aircraft on 10 July 1981 and the continuation of hostilities, including exchange of fire, air strikes and naval bombardments throughout the period until 24 July; the period of violence, including a massive Israeli attack on Beirut, was brought to an end by a cease-fire on 24 July 1981, **which** the Secretary-General had helped to bring about.

Since that time, as the Secretary-General reported, UNIFIL had made strenuous efforts to maintain the cease-fire, and calm had prevailed in the area of the UNIFIL operations, despite the underlying tension. The Secretary-General stated also that the situation in southern Lebanon remained precarious and unstable and that UNIFIL continued to be prevented from fully implementing the task allotted to it by the Council, as the parties failed to cooperate fully. The Secretary-General also noted that no progress had

been made in the further deployment of UNIFIL in the enclave controlled by the *de facto* forces and that restrictions relating to the freedom of movement of UNIFIL and UNTSO personnel in the enclave continued to complicate UNIFIL operations.

The Secretary-General further reported that during the period under review, means of consolidating the cease-fire and of making progress in the fulfilment of the UNIFIL mandate had been under discussion with the Lebanese Government and other parties concerned.

In spite of all the difficulties faced by UNIFIL, the Secretary-General considered that its presence and activities in southern Lebanon were an indispensable element in maintaining peace, not only in the immediate area but in the Middle East as a whole. He recommended that the mandate of the Force be extended for a further period of six months.

During the 2320th meeting, the President of the Council invited the representatives of Israel, Kuwait, Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic! at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.<sup>3</sup> The Council also decided to extend an invitation to Mr. Clovis Maksoud under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure.<sup>52</sup>

The representative of Lebanon suggested that UNIFIL, which had been sent to southern Lebanon on a dynamic mission, had been unable to bring about peace and had become a static reality in the dynamics of an ever-expanding war. He pointed out the role played by the so-called armed elements and the so-called *de facto* forces in undermining the chances for peace in the area. He regretted that UNIFIL had not yet used its right of self-defence to resist attempts to prevent it from discharging its duties and proposed that the time had come to redefine its mandate unequivocally, so that the Force could enjoy the full support and exercise its deterrent prerogative fully unhindered. He pointed out that the Lebanese people still hoped that UNIFIL would help to contain the explosive situation in the country and to prevent events in the south from detonating a more general war. He referred in that context to his letter dated 14 December 1981<sup>53</sup> addressed to the Secretary-General asking for a strengthening of UNIFIL without changing its mandate. His Government's proposals, which were reflected in a draft resolution distributed prior to the Council's meeting, were not geared towards asking UNIFIL to go to war and enforce peace, but were designed to give UNIFIL the appropriate strength in relation to its tasks, foremost the withdrawal of Israel from southern Lebanon, in accordance with resolution 425 (1978). Peace in southern Lebanon was not only an aim in terms of international morality and rights, but also a pragmatic imperative, since the region and the world could not afford the hazard of non-peace.<sup>54</sup>

At the same meeting, the representative of Israel declared that the first part of the mandate of UNIFIL, namely, the withdrawal of Israeli forces, had been successfully carried out and mentioned that the completion of that withdrawal had been confirmed by the UNIFIL Commander on 13 June 1978 and recorded in the progress report of the Secretary-General on the same day.<sup>55</sup> He deplored that the remaining parts of the UNIFIL mandate had not yet been implemented: international peace and security had not been restored in Lebanon because of the

continuing presence of Syrian troops and of PLO terrorists on Lebanese soil.<sup>56</sup>

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic stated that the sole purpose of the establishment of the Arab Defence Force in Lebanon was to terminate a tragic fratricidal war and to grant the Lebanese people the opportunity to determine their own destiny in unity without external interference.<sup>57</sup>

The representative of Ireland stated that the success of UNIFIL in helping to maintain peace in the region was clear for all to see and, to appreciate that fully, one needed only to consider what the situation would be if UNIFIL did not exist. The cease-fire that had been brought about by resolution 490 (1981) was still holding, owing among other things to the special contribution of UNIFIL. He renewed the Irish appeal that peace-keeping forces should not be met with hostility but should receive full co-operation from all concerned; that would enable the Force to deploy and to have full freedom of movement throughout the whole area of operations. Further, he submitted again the basic principle that a peace-keeping force was not a substitute for efforts to negotiate a settlement; the peace-keeping force allowed an opportunity for peace-making.<sup>58</sup>

In indicating his delegation's support for the renewal of the UNIFIL mandate, the representative of France also favoured the earliest possible resumption of the activities of the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission and welcomed the Lebanese suggestions of strengthening the means and objectives of UNIFIL.<sup>59</sup>

At the same meeting, the President put to the vote the draft resolution,<sup>60</sup> which had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations; it received 13 votes in favour, none against, with 2 abstentions, and was adopted as resolution 498 (1981).<sup>61</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council.*

Recalling its resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978), 427 (1978), 434 (1978), 444 (1979), 450 (1979), 459 (1979), 467 (1980), 474 (1980), 483 (1980), 488 (1981) and 490 (1981),

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon of 11 December 1981, and taking note of the conclusions and recommendations expressed therein,

Taking note of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the Secretary-General dated 14 December 1981,

Convinced that the deterioration of the present situation has serious consequences for peace and security in the Middle East,

1. Reaffirms its resolution 425 (1978), in which it

(a) Calls for strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;

(b) Calls upon Israel immediately to cease its military action against Lebanese territorial integrity and withdraw forthwith its forces from all Lebanese territory;

(c) Decides, in the light of the request of the Government of Lebanon, to establish immediately under its authority a United Nations interim force for southern Lebanon for the purpose 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 force to be composed of personnel drawn from Member States;

2. Reaffirms its past resolutions and particularly its repeated calls upon all concerned for the strict respect of the political independence, unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon;

3. Reiterates its determination to implement resolution 425 (1978) in the totality of the area of operation assigned to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon up to the internationally recognized boundaries so that the Force may fulfil its deploy-



ment and so that the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization may resume its normal functions, unhindered, under the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement of 1949;

4. *Calls upon* all concerned to work towards the consolidation of the cease-fire called for by the Security Council in resolution 490 (1981) and reiterates its condemnation of all actions contrary to the provisions of the relevant resolutions;

5. *Calls attention* to the terms of reference and general guidelines of the Force, as stated in the report of the Secretary-General of 19 March 1978 confirmed by resolution 426 (1978), and particularly:

(i) That the Force "must be able to function as an integrated and efficient military unit";

(b) That the Force "must enjoy the freedom of movement and communication and other facilities that are necessary for the performance of its tasks";

(c) That the Force "will not use force except in self-defence";

(d) That "self-defence would include resistance to attempts by forceful means to prevent it from discharging its duties under the mandate of the Security Council";

6. *Supports* the efforts of the Government of Lebanon in the civilian and military fields of rehabilitation and reconstruction in southern Lebanon, and supports, in particular, the restoration of the authority of the Government of Lebanon in that region and deployment of substantial contingents of the Lebanese army in the area of operation of the Force;

7. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue his discussions with the Government of Lebanon, with a view to establishing a joint phased programme of activities to be carried out during the present mandate of the Force, aimed at the total implementation of resolution 425 (1978), and to report periodically to the Security Council;

8. *Decides* to renew the mandate of the Force for six months, that is, until 19 June 1982;

9. *Commends* the efforts of the Secretary-General and the performance of the Force, as well as the support of the troop contributing Governments, and of all Member States who have assisted the Secretary-General, his staff and the Force in discharging their responsibilities under the mandate;

10. *Decides* to remain seized of the question and to review, within two months, the situation as a whole in the light of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the Secretary-General dated 14 December 1981.

Explaining his delegation's abstention in the vote, the representative of the Soviet Union emphasized that UNIFIL should function in strict conformity with the Charter and act under the control of the Council, particularly with respect to its functions, its total strength, the principles underlying the selection of national contingents and the procedures whereby those troops were financed.<sup>62</sup>

The representative of the United States welcomed the renewal of the UNIFIL mandate since it had been performing a crucial role in preserving peace in the Middle East. The hope was that the momentum towards a peaceful settlement of the broader Arab-Israeli conflict on the basis of resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) as well as of the Camp David framework could be maintained. The only way to reach a final settlement was first of all to avoid eruptions of violence. He added that his Government was pleased about the language of the resolution underlying the sovereignty of the Lebanese Government and the integrity of its national territory.<sup>63</sup>

The representative of Lebanon thanked the Council for its prompt response and for the decision to reassess the situation after two months. He regretted that his Government's aims could not be met fully owing to differences of opinion within the Council and appealed once again to the members to consider further the Lebanese proposal to strengthen UNIFIL.<sup>64</sup>

**Decision** of 25 February 1982 (2332nd meeting): resolution 50 I (1982)

In accordance with paragraph 10 of resolution 498 (1981), the Council resumed the deliberations regarding UNIFIL and the developments in the Israel-Lebanon sector in February 1982. At its 233 1st meeting, on 23 February 1982, the Council included the situation in the Middle East in its agenda and considered resolution 498 (1981), a special report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL,<sup>65</sup> and a letter<sup>66</sup> dated 16 February 1982 from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the President of the Council during its 2331st and 2332nd meetings, on 23 and 25 February 1982.

In the special report, dated 16 February 1982, the Secretary-General had informed the Council that since the adoption of resolution 498 (1981) the cease-fire in southern Lebanon had been maintained; however, the basic underlying tensions in the area had persisted, and the situation had remained extremely volatile. UNIFIL had continued to face attempts at infiltration by armed elements, and the encroachments by the *de facto* forces in the UNIFIL area of deployment had not been removed. The violations of Lebanon's territorial integrity had also continued.

The Secretary-General had further informed the Council that a senior aide had visited the area at his request and conducted talks with all sides concerned. The Force Commander of UNIFIL and the Lebanese Government had urged that the ceiling for UNIFIL troops should be increased by no less than 1,000 to reinforce the current operations and to make further deployment possible in accordance with resolution 425 (1978).

The letter dated 16 February 1982 from the representative of Lebanon contained a confirmation of the requests of the Lebanese Government concerning UNIFIL, as presented in a memorandum to the Secretary-General on 14 December 1981.<sup>67</sup>

Following the adoption of the agenda, at the 233 1st meeting, on 23 February 1982, the President of the Council invited the representatives of Lebanon and Israel, and at the 2332nd meeting, on 25 February, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.<sup>68</sup> At the 2331st meeting, the Council also decided, by a vote and in accordance with its previous practice, to invite the representative of the PLO to participate in the deliberations without the right to vote.<sup>69</sup> At the same meeting, the Council further decided to extend an invitation to Mr. Clovis Maksoud under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure.<sup>69</sup>

At the 2331st meeting, the representative of Lebanon welcomed that the Council had started consultations on the question of UNIFIL on 16 February, and expressed hope that the time for reflection on the best course to follow would help avoid another crisis and enable UNIFIL to perform the mission entrusted to it by the Council in 1978. He emphasized that this increase in UNIFIL troop strength recommended by the Secretary-General had to be unequivocally related to the full implementation of resolution 425 (1978). He asked how and when Israel would cease its military action against Lebanese territorial integrity and withdraw its forces, how and when UNIFIL would be enabled to restore international peace and security in the area, and how and when UNIFIL, in



completing its mandate, would assist the Government of Lebanon in restoring its authority in the area. In the belief that the Council could reverse the seemingly irreversible process towards conflagration and war, he proposed an injunction to ensure Israel's total and unconditional withdrawal, a qualitative and quantitative enhancement of UNIFIL capabilities, and a strict implementation of a joint phased programme of action to ensure the gradual transition of the responsibilities for peace and security from UNIFIL to the Lebanese Army, thereby restoring Lebanese sovereignty and territorial integrity. Those steps required that UNIFIL play a dynamic role in the fulfilment of its mission. A static role for UNIFIL would condemn the Force to the role of a helpless hostage in the ever-expanding cycle of turmoil and violence.<sup>70</sup>

At the beginning of the 2332nd meeting, on 25 February 1982, the President drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 23 February 1982,<sup>71</sup> in which the representative of Lebanon had transmitted to the Secretary-General the text of a memorandum dated 16 February from the Lebanese parliamentary delegation, expressing its views on the situation in southern Lebanon in connection with the Council's debate.

At the same meeting, the representative of Ireland refused criticism that UNIFIL had been ineffective and pointed to its success in promoting peaceful conditions in the area where it had been allowed to operate. He urged that the request for an increase in UNIFIL numbers be approved, but made mention of the problem that UNIFIL had not yet been able to fulfil its peace-keeping mandate. In order to advance that objective, he called upon the Council to insist at all times on full respect for the Force, to co-operate further with the Force and to seek its full deployment! and to make clear that the Force was no substitute for continuing efforts to negotiate a peace settlement, an aim for which peace-keeping was supposed to provide an opportunity. He welcomed renewed efforts by a permanent member of the Council to initiate negotiations, through a special envoy charged with mediation. He concluded by pointing out what the situation in Lebanon would be without UNIFIL and that the international community had a serious interest in its continuation.\*

The representative of the Soviet Union raised the question of whether the Council should take some preventive actions to forestall a new act of aggression by Israel. In view of the draft resolution that had been elaborated in consultations, he announced that his Government would not object to the increase in UNIFIL troop strength by 1,000 men and, for reasons of principle, would again abstain in the vote on the draft.<sup>73</sup>

At the same meeting, the President put the draft resolution,<sup>74</sup> which had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations, to the vote; it received 13 votes in favour, none against, with 2 abstentions, and was adopted as resolution 501 (1982).<sup>75</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council.*

Recalling its resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978), 427 (1978), 434 (1978), 444 (1979), 450 (1979), 459 (1979), 467 (1980), 474 (1980), 483 (1980), 488 (1981), 490 (1981) and 498 (1981),

Acting in accordance with its resolution 498 (1981), and in particular with paragraph 10 of that resolution, in which it decided to review the situation as a whole,

## Chapter VIII. Maintenance of international peace and security

Having studied the special report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon,

Taking note of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the President of the Security Council,

Having reviewed the situation as a whole in the light of the report of the Secretary-General and of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon,

Noting from the report of the Secretary-General that it is the strong recommendation of the Commander of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, and also the wish of the Government of Lebanon, that the ceiling for troops of the Force should be increased, and that the Secretary-General fully supports the recommendation for an increase by one thousand of the troop strength of the Force,

1. Reaffirms its resolution 425 (1978) which reads:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Taking note of the letters from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon and from the Permanent Representative of Israel,*

*"Having heard the statements of the Permanent Representatives of Lebanon and Israel,*

*"Gravely concerned at the deterioration of the situation in the Middle East and its consequences to the maintenance of international peace,*

*"Convinced that the present situation impedes the achievement of a just peace in the Middle East,*

*"1. Calls for strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;*

*"2. Calls upon Israel immediately to cease its military action against Lebanese territorial integrity and withdraw forthwith its forces from all Lebanese territory;*

*"3. Decides, in the light of the request of the Government of Lebanon, to establish immediately under its authority a United Nations interim force for southern Lebanon for the purpose 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 force to be composed of personnel drawn from Member States;*

*"4. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Council within twenty-four hours on the implementation of the present resolution."*

2. *Decides to approve the immediate increase in the strength of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon recommended by the Secretary-General in paragraph 6 of his report, from six thousand to approximately seven thousand troops, to reinforce present operations as well as to make further deployment possible on the lines of resolution 425 (1978);*

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 confirmed by resolution 426 (1978) and particularly:*

*(a) That the Force "must be able to function as an integrated and efficient military unit";*

*(b) That the Force "must enjoy the freedom of movement and communication and other facilities that are necessary to the performance of its tasks";*

*(c) That the Force "will not use force except in self-defence";*

*(d) That "self-defence would include resistance to attempts by forceful means to prevent it from discharging its duties under the mandate of the Security Council";*

4. *Calls upon the Secretary-General to renew his efforts to reactivate the General Armistice Agreement between Lebanon and Israel of 23 March 1949 and, in particular, to convene an early meeting of the Mixed Armistice Commission;*

5. *Requests the Secretary-General to continue his discussions with the Government of Lebanon and the parties concerned with a view to submitting a report by 10 June 1982 on the necessary requirements for achieving further progress in a phased programme of activities with the Government of Lebanon;*

6. *Decides to remain seized of the question and invites the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the situation as a whole within two months.*

Following the adoption of the resolution, the representative of the United States expressed her

appreciation of the common effort among the members of the Council to arrive at a text that would have the support of the Lebanese Government and of Lebanon's neighbours as well as of the troop contributors and others who supported the UNIFIL operation. She noted that it had taken too much time to accede to the request for more troops and renewed her delegation's wish to address the question of continued violence in all its aspects and complexities in the area.<sup>76</sup>

**Decision** of 22 April 1982: statement of the President

Following a letter dated 10 April 1982<sup>77</sup> in which the representative of Lebanon submitted a complaint to the Council concerning massive Israeli troop concentrations on the Lebanese-Israeli borders and official Israeli threats against the territorial integrity of Lebanon, another letter dated 21 April 1982<sup>78</sup> brought charges that the Israeli air force had launched extensive attacks on the coastal area south of Beirut and north-east of Sidon, which, according to preliminary reports, had caused heavy casualties and severe damage to civilian property. The representative of Lebanon requested urgent consultations of the Council, in order to determine what appropriate measures could be taken immediately to avoid further escalation and deterioration of the situation,

On 22 April 1982, following consultations with members of the Council, the President issued the following **statement**<sup>79</sup> on their behalf:

**The President of the Security Council and the members of the Council, having taken note of the letter dated 21 April 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations, the oral report of the Secretary-General and his appeal of 21 April 1982, which reads as follows:**

"The Secretary-General has learned with deep concern of the Israeli air strikes today in Lebanon.

"He urgently appeals for an immediate cessation of all hostile acts and urges all parties to exercise the maximum restraint so that the cease-fire, which has generally held since July 1981, can be fully restored and maintained."

1. Urgently demand an end to all armed attacks and violations which jeopardize the cease-fire which has been in effect since 24 July 1981 and warn against any recurrence of violations of the cease-fire, in accordance with Security Council resolution 490 (1981) of 21 July 1981;

2. Enjoin all the parties to fulfil their responsibilities with respect to peace and invite them to work for consolidation of the cease-fire.

In pursuance of resolution 501 (1982), the Secretary-General submitted a special report dated 25 April 1982,<sup>80</sup> in which he stressed that the situation in southern Lebanon remained extremely volatile. He pointed out that although the arrangements for the cease-fire which had come into effect in July 1981 had generally held, unresolved tensions had led to the very real danger of widespread hostilities being sparked in the area. He referred to the Israeli air strikes into Lebanon on 21 April and to the appeal issued by him on that day. He stressed that the cease-fire was no substitute for the fulfilment of the UNIFIL mandate and that there had been little progress in that direction in the two preceding months. He provided detailed information about the increase in the strength of some UNIFIL troops and about new endeavours to reactivate the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission. Regarding the implementation of a phased programme of activities with the Government of Lebanon, the Secretary-General stated that the Commander of UNIFIL had initiated a series of meetings aimed at enlisting

support for certain early steps that would demonstrate the desire of the parties to co-operate with UNIFIL and contribute to a reduction of tensions.

**Decision** of 26 May 1982 (2369th meeting): resolution 506 (1982)

At its 2369th meeting, on 26 May 1982, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF dated 20 May 1982<sup>81</sup> in its agenda.

In the report, covering the period from 21 November 1981 to 20 May 1982, the Secretary-General indicated that UNDOF had continued to perform its functions effectively, with the co-operation of the parties, and that, during the period under review, the situation in the Israel-Syria sector had remained quiet, with no serious incidents. The Secretary-General cautioned, however, that the situation in the area continued to be potentially dangerous, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem could be reached. In the existing circumstances, the Secretary-General considered the continued presence of UNDOF to be essential and recommended that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months.

At the 2369th meeting, on 26 May 1982, the President of the Council put a draft resolution,<sup>82</sup> which had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations, to the vote. It was adopted unanimously as resolution 506 (1982).<sup>83</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council,*

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

*Decides:*

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

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 30 November 1982;

(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).

In connection with the adoption of the resolution, the President made the following complementary statement on behalf of the Council:<sup>84</sup>

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 28, that "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". This statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council.

**Decision** of 4 June 1982: statement of the President

**Decision** of 5 June 1982 (2374th meeting): resolution 508 (1982)

**Decision** of 6 June 1982 (2375th meeting): resolution 509 (1982)

**Decision** of 8 June 1982 (2377th meeting): rejection of a draft resolution

By letter dated 4 June 1982,<sup>85</sup> the representative of Lebanon charged that Israeli military aircraft had conducted no fewer than nine successive bombing raids on the city of Beirut and that Israeli forces and Israeli aircraft had begun to shell the area in southern Lebanon north of Nabatiyeh, causing an undetermined number of casualties. He called for urgent consideration by the Council.

By another letter of the same **date**,<sup>86</sup> the representative of Lebanon **called** for an urgent meeting of the Council.

On the same day, 4 June 1982, **after** consultations with the members of the Council, the President made the following **statement**<sup>87</sup> on their behalf:

**The President and the members of the Security Council have learned with concern of the serious events which occurred today in Lebanon and of the loss of human life and the destruction caused by those events. The President and the members of the Council make an urgent appeal to all the parties to adhere strictly to the cease-fire that had been in effect since 24 July 1981 and to refrain immediately from any hostile act likely to provoke an aggravation of the situation.**

At its 2374th meeting, on 5 June 1982, the Council included the second **letter** dated 4 June 1982<sup>86</sup> from the representative of Lebanon in the agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council invited, at its 2374th **meeting**, the representatives of Israel and Lebanon and, at its 2375th meeting, of Egypt, at their request, to **participate** in the discussion without the **right** to vote.<sup>87</sup> At its 2374th **meeting**, the Council also **decided**, by a vote and in **accordance** with its previous practice, to invite the **representative** of the PLO to **participate** in the deliberations **without** the right to **vote**.<sup>88</sup> At the same meeting, the Council further decided to extend an invitation to Mr. Clovis Maksoud under rule 39 of the provisional rules of **procedure**.<sup>89</sup> The Council considered the issue at its 2374th to 2377th meetings, on 5, 6 and 8 June 1982.

At the 2374th meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council members to a draft **resolution**,<sup>90</sup> which had been submitted by the representative of Japan. He also referred to a letter dated 4 June 1982<sup>91</sup> from the representative of Jordan, who had transmitted the text of a letter from the observer of the PLO charging Israel with launching successive bombing **attacks** on Beirut and southern Lebanon on that day.

The Secretary-General informed the members of the Council in detail about the successive Israeli air strikes against several targets in Beirut and throughout the southern half of Lebanon. He indicated that full information about the casualties was not yet available and that he had issued an urgent appeal, in conjunction with the statement of the President, for cessation of hostilities at the earliest possible **time**.<sup>92</sup>

The representative of Japan also expressed his deep concern about the military activities in Lebanon and introduced a draft resolution for quick adoption. He briefly summarized the main provisions of the draft and asked that it be adopted **unanimously** in order to meet the grave situation **in Lebanon**.<sup>93</sup>

The President then put the draft resolution to the vote; it was adopted unanimously as resolution 508 (1982).<sup>94</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling its resolutions 425 (1 978), 426 (1 978) and its ensuing resolutions and, more particularly, resolution 501(1982),*

*Taking note of the letters of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon dated 4 June 1982,*

*Deeply concerned at the deterioration of the present situation in Lebanon and in the Lebanese-Israeli border area, and its consequences for peace and security in the region,*

*Gravely concerned at the violation of the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of Lebanon,*

*Reaffirming and supporting the statement made by the President and the members of the Security Council on 4 June 1982, as well as the urgent appeal issued by the Secretary-General on 4 June 1982,*

*Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General,*

1. **Calls** upon all the parties to the conflict to cease immediately and **simultaneously** all military activities within Lebanon and across the Lebanese-Israeli border and not later than 0600 hours, local time, on Sunday, 6 June 1982;

2. **Requests** all Member States which are in a position to do so to bring their influence to bear upon those concerned so that the cessation of hostilities declared by Security Council resolution 490 (1981) can be respected;

3. **Requests** the Secretary-General to undertake all possible efforts to ensure the implementation of and compliance with the present resolution and to report to the Security Council as early as possible and not later than forty-eight hours after the adoption of the present resolution.

Following the adoption of resolution 508 (I 982), the representative of the United Kingdom expressed the dismay felt by his Government and by the people of Britain at the terrorist attack on the Israeli Ambassador to London, but emphasized that that assassination attempt did not in any way justify the massive Israeli air strikes against Lebanese towns and **villages**.<sup>95</sup>

The representative of Ireland also stated his deep concern about the situation in Lebanon, which was extremely dangerous. He condemned the attack on the Israeli **ambassador**, who had **been** accredited to Ireland earlier on, but he described the Israeli air strikes as an indiscriminate attempt at retribution of massive **proportions** and with incalculable consequences.<sup>96</sup>

The representative of Lebanon informed the Council that Israeli commandos had landed a few hours ago on the coastal road to Beirut and had started to shoot at cars and buses full of refugees fleeing from the south. He pointed **out** that despite the Presidential statement of 4 June the **Israeli** military activity had continued intensively and underlined the Lebanese wish for the Israeli aggression to be stopped by the Council. He described the chaotic circumstances that had resulted from the Israeli operations and expressed renewed hope that the Council's resolution would indeed initiate peace and security for all of **Lebanon**.<sup>97</sup>

The representative of the PLO cited the reporting in *The New York Times* as an example of how the media saw the Israeli attack on Palestinian civilian concentrations in Beirut and denied PLO **responsibility** for the attack on the Israeli Ambassador. He **reaffirmed** the PLO principle not to **engage** in any act of violence outside the occupied land or **involving** an innocent third party and denounced the Israeli terrorist acts against the Palestinian population in the occupied **territory**.<sup>98</sup>

The representative of the Soviet Union pointed out the numerous grave occasions of Israeli aggression against Lebanon in the previous six weeks and condemned the new large-scale military aggression against a sovereign Arab State. The **Israeli** record was a clear violation of international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant United Nations decisions. In the light of that situation, his delegation favoured the immediate end of the Israeli aggression against Lebanon and an end to further escalation in the area. The resolution, which had been accepted by the Council, did not fully reflect his Government's call for an immediate cease-fire and a strong condemnation of Israeli **aggressive** policies. He urged the Council to use all **effective** means under the Charter to halt further Israeli aggression against **Lebanon**.<sup>99</sup>

The representative of Israel criticized the Council for passing over the PLO campaign of terror, **includ-**

ing the attempted assassination of the Israeli Ambassador. He charged that the PLO had committed some 150 acts of terrorism since July 1981 and warned that Lebanon could not claim the benefits of international law if it did not carry out its duty to interdict Palestinian attacks from its soil against Israeli targets.<sup>101</sup>

Mr. Clovis Maksoud conveyed the view of LAS that the PLO could not be associated with the attempt to kill the Israeli Ambassador, but added that the Palestinians had been exercising the right of all peoples who had been deprived of the exercise of their national rights when they had carried out legitimate acts of resistance. He also criticized sharply the Israeli warning that it would direct further strikes against Lebanon.<sup>101</sup>

The President, speaking in his capacity as the representative of France, noted that his Government had condemned the air raids and the escalation of violence in Lebanon and along the frontier between Lebanon and Israel. In view of the spreading hostilities, the Council had to decide quickly on a call for an immediate cease-fire. Force would not guarantee the right of Israel to live in security or the right of the Palestinians or the Lebanese to live in peace.<sup>102</sup>

At the beginning of the 2375th meeting, on 6 June 1982, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution<sup>103</sup> submitted by Ireland.

In pursuance of resolution 508 (1982), the Secretary-General submitted his report dated 6 June 1982,<sup>104</sup> in which he stated that he had made an urgent appeal to the parties for a cessation of hostilities. He noted that the representative of the PLO had reaffirmed its commitment to stop all military operations across the Lebanese border and that the representative of Israel had informed him that although Israel had been acting in exercise of its right of self-defence, resolution 508 (1982) would be brought before the Israeli Cabinet. The Secretary-General added that the hostilities had escalated dangerously and that the Israeli forces had moved into southern Lebanon. He also conveyed the detailed information received from the Commander of UNIFIL.<sup>105</sup>

After the Secretary-General's oral report, the representative of Ireland introduced the draft resolution submitted by his delegation and urged the Council to take rapid and unanimous action to put a stop to the massive invasion of Lebanese territory by Israeli forces.<sup>106</sup>

At the same meeting, the representative of Israel reviewed in detail the numerous terrorist actions committed by Palestinians against Israeli citizens and representatives. He asserted that his Government was simply exercising the right of self-defence to protect the lives of its citizens and to ensure their safety against the PLO, which had headquarters, training grounds and bases of operations in Lebanon. He reiterated his Government's pledge that it honoured the independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon and had no territorial ambitions in Lebanon. He stressed that it was Lebanon's duty to prevent its territory from being used for terrorist attacks against other States and that in the mean time the Government of Israel had decided to free the inhabitants of Galilee from PLO harassment.<sup>107</sup>

At the same meeting, the draft resolution submitted by Ireland was put to the vote and adopted

unanimously as resolution 509 (1982).<sup>108</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council.*

*Recalling its resolutions 425 (1978) and 508 (1982).*

*Gravely concerned at the situation as described by the Secretary-General in his report to the Council,*

*Reaffirming the need for strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries,*

1. *Demands that Israel withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon;*

2. *Demands that all parties observe strictly the terms of paragraph 1 of resolution 508 (1982), which called on them to cease immediately and simultaneously all military activities within Lebanon and across the Lebanese-Israeli border;*

3. *Calls on all parties to communicate to the Secretary-General their acceptance of the present resolution within twenty-four hours;*

4. *Decides to remain seized of the question.*

The representative of China condemned the ongoing armed invasion by Israeli forces and pointed out that, despite many Council meetings to consider the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, the situation in the southern region had been deteriorating; he viewed the escalation of the war by Israel not only as another insolent challenge to the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples, but also as a deliberate exacerbation of the situation in the Middle East, endangering world peace and security.<sup>109</sup>

The representative of the Soviet Union also condemned the massive incursion by the Israeli aggressors into Lebanon, trampling underfoot basic norms of international law and many resolutions of the Council. He called upon the Council to weigh seriously the Israeli moves in Lebanon which were designed to plunge the Middle East 'into a new military conflict and constituted a direct threat to international peace and security.'<sup>110</sup>

The representative of Poland joined in the condemnation of the Israeli invasion, which directly contravened Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter and numerous resolutions, including resolution 508 (1982), adopted on the previous day.<sup>111</sup>

The representative of Egypt stated that the Israeli invasion of southern Lebanon ran counter to Israel's declared intention of seeking a comprehensive peace, threatened world peace and subjected the Middle East to a new wave of instability and chaos. He reiterated the requirements issued by his Government for an easing of tensions in the area: first, an immediate cease-fire in Lebanon; secondly, the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries; thirdly, the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon.<sup>112</sup>

At the beginning of the 2376th meeting, on 8 June 1982, the President drew attention to the report of the Secretary-General dated 7 June 1982 relating to resolution 509 (1982),<sup>113</sup> in which he informed the Council that he had transmitted the text of resolution 509 (1982) to the Foreign Ministers of Israel and Lebanon and to the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO; the replies received from Lebanon, Israel and the PLO were also included.

At the 2376th meeting, the Secretary-General updated his report orally and indicated that extensive hostilities continued, with the Israeli forces moving further north and with the UNIFIL troops being forcibly run over and pushed aside despite persistent

efforts to hold their positions against the Israeli avalanche.”<sup>114</sup>

The representative of Lebanon stated that his Government had asked for the meeting because the situation in Lebanon was becoming increasingly grave and serious. He denounced Israel's flat non-compliance with resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) and warned that the future, independence and sovereignty of Lebanon were at stake; therefore, he called once again upon the Council to prevent Lebanon's extinction by stopping the war **immediately**. The invasion of Lebanon violated the Geneva Convention and all rules of international morality and human rights. He mentioned an appeal by the Lebanese Red Cross stating unequivocally that its workers and vehicles had been savagely attacked by Israelis and that they had been prevented from evacuating the civilians and the wounded and from transporting medicines, blood and food supplies to the **distressed**.<sup>115</sup>

The representative of Israel charged again that Lebanese territory had become the staging-ground for indiscriminate terrorist attacks on the **civilian population** of Israel. His Government's complaints to the Council regarding those attacks had gone unheeded, whereas its resort to the exercise of its right of **self-defence** had led to emergency and other extraordinary **meetings** of the Council. His Government was ready to **affirm** the sovereignty of Lebanon, but it insisted that Lebanon equally acknowledge the right of the people of Israel to live in peace and **security**.<sup>116</sup>

At the 2377th meeting, on 8 June 1982, the representative of Spain stated that Israel's disregard for the President's appeal dated 4 June and its massive and continued invasion of Lebanon violated numerous Council resolutions and had most serious implications for world peace. The disdain shown by Israel for resolution 508 (1982) and for basic norms such as the General Armistice Agreement of 1949 could not be justified by linking the armed attack against Lebanon with the assassination attempt against the Israeli Ambassador to London.

In view of the worsening situation, his delegation had decided to submit a draft **resolution**,<sup>117</sup> which he presented to the Council for immediate adoption. In the preamble of the draft resolution, the Council would have recalled resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), and taken note of the report of the **Secretary-General** dated 7 June 1982 as well as of the positive replies received from the Government of Lebanon and the PLO; in the operative part, the Council would have: (a) condemned the non-compliance with resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) by Israel; (b) urged the parties to comply with the regulations attached to The **Hague Convention** of 1907; (c) reiterated its demand that Israel withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon; (d) reiterated also its demand that all parties observe strictly the terms of paragraph I of resolution 508 (1982), in which the Council had called upon them to cease immediately and simultaneously all military activities within Lebanon and across the **Lebanese-Israeli border**; and (e) demanded that within six hours all hostilities must be stopped, in compliance with resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982); and (f) decided, in the event of non-compliance, to meet again to consider practical ways and means, in accordance with the **Charter**.<sup>118</sup>

At the same meeting, the President put the draft resolution to the vote; it received 14 votes in favour and 1 against and was not adopted, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the **Council**.<sup>119</sup>

In explanation of her vote, the representative of the United States pointed out that the two previous resolutions, 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), contained **balancing** language that took account of the complex origin of the conflict in Lebanon and across the Lebanese-Israeli border, whereas the text that had just been voted on was not sufficiently balanced to accomplish the **objectives** of ending the cycle of violence and establishing the conditions for a just and lasting peace in Lebanon. For that reason, she concluded, her Government had voted against the draft resolution, but would continue **ongoing** efforts to bring the violence to an **end**.<sup>120</sup>

Several delegations deplored in varying degrees that the Council had not been able to adopt the draft resolution in the search for an end to the Israeli **invasion**.<sup>121</sup>

Decision of 18 June 1982 (2379th meeting): resolution 511 (1982)

At its 2379th meeting, on 18 June 1982, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General dated 10 June 1982 on **UNIFIL**<sup>122</sup> in the agenda.

In his report, covering the activities of the Force for the period from 11 December 1981 to 3 June 1982, the Secretary-General described the situation in southern Lebanon and noted that during the period under review the activities of armed elements, the **de facto** forces and the IDF within and near the UNIFIL area of operation had continued and gave an account of the main incidents that had taken place. He stated that both at United Nations Headquarters and in the field, intense efforts had been made to maintain the cease-fire that had come into effect on 24 July 1981 and to restore it after hostile acts occurred. The Secretary-General emphasized that significant changes in deployment had been made as a result of the increase in the strength of the Force. The Secretary-General noted that, on 21 April and 9 May 1982, Israeli aircraft had attacked targets in Lebanon, and he stated that since the situation in the area remained extremely volatile he had taken every opportunity to urge restraint on the parties.

In two addenda to his report, dated 11 June 1982<sup>123</sup> and 14 June 1982,<sup>124</sup> the Secretary-General referred to events that had occurred between 4 and 10 June and between 11 and 13 June respectively. The Secretary-General stated that, despite the difficult and dangerous situation prevailing in Lebanon, all UNIFIL troops and UNTSO observers had remained in their positions and, although the Israeli forces had imposed restrictions on the movement of UNIFIL on the coastal road and in the enclave, UNIFIL headquarters had, nevertheless, been able to restore communications with and supplies to the various battalions. He added that UNIFIL troops were also endeavouring to the extent possible in the circumstances to extend protection and humanitarian assistance to the population of the area.

The Secretary-General stated that, despite the fundamentally altered situation in southern Lebanon and the dangers inherent in it, UNIFIL troops continued functioning. He expressed the view that if the terms of resolution 509 (1982) were to be

implemented, UNIFIL could usefully contribute to the objectives prescribed by the Council. However, for UNIFIL to function **effectively**, he added, there would need to be a clear definition by the Council itself of the terms of reference of the Force in the existing situation, as well as full cooperation from the parties concerned. The Secretary-General added that the Government of Lebanon had expressed the view that UNIFIL should continue to be stationed in the area, pending further consideration of the situation in the light of resolution 509 (1982).

Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council invited the representatives of Israel, Lebanon, the Netherlands, Sweden and the Syrian Arab Republic, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to **vote**.<sup>3</sup> The Council also decided, by a vote and in accordance with its previous practice, to invite the representative of the PLO to participate in the deliberations without the right to **vote**.<sup>125</sup> The Council further decided to extend an invitation to Mr. Clovis Maksoud under rule 39 of the provisional rules of **procedure**.<sup>126</sup> The Council considered the issue during its 2379th meeting, on 18 June 1982.

The President drew the attention of the Council to a draft **resolution**,<sup>127</sup> which had been prepared in the course of consultations by the Council. The draft resolution was then put to the vote, received 13 votes in favour, none against, and 2 abstentions, and was **adopted** as resolution 5 I 1 (1982).<sup>128</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council.*

*Recalling* its resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978), 427 (1978), 434 (1978), 444 (1979), 450 (1979), 459 (1979), 467 (1980), 483 (1980), 488 (1981), 490 (1981), 498 (1981) and 501 (1982).

*Reaffirming* its resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982).

*Having studied* the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and taking note of the conclusions and recommendations expressed therein,

*Bearing in mind* the need to avoid any developments which could further aggravate the situation and the need, pending an examination of the situation by the Security Council in all its aspects, to preserve in place the capacity of the United Nations to assist in the restoration of the peace,

1. *Decides*, as an interim measure, to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a period of two months, that is, until 19 August 1982;

2. *Authorizes* the Force during that period to carry out, in addition, the interim tasks referred to in paragraph 17 of the report of the Secretary-General on the Force;

3. *Calls* on all concerned to extend full co-operation to the Force in the discharge of its tasks;

4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council regularly informed of the implementation of resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) and the present resolution.

Following the adoption of the resolution, the representative of the United States welcomed the renewal of the UNIFIL mandate for two months so that the Council would have the opportunity to study what best would serve the people of Lebanon and the peace of the **region**.<sup>129</sup>

The representative of Ireland deplored that in view of the massive Israeli invasion of Lebanon the renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL had been disrupted and that the cease-fire had not yet been fully restored. He dismissed the Israeli claim of **self-defence** as unwarranted, pointed to the lack of proportionality between the different violent measures and charged that such destructive actions escalated the levels of violence and further weakened the hopes for comprehensive peace in the region.

He further protested against the contempt that the Israeli military showed for the United Nations peace-keeping force and their disregard for the fragile purpose and mode of peace-keeping, which depended on the consent of the parties, the full cooperation from all concerned and the acceptance of its moral authority. He added that the Force had never been allowed to deploy fully throughout its area of operations and expressed his Government's concern about the future of UNIFIL. He underlined two requirements **regarding** UNIFIL: (a) that UNIFIL be given full co-operation in what it was expected to do; and (b) that the decision to extend its mandate for an interim period of two months should be seen as a temporary expedient. He concluded by saying that the extension of the UNIFIL mandate was no more than a **holding** operation and that it was up to the Council to make new dispositions beyond the interim period.<sup>130</sup>

The representative of the Soviet Union stressed that the renewal of the UNIFIL mandate was not a routine decision, because the Israeli troops had carried out the large-scale aggression against Lebanon, breaking through the lines of the peace-keeping force and sowing death and destruction among the Lebanese and the Palestinians. The Israeli invasion, which demonstrated the Israeli disregard of the Council and its **decisions**, constituted a serious threat to the sovereignty and independence of Lebanon. The Soviet Government considered that the Council should immediately take steps to halt the Israeli aggression and to defend the sovereignty and **territorial** integrity of Lebanon and the legitimate rights of the Arab people. He also indicated that his Government found it possible not to oppose the extension of UNIFIL.<sup>131</sup>

The representative of the United Kingdom stated that the invasion of Lebanon was clearly in violation of international law and of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, as well as in complete disregard of the demands of the Council. He added that the British Government, together with the other States members of the European Community, saw the invasion as a violation of Lebanon's sovereignty and could not accept the Israeli claim that its action amounted to self-defence. Since it was too early to know whether there was a role for UNIFIL in the radically altered circumstances in Lebanon, he welcomed the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL, so that the opportunity for a possible new role for the Force could be preserved.<sup>132</sup>

The representative of China also condemned the Israeli authorities for flagrantly launching the massive invasion of Lebanon, bombarding Lebanese cities and towns and **Palestinian** refugee camps and barring the discharge of the functions of UNIFIL. In view of the need created by the new situation in Lebanon and the request of the Lebanese Government, **his delegation** had supported the adoption of the **resolution**.<sup>133</sup>

The representative of the Netherlands stated that the Israeli violations of the UNIFIL area seriously undermined the ability of the Force to perform its duties. He explained that his Government maintained its troops in UNIFIL in view of the humanitarian assistance and protection that the Force could extend to the population, but did not wish to discuss the continued deployment until the political situation had become a little clearer. He appealed urgently to the Israeli Government to respect UNIFIL fully, to

withdraw the Israeli units and to allow humanitarian assistance without hindrance.')

The representative of Israel read out to the members of the Council his letter dated 7 June 1982<sup>135</sup> addressed to the Secretary-General, in which he presented his Government's response to resolution 509 (1982) arguing that the Israeli action had been taken in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter and announcing that a withdrawal of the Israeli forces would be **inconceivable** prior to the conclusion of concrete arrangements that would reliably preclude hostile action against Israel's **citizens**.<sup>136</sup>

The representative of Sweden explained his participation in the Council meeting by pointing out his Government's very deep concern about the flagrant violation not only of the independence of Lebanon but also of the political authority of UNIFIL and of the Council. The Israeli contempt for UNIFIL and the way its troops had simply overrun the peace-keeping force to launch the attack against Lebanon were very disturbing to the Swedish Government. He underlined that the concept of peace-keeping rested on the assumption that the parties would co-operate in good faith with the peace-keeping forces and that the question of the future of the Palestinian people could not be settled through the use of force nor could Israel's security be achieved by military means. He warned that the history of peace-keeping in the Middle East had taught a disastrous lesson of what a drastic and ill-advised removal of United Nations peace-keeping troops could entail. Peace-keeping had proved to be an **effective** instrument at the disposal of the international community for the containment of conflicts. It should be maintained as a function of the United Nations and the international community as a whole, acting through its universal Organization, and should assume responsibility for those **operations**.<sup>137</sup>

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic criticized the use of the veto to defeat the adoption of the Spanish draft resolution issuing a further warning against Israel and called for expulsion of Israel from the United Nations for its gross violations of its Charter obligations and appealed to the Council not to delay any longer the application of mandatory sanctions against Israel under Chapter VII of the Charter.<sup>138</sup>

**Decision** of 19 June 1982 (2380th meeting): resolution 512 (1982)

**Decision** of 26 June 1982 (2381st meeting): rejection of a **draft** resolution

**Decision** of 4 July 1982 (2382nd meeting): resolution 513 (1982)

At its 2380th meeting, on 19 June 1982, the Council resumed its consideration of the item that had been included in the agenda at the 2374th meeting, on 5 June 1982. At the beginning of the 2380th meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft **resolution**<sup>139</sup> submitted by the delegation of France.

Speaking in his capacity as representative of France, the President stated that the bloodshed that had begun during the tragic events in Lebanon had not yet ended. While attempts continued to bring about the implementation of resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), his delegation was **increasingly** concerned with the situation of the civilian popula-

tions, both Lebanese and Palestinian, who needed large-scale and effective aid. The draft resolution had been prepared to demonstrate the Council's solidarity with the suffering population and to increase and improve the aid that had so far been made available. He urged the Council to adopt the draft resolution, which was of special significance for France, which had a particularly deep attachment to **Lebanon**.<sup>140</sup> The President then put the draft resolution to the vote; it received 15 votes in favour and was adopted **unanimously** as **resolution 512 (1982)**.<sup>141</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council.*

**Deeply concerned at the sufferings of the Lebanese and Palestinian civilian populations,**

**Referring to the humanitarian principles of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and to the obligations arising from the regulations annexed to The Hague Convention of 1907.**

**Reaffirming its resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982),**

1. **Calls** upon all parties to the conflict to respect the rights of the civilian populations, to refrain from all acts of violence **against** those populations and to take all appropriate measures to alleviate the suffering caused by the conflict, in particular, by facilitating the dispatch and distribution of aid provided by United Nations agencies and by non-governmental organizations, in particular, the International Committee of the Red Cross;

2. **Appeals to Member States to continue to provide the most extensive humanitarian aid possible;**

3. **Stresses** the particular humanitarian responsibilities of the United Nations and its agencies, including the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, towards civilian populations and calls upon all the parties to the conflict not to hamper the exercise of those responsibilities and to assist in humanitarian efforts;

4. **Takes note** of the measures taken by the Secretary-General to co-ordinate the activities of the international agencies in this field and requests him to make every effort to ensure the implementation of and compliance with the present resolution and to report on these efforts to the Security Council as soon as possible.

At its 2381st meeting, on 26 June 1982, the Council resumed the consideration of the item.

The President, speaking in his **capacity** as the representative of France, introduced a draft **resolution**<sup>142</sup> sponsored by his delegation, under which, in the preambular part, the Council would have reaffirmed resolutions 508 (1982), 509 (1982) and 512 (1982); given expression to its serious concern at the constant deterioration of the situation in Lebanon, resulting from the violation of the sovereignty, integrity, independence and unity of the country; expressed profound apprehension regarding the dangers of extension of the fighting within Beirut; and, in the operative part: (a) demanded that all the parties observe an immediate cessation of hostilities throughout Lebanon; (b) demanded the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli forces engaged around Beirut to a distance of 10 kilometres from the periphery of that city, as a **first step** towards the complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon, as well as the simultaneous withdrawal of the Palestinian armed forces from Beirut, which should retire to the existing camps; (c) supported all efforts by the Government of Lebanon to censure Lebanese sovereignty throughout the territory and the integrity and independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized frontiers; (d) called upon all armed elements in the Beirut area to respect the exclusive authority of the Government of Lebanon and abide by its **directives**; (e) supported the Government of Lebanon in its will to regain exclusive control of its capital and to that end to install its armed forces, which should take up positions within Beirut and



interpose themselves on its periphery; (f) requested the Secretary-General, as an immediate measure, to station United Nations military observers, in agreement with the Government of Lebanon, with instructions to supervise the cease-fire and disengagement in and around Beirut; (g) further requested the Secretary-General to study any request by the Government of Lebanon for the installation of a United Nations force which could, within the framework of the implementation of the preceding paragraphs, take up positions beside the Lebanese interposition forces, or for the use of the forces available to the United Nations in the region; (h) requested the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on an urgent and sustained basis not later than 1 July 1982 on the status of implementation of the resolution and of resolutions 508 (I 982), 509 (I 982) and 512 (1982); (i) requested all Member States to co-operate fully with the United Nations in the implementation of the resolution; and (j) decided to remain seized of the question.

The President, in his capacity as the representative of France, strongly urged the adoption of the text as his Government was alarmed at the destruction of entire neighbourhoods in Beirut and hoped to see the return of at least minimum security throughout the city by stationing United Nations military observers, and possibly also creating conditions for the initiating of genuine negotiations.<sup>143</sup>

At the same meeting, the President put the revised draft resolution to the vote: it received 14 votes in favour and 1 vote against, and was not adopted, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.<sup>144</sup>

Following the vote, the representative of the United States explained that his delegation had cast a negative vote, since the draft resolution, which otherwise was supported by his Government, did not address the need for the elimination from Beirut and elsewhere of the presence of armed Palestinian elements.<sup>145</sup>

At its 2382nd meeting, on 4 July 1982, the Council resumed consideration of the item.

The President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution,<sup>146</sup> which had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations. He then drew attention to a number of documents, including an interim report<sup>147</sup> of the Secretary-General dated 30 June 1982, submitted in pursuance of resolution 512 (1982), in which a preliminary account of the humanitarian efforts of the United Nations system to assist Lebanon was given.

At the same meeting, the President put the draft resolution to the vote; it received 15 votes in favour and was adopted unanimously as resolution 513 (1982).<sup>148</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council,*

**Alarmed by the continued sufferings of the Lebanese and Palestinian civilian populations in southern Lebanon and in west Beirut,**

*Referring to the humanitarian principles of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and to the obligations arising from the regulations annexed to The Hague Convention of 1907,*

**Reaffirming its resolutions 508 (1982), 509 (I 982) and 512 (1982),**

**1. Calls for respect for the rights of the civilian populations without any discrimination and repudiates all acts of violence against those populations;**

**2. Calls further for the restoration of the normal supply of vital facilities such as water, electricity, food and medical provisions, particularly in Beirut;**

**3. Commends the efforts of the Secretary-General and the action of international agencies to alleviate the sufferings of the civilian population and requests them to continue their efforts to ensure their success.**

**Decision of 29 July 1982 (2385th meeting): resolution 515 (1982)**

**Decision of 1 August 1982 (2386th meeting): resolution 516 (1982)**

**Decision of 3 August 1982 (2387th meeting): statement of the President**

**Decision of 4 August 1982 (2389th meeting): resolution 517 (1982)**

**Decision of 6 August 1982 (2391st meeting): rejection of a draft resolution**

**Decision of 12 August 1982 (2392nd meeting): resolution 518 (I 982)**

By letter dated 28 July 1982,<sup>149</sup> the representatives of Egypt and France requested an urgent meeting of the Council in order to take up the situation in the Middle East; they attached to the letter a draft resolution<sup>150</sup> co-sponsored by Egypt and France.

At its 2384th meeting, on 29 July 1982, the Council included the letter, in addition to the letter dated 4 June 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations, in its agenda and resumed its consideration of the item.

Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council invited, in addition to the representatives previously invited, at the 2384th meeting, the representative of Pakistan, and at the 2389th meeting, the representatives of Cuba and India, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.<sup>3</sup>

At the beginning of the meeting, the President referred to the draft resolution submitted by Egypt and France.

The representative of France expressed deep regret about the continuing invasion of Lebanon and occupation of Beirut by Israeli troops and recalled the appeal by the President of France to the combatants to observe the requirements of the cease-fire and his suggestion that a United Nations force be set up to assist in separating the fighting parties in Beirut. He proposed that although that suggestion had not been adopted by the Council, another effort be made to seek the Council's support. In that connection he mentioned the working document that he, together with the representative of Egypt, had submitted to the Council on 2 July. Since the situation had gotten worse in and around Beirut, they had decided to submit officially the draft resolution whose text was identical with the earlier working document.

He emphasized the political dimension of the Lebanese situation and urged the other members to see the proposed text in the light of military and political characteristics of the ongoing crisis and of possible approaches to a peaceful settlement based on the Charter of the United Nations and on the acceptance of the Palestinian objective. He invited the Council to amend the submission to take account of recent developments and agreed to consider those suggestions with an open mind.<sup>151</sup>

He reviewed in great detail the draft resolution under which, in its preambular part, the Council, guided by the purposes and principles of the Charter, would have recalled its resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), recalled further its resolutions 508 (1982), 509 (1982), 511 (1982), 512 (1982) and 513 (1982), expressed its **grave** concern at the situation in the Middle East, in **particular** the existing situation in Lebanon, reaffirmed the obligation of all to respect strictly the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all countries and the legitimate national rights of all peoples in the Middle East, **reaffirmed** further the obligation that all States should settle their disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and **justice** would not be endangered and that they should 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, and expressed its determination to seek the restoration of peace and security in the region based on the principles of security for all States and justice for all peoples.

In the operative part, under section A, the Council would have (a) demanded that all the parties to the existing **hostilities** in Lebanon observe an immediate and lasting cease-fire throughout Lebanon; (b) demanded the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli forces engaged around Beirut to an agreed distance as a first step towards their complete withdrawal from Lebanon and the simultaneous withdrawal from west Beirut of the Palestinian armed forces, which would be **redeployed** with their light weapons, as a first step in camps to be determined, preferably outside Beirut, through modalities to be agreed upon between the parties, so putting an end to their military activities; (c) called for the conclusion of an agreement between the Palestinian armed forces and the Government of Lebanon concerning the destination and destiny of their weapons, other than those referred to above; (d) called for the departure of all non-Lebanese forces, except those which would be authorized by the **legitimate** and representative authorities of Lebanon; (e) supported the Government of Lebanon in its efforts to regain exclusive control of its capital and, to that end, to install its armed forces, which should take up positions in Beirut and interpose themselves on its periphery; and (f) further supported all efforts by the Government of Lebanon to ensure Lebanese sovereignty throughout the territory and the integrity and independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized frontiers.

Under section B, the Council would have (a) requested the Secretary-General, as an immediate measure, to station **United Nations** military observers, by agreement with the Government of Lebanon, in order to supervise the cease-fire and disengagement, in and around Beirut; and (b) further requested the **Secretary-General**, bearing in mind the provisions of **resolution 511 (1982)**, to prepare a report on the prospects for the deployment of a United Nations peace-keeping force, which could, within the framework of the **implementation** of the preceding paragraphs, take up positions beside the Lebanese interposition forces, or on the use of the United Nations forces already deployed in the region.

Under section C, the Council would have (a) considered that the settlement of the Lebanese problem should contribute to the initiation of a durable restoration of peace and security in the

region within the framework of negotiations based on the principles of security for all States and justice for all peoples, in order, namely, to (i) reaffirm the right of all States in the region to existence and **security** in accordance with resolution 242 (1967); (ii) reaffirm the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination with all its implications, on the understanding that to that end the Palestinian people should be represented in the negotiations and, consequently, the PLO should be associated therein; and (iii) call for the mutual and simultaneous recognition of the parties concerned; and (b) requested the Secretary-General, in consultation with all the parties concerned including the representatives of the Palestinian people, to make proposals to the Council designed to achieve by political means the objectives mentioned above, with a view to the recognition of and respect for the existence and security of all.

Under section D, the Council would have (a) requested the Secretary-General to report to the **Council** on an urgent and sustained **basis not later than . . .** on the status of the **implementation** of the resolution; and (b) requested all Member States to cooperate fully with the United Nations Secretariat in the implementation of the resolution.

The representative of Egypt suggested that the problem of the Middle East would continue to defy settlement unless and until a just solution to the Palestinian question had been achieved. He added that Egypt, the first and only Arab country to establish normal relations with **Israel**, rejected **completely** the Israeli invasion of Lebanon and its policies against the Palestinian people and the PLO. Based on its conviction that the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon could not be restored unless Israel withdrew completely from all Lebanese territory, his Government, together with France, had embarked on a new **initiative** for a movement towards a comprehensive peaceful settlement for the Middle East as a whole. He underlined basic Charter principles regarding the non-use of force and the resolution of disputes through peaceful means as well as the right to self-determination and endorsed the Council resolutions regarding the invasion of Lebanon. He then introduced the draft resolution, presenting its various parts and commenting on Egypt's reasons for submitting them to the Council. He urged in conclusion all Council members and all the parties in the Middle East to give their support to the French-Egyptian initiative.\*

The representative of Jordan stated that the Council was duty-bound to warn the aggressor that it would not tolerate the continued **aggression** against the Lebanese and Palestinian **populations** and **reminded** the Council of its power to invoke measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. **Regarding** the French-Egyptian draft resolution, he expressed **surprise** that suggestions for changes of the original working document of 2 July were not contained in the text, which had been **formally** submitted to the Council, but he indicated his willingness to **participate** in the efforts to amend the text for adoption by the Council. He emphasized in particular the relevance of basic Charter principles, such as the peaceful settlement of disputes, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, and the right to **self-determination**, for the renewed effort to find ways and means to resolve the Middle East problem.<sup>3</sup>

At the conclusion of the 2384th meeting, the representative of Lebanon informed the Council that his Government had been advised by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) that Israeli check-points were still preventing the entry into West Beirut of any food or supplies, despite what had been promised.<sup>154</sup>

At the 2385th meeting, on 29 July 1982, the representative of Lebanon gave strong support to the French-Egyptian initiative and stressed that peace in Lebanon could not wait for the comprehensive settlement of the Middle East crisis. He repeated the three basic objectives for a solution in Lebanon, namely, the withdrawal of Israel from all of Lebanon, the withdrawal of all non-Lebanese forces, and the deployment of the Lebanese Army and security forces, and concluded by saying that Israel's security could be guaranteed only by peace and mutual recognition of every nation's and people's right to exist, as provided for in the draft resolution.<sup>155</sup>

The representative of Pakistan pointed out that very recently the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries held at Nicosia had called upon the Council to apply as a matter of urgency comprehensive mandatory sanctions against Israel under Chapter VII of the Charter, until Israel fully carried out the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.<sup>156</sup>

The representative of Ireland stressed the fact that the capital of a Member State had been under virtual siege for nearly two months by the armed forces of its neighbour and that the Council had not yet succeeded in implementing its resolutions and terminating the occupation. In view of this circumstance, time was ripe for a new effort that would provide for certain immediate steps to stop the conflict in Beirut and address the problem in its larger context. His Government had always felt that something should be done to get a real political dialogue under way and that the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination had to be included in whatever was to be discussed and agreed to. He expressed his appreciation for the initiative taken by Egypt and France and especially for the main lines of the draft resolution, although he cautioned that a United Nations force should not be established unless the whole issue including all the implications of such a step were discussed in depth in the Council.<sup>157</sup>

The representative of Spain informed the Council that his Government had instructed him to submit urgently a draft resolution that was addressed to purely humanitarian concerns and could be adopted at the same meeting. He then read out the text of the draft resolution<sup>158</sup> and appealed to the Council members to adopt it as soon as possible to put an end to the siege of Beirut where the civilian population had been suffering from hunger, thirst, war and death.<sup>159</sup>

The representative of Jordan welcomed the Spanish draft resolution and called upon the Council to take it up urgently and referred to an appeal by members of the Government of Lebanon who described the worsening situation in West Beirut as a result of the continued siege of the area by Israeli occupiers.<sup>160</sup>

The representative of the United States renewed her Government's commitment to the peace, independence and sovereignty of Lebanon, but indicated

that her delegation could not support the Spanish draft since there was no time to gather or confirm the facts about the current situation in Beirut, since there was only an inadequate opportunity for consultations with her Government and since the draft resolution was lacking in balance. Although the PLO had imposed itself in the first instance on the civilian population of Beirut, the draft resolution submitted by Spain called only upon Israel to desist in its military activities. She felt that a one-sided appeal in a two-sided conflict suggested political as well as humanitarian purposes. In the light of those difficulties, she asked for suspension of the Council meeting to permit consultation about the text with her Government.<sup>161</sup>

The representative of France fully supported the Spanish representative and agreed that priority should be given to the draft resolution and it should be voted upon as quickly as possible.<sup>162</sup>

At the same meeting, following a short suspension,<sup>163</sup> the President proposed, in accordance with the request of the United States, to suspend the meeting for consultations. The representative of Panama opposed the proposal for suspension, and the President put the United States request to a vote. The result was 6 votes in favour, 6 against, and 3 abstentions; the proposal for a suspension of the meeting therefore failed to obtain the required majority and was not adopted.<sup>164</sup>

Immediately following the vote on the suspension of the meeting, the President put the draft resolution submitted by Spain to the vote. It obtained 14 votes in favour; one member did not participate in the vote. Therefore, the draft had been adopted as resolution 5 15 (1982).<sup>165</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council,*

*Deeply concerned at the situation of the civilian population of Beirut,*

*Referring to the humanitarian principles of the Geneva Convention of 1949 and to the obligations arising from the regulations annexed to The Hague Convention of 1907.*

*Recalling its resolutions 512 (1982) and 513 (1982).*

*1. Demands that the Government of Israel lift immediately the blockade of the city of Beirut in order to permit the dispatch of supplies to meet the urgent needs of the civilian population and allow the distribution of aid provided by United Nations agencies and by non-governmental organizations, particularly the International Committee of the Red Cross;*

*2. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit the text of the present resolution to the Government of Israel and to keep the Security Council informed of its implementation.*

The representative of the United States stated that her Government had found it impossible to participate in the vote and strongly objected to the procedure employed at the meeting; she suggested that it would be impossible for the Council to function if members were not to be provided an opportunity for consultation with their Governments.<sup>166</sup>

The representative of the Soviet Union viewed the Council's action as most appropriate in that the anti-humanitarian actions on the part of Israel in Beirut had cut off supply routes for food and electricity, prevented various humanitarian organizations, including the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), from carrying out their work and grossly violated the Council's resolutions 5 12 (1982) and 5 13 (1982).<sup>167</sup>

At its 2386th meeting, on 1 August 1982, the Council resumed its consideration of the item.

At the beginning of the meeting, the President stated that the meeting had been convened at the urgent request, made during the night, of the representative of Lebanon in view of the new and serious outbreak of fighting in and around Beirut. He drew the attention of the members to a draft **resolution**<sup>168</sup> that had been drawn up following consultations during the morning. Before putting the text to the vote, the President announced the correction of a small error in the printed copy. Then the draft was put to the vote, received 15 votes in favour and was adopted unanimously as resolution 516 (1982).<sup>169</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council.*

**Reaffirming its resolutions 508 (1982), 509 (1982), 511 (1982), 512 (1982) and 513 (1982).**

**Recalling its resolution 515 (1982),**

**Alarmed by the continuation and intensification of military activities in and around Beirut,**

*Taking note of the latest massive violations of the cease-fire in and around Beirut,*

1. **Confirms** its previous resolutions and demands an immediate cease-fire, and a cessation of all military activities within Lebanon and across the Lebanese-Israeli border;

2. **Authorizes the Secretary-General to deploy immediately, on the request of the Government of Lebanon, United Nations observers to monitor the situation in and around Beirut;**

3. **Requests the Secretary-General to report back to the Security Council on compliance with the present resolution as soon as possible and not later than four hours from now.**

Following the adoption of resolution 516 (1982), the representative of Lebanon thanked the Council for convening so urgently and **adopting** the resolution in reaction to the new Israeli **attack** in the West Beirut area and read out an **appeal** by the Prime Minister of Lebanon who asked in despair why the people in Lebanon were subjected to the attacks and so much suffering and why the United Nations had so far been unable to put an end to the bloodshed and violence.<sup>170</sup>

In pursuance of resolution 516 (1982), the Secretary-General submitted a report dated 1 August 1982,<sup>171</sup> in which he informed the Council that, following the adoption of the resolution, he had received a **letter**<sup>172</sup> from the representative of Lebanon requesting, on behalf of his Government, the stationing of United Nations observers in the Beirut area to ensure that the cease-fire was fully observed by all concerned. The Secretary-General stated that he had instructed the Chief of Staff of UNTSO to make the necessary **arrangements**, in consultation with the parties **concerned**, for the immediate deployment of United Nations observers in and around Beirut in accordance with resolution 516 (1982).

The Secretary-General reported that the Israeli authorities had informed the UNTSO Chief of Staff that the matter would be brought before the Israeli Cabinet. He informed the Council that the Chairman of the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission had met with the Commander of the Lebanese Army, who had assured the UNTSO Chief of Staff that the Army was ready to provide all the facilities and to assist the United Nations observers in the implementation of resolution 516 (1982). He had also received a message from the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO informing him of the **acceptance** by the PLO of resolution 516 (1982) and of his readiness to co-operate with United Nations observers. He added that the Chairman of the Commission had reported from his preliminary observations on

the ground in Beirut that the cease-fire appeared to be holding as of 2400 hours local time.

In the addendum to his report dated 3 August 1982,<sup>173</sup> the Secretary-General stated that intensive efforts had continued for the speedy implementation of resolution 516 (1982). He reported that the Israeli authorities had informed the Chief of Staff of UNTSO that the Israeli Cabinet would discuss the subject on 5 August 1982 and that, pending a decision by the Government of Israel on resolution 516 (1982), no co-operation would be extended to UNTSO personnel in the execution of that resolution. Noting that every effort was being made to stress to the Israeli authorities the importance and urgency of the matter, the Secretary-General said that **although** the detailed plan for the deployment of United Nations observers in the Beirut area had been ready since 1 August, it could not be put into full effect until the reply from the Israeli Government was received.

The Secretary-General stated further that, as a temporary practical measure, he had instructed the UNTSO Chief of Staff to take immediate steps to set up initially observation machinery in territory controlled by the Lebanese Government, in close consultation and co-operation with the Lebanese Army. He reported that the United Nations observers **assigned** to the Israel-Lebanon Mixed Armistice Commission had been constituted as the Observer Group Beirut (OGB) and that the Chairman of the Commission had been appointed Officer-in-Charge.

At the 2387th meeting, on 3 August 1982, the Council resumed its consideration of the item.

At the beginning of the meeting, the President made the following statement, which had been prepared during consultations **with** members of the Council, on **their** behalf in connection with the grave situation in **Lebanon**:<sup>174</sup>

1. The members of the Security Council are seriously concerned at the prevailing **high** state of tension and at reports of military movements and continued **outbreaks** of firing and shelling in and around Beirut, contrary to the demand in resolution 516 (1982), which was adopted at 1325 hours, New York time, on 1 August 1982, for an immediate cease-fire and cessation of all military activities within Lebanon and across the Lebanese-Israeli border. They consider it vital that these provisions be fully implemented.

2. The members of the Security Council have taken note of the Secretary-General's reports submitted pursuant to resolution 516 (1982). They express full support for his efforts and for the steps he has taken, following the request of the Government of Lebanon, to secure the immediate deployment of United Nations **observers** to monitor the situation in and around Beirut. They note with satisfaction from the Secretary-General's report that some of the **parties** have **already** assured General Erskine of **their full co-operation** for the deployment of United Nations observers and they call **urgently** on all of the parties to cooperate fully in the effort to secure effective deployment of the observers and to ensure their safety.

3. They insist that all parties must observe strictly the **terms** of resolution 516 (1982). They call further for the immediate **lifting** of all obstacles to the **dispatch** of supplies and the distribution of aid to meet the urgent needs of the civilian population in accordance with previous resolutions of the Council. The members of the Security Council will keep the situation under close review.

At the 2388th meeting, on 4 August 1982, the Council continued its consideration of the item in response to a request by the representative of the Soviet Union, as the President informed the members at the beginning of the **meeting**.<sup>175</sup> He also drew the attention of the members to a draft resolution submitted by Jordan and **Spain**.<sup>176</sup>

The representative of the Soviet Union pointed out that his delegation had alerted the Council to the fact that Israeli military forces had launched new large-scale attacks against west Beirut and that the representative of Israel had denied those facts at the previous meeting. He added that the new acts of aggression were by that time widely known and that, faced with the extremely serious situation, the Council had to take effective and decisive measures including the deployment of additional United Nations observers in and around Beirut. Furthermore, the Council should consider measures under Chapter VII of the Charter.<sup>177</sup>

The representative of Jordan described in some detail the devastation resulting from the most recent Israeli attack in Beirut and suggested that Israel had launched the new attack in order to bring about the collapse of the tripartite discussions between the Special Ambassador of the United States, the PLO and the Lebanese Government. In face of the Israeli attempt to take over the capital of Lebanon, the Council needed to take the firmest measures. For that reason, he introduced the draft resolution, which was co-sponsored by Spain and Jordan.<sup>178</sup>

The representative of Spain expressed dismay that the Israeli Government was delaying the dispatch of additional United Nations observers by reserving the decision to accept the Council mandate to a cabinet meeting yet to be held and denounced the Israeli delaying tactics at a time of grave fighting. He expressed hope that the Council would adopt the Jordanian-Spanish draft to put an end to the Israeli aggression.<sup>179</sup>

The representative of China condemned the Israeli attack against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples and proposed that the Council, faced with such lawlessness on the part of the Israeli authorities, should put an end to the Israeli invasion by the adoption of forceful measures against Israel, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter.<sup>180</sup>

At the 2389th meeting, on 4 August 1982, the President drew attention to the revised text<sup>181</sup> of the Jordanian-Spanish draft resolution. The representative of Spain announced several changes, including the addition of a new paragraph, and read out the changes.<sup>182</sup> The President repeated the wording of the various changes and then put the revised text to the vote. It received 14 votes in favour, with 1 abstention, and was adopted as resolution 517 (1982).<sup>183</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council,*

*Deeply shocked and alarmed by the deplorable consequences of the Israeli invasion of Beirut on 3 August 1982,*

1. *Reconfirms* its resolutions 508 (1982), 509 (1982), 512 (1982), 513 (1982), 515 (1982) and 516 (1982);
2. *Confirms once again* its demand for an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon;
3. *Censures* Israel for its failure to comply with the above resolutions;
4. *Calls for the prompt return of Israeli troops which have moved forward subsequent to 1325 hours, eastern daylight time, on 1 August 1982;*
5. *Takes note of the decision of the Palestine Liberation Organization to move the Palestinian armed forces from Beirut;*
6. *Expresses its appreciation for the efforts and steps taken by the Secretary-General to implement the provisions of resolution 516 (1982) and authorizes him, as an immediate step, to increase the number of United Nations observers in and around Beirut;*
7. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the implementation of the present resolution as soon as

possible and not later than 1000 hours, eastern daylight time, on 5 August 1982;

8. *Decides* to meet at that time, if necessary, in order to consider the report of the Secretary-General and, in case of failure to comply by any of the parties to the conflict, to consider adopting effective ways and means in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

Following the adoption of the resolution, the representative of the United States explained his delegation's abstention in the vote by pointing to the lack of an explicit and unequivocal call for the withdrawal of the PLO from Lebanon and added that the text was not consistent with the balanced policy set forth by the President of the United States in a declaration issued that morning.<sup>184</sup>

In pursuance of resolution 517 (1982), the Secretary-General submitted a report dated 5 August,<sup>185</sup> in which he informed the Council that the representative of Lebanon had assured him of the Lebanese Government's readiness to co-operate fully in the implementation of the resolution and that the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO had reaffirmed that organization's commitment to the cease-fire. He stated that the Israeli authorities had undertaken to respond to the Council's resolution later that day, following a Cabinet meeting. He added that, as soon as transit arrangements were completed, additional observers from the existing establishment of UNTSO would be dispatched to the Beirut area.

The Secretary-General reported further that on 4 August, in Vienna, he had appealed to the Prime Minister of Israel for adherence to the cease-fire and co-operation in the deployment of United Nations observers in and around Beirut and had expressed his readiness to go immediately to Israel and Lebanon to discuss the matter with all parties concerned. He said that he had been informed by the Prime Minister of Israel that the Government would welcome his visit if there was not a parallel visit to the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO. The Secretary-General stated that he did not find that position acceptable, as he felt it his duty to meet with all parties involved in the hostilities, and he reiterated his appeal for co-operation.

In two addenda to his report, dated 5 and 6 August,<sup>186</sup> the Secretary-General conveyed to the Council the decision of the Israeli Cabinet, whereby the Israeli Government, charging that all previous cease-fires in Lebanon and the Beirut area had been violated by the terrorist organizations, refused to accept the stationing of United Nations observers, since they would not be able to monitor the activities of the organizations and since their presence would signal to those terrorists that they would not have to leave Beirut and Lebanon despite the urgent demands of the Lebanese Government and the President of the United States.

At the 2390th meeting, on 6 August 1982, when the Council resumed the consideration of the item, the President drew the attention of the members to the report of the Secretary-General and a draft resolution<sup>187</sup> submitted by the Soviet Union.

The representative of the Soviet Union denounced the Israeli rejection of the demands contained in resolution 517 (1982) as a sign of growing arrogance and a challenge which the Council could not ignore but had to take up. Under those circumstances, he submitted to the Council a draft resolution under which the Council, deeply indignant at the refusal of Israel to comply with the decisions of the Security

Council aimed at terminating the bloodshed in Beirut, would have (a) strongly condemned Israel for not implementing resolutions 516 (1982) and 517 (1982); (b) demanded that Israel immediately implement the resolutions fully; and (c) decided that, in order to carry out those decisions of the Council, all the States Members of the United Nations should, as a first step, refrain from supplying Israel with any weapons and from providing it with military aid. The representative of the Soviet Union added that he hoped that the Council would support the draft, which constituted the absolute minimum necessary to put an end to Israel's aggression; if that did not have the desired effect, the Council would have to take more severe measures under the Charter.<sup>188</sup>

The representative of Jordan indicated that his delegation believed that the draft resolution did not go far enough, in view of the language employed in the previous resolutions regarding the bloodshed in Beirut; he saw the appeal to Member States to refrain from supplying weapons or providing military aid as inadequate and mentioned the application of measures under Chapter VII as appropriate.<sup>189</sup>

The Council continued its consideration of the item at its 2391st meeting, on 6 August 1982.

The representative of the Soviet Union reiterated his appeal to the Council that the small step indicated in his delegation's draft resolution be accepted. He announced a small change in the text, which his Government had agreed to accept in order to achieve the constructive purpose entailed in the draft resolution. He said that in the third operative paragraph the words "as a first step" would be deleted and that the words "until the full withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Lebanese territory" would be added at the end of that paragraph. In the light of the importance of the moment, he asked that the draft resolution, as orally revised, be put to the vote immediately.<sup>190</sup>

The representative of the United Kingdom indicated that his delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolution, since no effort had been made to take into account the views of some parties to the conflict and no good had been done by the introduction of the draft, as witnessed by the silence of the representative of Lebanon.<sup>191</sup>

At the same meeting, the President read out the text of the draft resolution, as orally revised, and put it to the vote; it received 11 votes in favour, 1 vote against, and 3 abstentions, and was not adopted, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.<sup>192</sup>

The representative of the United States, referring to the ongoing efforts of his Government through its special envoy to help bring about a negotiated settlement of the crisis in Beirut and in Lebanon, stated that his delegation stood ready to support any action in the Council that would assist the envoy in his mission and that it had cast a negative vote because the draft resolution had called for sanctions against Israel and because the unbalanced text would not have contributed to a negotiated peaceful settlement.<sup>193</sup>

The representative of the Soviet Union stated that his delegation had been approached by the delegation of the United States, shortly before the Council meeting began, regarding the possibility of arriving at a consensus text, and that his delegation had requested that a specific amendment be proposed instead of

general remarks before an agreement could be sought on the revision of the draft resolution.<sup>194</sup>

The representative of the United States replied that his delegation had simply maintained its general willingness to consider any reasonable text that would have served the peace process in Lebanon.<sup>195</sup>

Subsequently, the President explained that in fulfilling his functions he had conducted informal talks with members of the Council to see to it that they would help maintain the unity and common purpose of the Council, but that at a certain point, based on his own judgement, he had decided to proceed to the formal meeting as those efforts were not likely to bear fruit.<sup>196</sup>

At its 2392nd meeting, on 12 August 1982, the Council resumed its consideration of the item. The President drew attention to a draft resolution<sup>197</sup> sponsored by Guyana, Jordan, Panama, Togo, Uganda and Zaire.

The representative of the Soviet Union stated that his delegation had requested the urgent convening of the Council in view of the worsening situation in Lebanon, as the Israeli forces continued to violate the cease-fire in Beirut and as Israeli troops with tanks had moved into regions located north of Beirut. Under those circumstances, it was his delegation's view that the Council should undertake immediate action to put an end to Israeli aggression.<sup>198</sup>

The representative of Jordan referred to the letter dated 12 August 1982 from the representative of Lebanon,<sup>199</sup> in which the new attacks by the Israeli forces were reported to the President of the Council, and denounced the Israeli campaign against Beirut and the areas north of the Lebanese capital. He also brought to the Council's attention a letter received by his Mission from the observer of the PLO,<sup>200</sup> which set out the relentless attacks by Israeli tanks, airplanes and infantry against Lebanese and Palestinian quarters in Beirut. As the attacks were continuing despite the cease-fire arranged by the Special Envoy of the United States, the representative of Jordan submitted to the Council the draft resolution sponsored by the delegations of Guyana, Jordan, Togo, Uganda and Zaire, which was designed to strengthen the presence of United Nations observers in and around Beirut and to lift all restrictions that the Israeli command had imposed on the city of Beirut.<sup>201</sup>

The representative of the PLO stressed the seriousness of the deteriorating situation in Lebanon and read out a message from the Chairman of the PLO, in which the continued shelling was reported and immediate steps were requested to ensure the safety of Lebanese and Palestinian civilians, in consequence of the agreement involving the PLO, the Lebanese Government and the Special Envoy of the United States.<sup>202</sup>

At the same meeting, the President suspended the meeting for a short time in order to allow some delegations to receive instructions from their Governments before proceeding to the vote on the draft resolution.<sup>203</sup> Following the suspension, the representative of Jordan announced a few minor editorial and procedural changes in the text of the draft resolution.<sup>204</sup>

The President then put the draft resolution, as orally revised, to the vote; it received 15 votes in favour and was adopted unanimously as resolution 518 (1982).<sup>205</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council.*

Recalling its resolutions 508 (1982), 509 (1982), 511 (1982), 512 (1982), 513 (1982), 515 (1982), 516 (1982) and 517 (1982),

Expressing its *most serious* concern about continued military activities in Lebanon and, particularly, in and around Beirut,

1. *Demands* that Israel and all parties to the conflict observe strictly the terms of Security Council resolutions relevant to the immediate cessation of all military activities within Lebanon and, particularly, in and around Beirut;

2. *Demands* the immediate lifting of all restrictions on the city of Beirut in order to permit the free entry of supplies to meet the urgent needs of the civilian population in Beirut;

3. *Requests* the United Nations observers in, and in the vicinity of, Beirut to report on the situation;

4. *Demands* that Israel co-operate fully in the effort to secure the effective deployment of the United Nations observers, as requested by the Government of Lebanon, and in such a manner as to ensure their safety;

5. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report as soon as possible to the Security Council on the implementation of the present resolution;

6. *Decides* to meet, if necessary, in order to consider the situation upon receipt of the report of the Secretary-General.

In pursuance of resolution 518 (1982), the Secretary-General submitted a report dated 13 August 1982,<sup>206</sup> in which he stated that he had brought the resolution to the attention of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Israel and Lebanon and of the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO. He reported that the representative of Israel had informed him that IDF strictly observed the cease-fire throughout Lebanon on the axiomatic condition that it was mutual and absolute and that Israel's position with regard to United Nations observers had been set out in his letter dated 5 August 1982.<sup>207</sup> The Secretary-General had been informed that the Lebanese Government and the PLO accepted resolution 518 (1982).

The Secretary-General stated further that there were 10 United Nations observers in Beirut and that efforts were continuing to bring additional observers to the area and also to enable them to function effectively. With reference to paragraph 2 of resolution 518 (1982), the Secretary-General stated that he had been following with deep anxiety the deterioration of the situation affecting the civilian population in west Beirut. He informed the Council that he had asked the Chairman of the United Nations inter-agency survey mission to return to Lebanon on 10 August to reassess the needs of the affected population and that he was continuing his efforts to secure the free entry of supplies to meet the urgent needs of the civilian population in Beirut.

Decision of 17 August 1982 (2393rd meeting): resolution 519 (1982)

At its 2393rd meeting, on 17 August 1982, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL dated 13 August 1982<sup>208</sup> in the agenda.

In his report, the Secretary-General gave an account of developments relating to UNIFIL since the adoption of resolution 511 (1982) on 18 June. He noted that the conditions prevailing in Lebanon had complicated the logistic support of the Force and that further difficulties had been created by restrictions on the freedom of movement of UNIFIL imposed by the Israeli forces. He described incidents involving Israeli forces which had occurred in the UNIFIL area of deployment in the days immediately following the Israeli invasion and which had been strongly protested to the Israeli authorities. He reported that

UNIFIL had taken action to contain the activities of a new armed group, equipped and controlled by the Israeli forces, which had appeared in parts of the UNIFIL area at the end of June, and had continued to resist attempts by the *de facto* forces to operate in the UNIFIL area of deployment, although in some instances they had been able to enter that area with the assistance of the Israeli forces. He added that during the latter part of the reporting period the UNIFIL area had been generally quiet and that no armed clashes had been observed.

The Secretary-General reported further that, until 16 June 1982, UNIFIL humanitarian teams had been able to assist the population of Tyre through the distribution of food and water and the dispensing of medical aid, but that those efforts had been halted by the Israeli authorities on 16 June. In the second half of June UNIFIL had extended co-operation to the humanitarian efforts of various United Nations programmes and ICRC.

Recalling that in his last report he had referred to the fundamentally altered situation in which the Force had found itself after the Israeli invasion, the Secretary-General stated that, despite the difficulties it had faced, the Force had been deeply engaged in extending protection and humanitarian assistance to the civilian population in its area. He expressed the view that the presence of UNIFIL had provided an important stabilizing and moderating influence in southern Lebanon during that difficult time.

The Secretary-General stated that, as the overall situation in southern Lebanon remained uncertain and fraught with danger, the Government of Lebanon had indicated that UNIFIL should continue to be stationed in the area for an additional interim period of two months, pending further consideration of the situation in the light of resolutions 508 (1982), 509 (1982), 511 (1982), 512 (1982), 513 (1982), 515 (1982), 516 (1982) and 517 (1982). Taking all factors into account, and bearing in mind the position of the Government of Lebanon, the Secretary-General recommended that the Council extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further interim period.

At the 2393rd meeting the President drew attention to the draft resolution,<sup>209</sup> which had been prepared in the course of consultations among the members, and put it to the vote; it received 13 votes in favour and none against, with 2 abstentions, and was adopted as resolution 519 (1982).<sup>210</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council.*

Recalling its resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978), 427 (1978), 434 (1978), 444 (1979), 450 (1979), 459 (1979), 467 (1980), 483 (1980), 488 (1981), 490 (1981), 498 (1981), 501 (1982) and 511 (1982),

Reaffirming its resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), as well as subsequent resolutions on the situation in Lebanon,

Having studied with grave concern the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and noting its conclusions and recommendations and the wishes of the Government of Lebanon as set out therein.

Bearing in mind the need, pending an examination by the Security Council of the situation in all its aspects, to preserve in place the capacity of the United Nations to assist in the restoration of the peace and of the authority of the Government of Lebanon throughout Lebanon.

1. *Decides* to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further interim period of two months, that is, until 19 October 1982;

2. *Authorizes* the Force during that period to continue to carry out, in addition, the interim tasks in the humanitarian and



administrative fields assigned to it in paragraph 2 of resolution 51 I (1982);

3. **Calls on all concerned, taking into account paragraphs 5, 8 and 9 of the report of the Secretary-General on the Force, to extend full co-operation to it in the discharge of its tasks;**

4. **Supports the efforts of the Secretary-General, with a view to optimum use of observers of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, as envisaged by relevant resolutions of the Security Council;**

5. **Decides to consider the situation fully and in all its aspects before 19 October 1982.**

Decision of 17 September 1982 (2395th meeting):  
resolution 520 (1982)

Decision of 18 September 1982 (2396th meeting):  
resolution 521 (1982)

On 2 September 1982, the Secretary-General submitted a report on the **situation** in the Beirut area,<sup>211</sup> in which he reviewed the situation in the area since 13 August. He indicated that the cease-fire, which had gone into effect on 12 August, had generally held, but that, despite persistent efforts, it had not been possible to increase the number of United Nations observers in Beirut beyond 10 and that, although from 21 August members of OGB had been able to move in and around Beirut with greater ease than before, their freedom of movement had been on occasion curtailed by IDF. He informed the Council of OGB reports, which indicated the arrival of the French, United States and Italian contingents of the multinational force which, as at 26 August 1982, numbered 2,285, and **detailed** the number of Palestinian and other forces that had departed from Beirut during the period 21 August to 1 September.

In two addenda to his report, dated 15 and 17 September 1982,<sup>212</sup> the Secretary-General reviewed the situation in the Beirut area from 2 to 15 September and from 15 to 17 September, respectively, outlining developments in the area on the basis of reports from the United Nations observers of OGB. He stated that the situation had remained generally calm from 2 to 13 September, but that tension had greatly increased on 14 September, and cited a number of incidents, including the explosion of 14 September at the headquarters of the Lebanese Christian Phalangist Party in which the **President-elect** of Lebanon had been killed.

By letter dated 16 September 1982,<sup>213</sup> the representative of Lebanon requested an **urgent** meeting of the Council to consider the situation in **Lebanon**, in the light of the latest Israeli incursion into **Beirut**.

At its 2394th meeting, on 16 September 1982, the Council included, in addition to the letter dated 4 June 1982 from the representative of Lebanon and the letter dated 28 July 1982 from the representatives of Egypt and France, the letter dated 16 September 1982 from the representative of Lebanon in its agenda and resumed its consideration of the item. In addition to those representatives **previously** invited, the President invited, at the **2394th** meeting, the representatives of Kuwait and the Syrian Arab Republic and, at the 2396th meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Democratic Yemen and Greece, at their request, **to participate** in the discussion without the right to vote. The **Council** considered the item at its **2394th** to 2396th meetings, on 16, 17 and 19 September 1982.

At the 2394th **meeting**, the representative of Lebanon noted that it had been nearly a month since the Council had last met to consider the Lebanese

question and that various efforts inspired by the resolutions of the Council had produced successful results. He deplored that Lebanon had been compelled to return to the Council to reiterate its urgent call that Lebanon should be **left** to the Lebanese. While his country was mourning the death of its young President-elect, the **Israelis** had once again chosen to invade **Beirut**, flouting international law and violating numerous commitments **including** the agreement negotiated by the Special Envoy of the **United States**. He asked by what right Israel could pretend to allot to itself the task of maintaining law and order in the capital of Lebanon, a sovereign country, and sharply rejected the claim of the Israeli army that it served as a force of stability in a country that the same Israeli forces had destabilized. He emphasized once again the Council's responsibility towards Lebanon and requested that the **Council** reaffirm its previous resolutions and see to it that Israel withdraw totally and unconditionally from Lebanese territory.\*

The representative of Kuwait condemned the new invasion of Beirut by Israeli forces as a grave and flagrant violation of the United States-sponsored agreement that had led to the withdrawal of the Palestinian and Syrian forces from the capital of Lebanon. He saw the Israeli act of aggression as another episode in the overall strategy which aimed at establishing only one military force in the Middle East and expressed his conviction that the United States had a major responsibility to force the Israelis to withdraw with dispatch from Beirut.\*

The representative of Jordan indicated that he had prepared a draft resolution, which was still in the form of a working paper and which he would not submit until he had had consultations with members of the Council. He invited proposals, amendments and changes regarding the **informal** text from the other members and hoped that the Council would be able to achieve consensus with regard to the extremely grave situation in Lebanon, where the principal aim was to safeguard the integrity of Beirut and its **population**.<sup>216</sup>

The representative of Lebanon underlined the urgency of the situation and supported the call by the representative of Jordan for a speedy agreement among the Council **members**.<sup>217</sup>

At the 2395th meeting, on 17 September 1982, the President drew the attention of the Council members to a draft **resolution**<sup>218</sup> submitted by the representative of Jordan.

The representative of Jordan expressed hope that the draft that he had submitted would meet with the consensus endorsement of the Council and that steps would be taken to carry out the objectives of the draft resolution. He then read out the text of the revised draft resolution and asked that it be put to the vote immediately before further statements were **made**.<sup>219</sup>

The President explained that several names were already inscribed on the list of speakers and that he therefore could not satisfy the wish of the representative of **Jordan**.<sup>220</sup>

The representative of France charged that the Israeli advance towards west Beirut was a deliberate and unwarranted violation of the plan of the Special Envoy of the United States, which had been seriously compromised by Israel's unilateral action. He recalled in that connection his Government's commitment to the immediate implementation of the **Coun-**

**civil resolutions** concerning the deployment in Beirut of UNTSO observers, whose presence would enable the Council to evaluate the threat facing the civilian populations and the possibility of taking other steps.<sup>221</sup>

The representative of the United Kingdom expressed his Government's dismay with the latest recurrence of violence in Lebanon. He deplored the interruption of the hoped-for peaceful recovery by the assassination of the President-elect and stressed that Israel had no right to arrogate to itself the power of intervention in the capital and territory of a neighbouring State.<sup>222</sup>

The representative of Uganda stated that there was no doubt that Israel had seized on the death of the President-elect as a mere pretext to move into west Beirut and called it inadmissible that Israel should assert a right to police the internal affairs of Lebanon in spite of the explicit wishes of the Government and people of Lebanon.<sup>223</sup>

The President then read out the specific words, as orally revised, of a paragraph in the revised draft resolution and put the text to a vote; the revised draft resolution received 15 votes in favour and was adopted unanimously as resolution 520 (1982).<sup>224</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council,*

*Having considered the report of the Secretary-General of 15 September 1982,*

*Condemning the murder of Bashir Gemayel, the constitutionally elected President-elect of Lebanon, and every effort to disrupt by violence the restoration of a strong, stable government in Lebanon,*

*Having listened to the statement by the Permanent Representative of Lebanon,*

*Taking note of the determination of Lebanon to ensure the withdrawal of all non-Lebanese forces from Lebanon,*

*1. Reaffirms its resolutions 508 (1982), 509 (1982) and 516 (1982) in all their components;*

*2. Condemns the recent Israeli incursions into Beirut in violation of the cease-fire agreements and of Security Council resolutions;*

*3. Demands an immediate return to the positions occupied by Israel before 15 September 1982, as a first step towards the full implementation of Security Council resolutions;*

*4. Calls again for the strict respect of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity and political independence of Lebanon under the sole and exclusive authority of the Government of Lebanon through the Lebanese Army throughout Lebanon;*

*5. Reaffirms its resolutions 512 (1982) and 513 (1982), which call for respect for the rights of the civilian populations without any discrimination, and repudiates all acts of violence against those populations;*

*6. Supports the efforts of the Secretary-General to implement resolution 516 (1982), concerning the deployment of United Nations observers to monitor the situation in and around Beirut, and requests all the parties concerned to cooperate fully in the application of that resolution;*

*7. Decides to remain seized of the question and asks the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council informed of developments as soon as possible and not later than within twenty-four hours.*

Following the adoption of the resolution, the representative of the Soviet Union noted that when States reached unanimity on a given resolution they should not fail to implement it, especially as the Council had the elementary obligation to achieve the implementation of its resolutions.<sup>225</sup>

At its 2396th meeting, on 18 September 1982, the Council resumed its consideration of the item, at the urgent request of the representative of Jordan.

At the beginning of the 2396th meeting, the Secretary-General gave an oral report on new devel-

opments in the Beirut area, as requested in resolution 520 (1982).<sup>226</sup> He informed the Council members about his efforts to obtain agreement from all the parties concerned to implement the resolution and about the discovery of the massacre that had occurred in several Palestinian refugee camps in the night of 17/18 September. He provided details regarding the precise deployment of Israeli and Lebanese troops as well as other armed elements in Beirut and read from reports that the 10 United Nations observers had sent from the scene of the killings. He indicated that his efforts to increase the number of observers had not slackened, but that the opposition to additional observers remained unchanged. He suggested that under the new circumstances observers might not be enough. He also noted that UNIFIL had successfully prevented the harassment of the civilian population in its area of deployment by any armed group.<sup>227</sup>

The representative of the PLO bitterly denounced the Israeli military for the atrocities committed in the Palestinian camps and rejected the Israeli claim that Christian militiamen or Christian Phalangists had been responsible for the massacre of innocent civilians. He urged the Council to consider sending a United Nations force to Beirut to protect the safety and security of the Palestinian people, as observers would not be enough to provide adequate protection.<sup>228</sup>

The representative of the Soviet Union condemned the new Israeli advance and occupation of the Lebanese capital and the crimes committed against the defenceless civilian population under cover of the Israeli occupiers. He called for strong and effective measures by the Council to halt the massacre of Palestinian people and suggested that the new resolution to be adopted should contain a warning by all members, including its permanent members, that Israel was obliged under Article 25 of the Charter to abide by the Council's decisions and to carry them out. If any delegation objected to such a provision, the whole world should know who was trying to protect the Israeli aggressor.<sup>229</sup>

The representative of Jordan lamented the massacre of innocent Palestinians and called upon the Council to overcome its seeming paralysis and to send contingents of armed forces, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, to protect the Palestinian people from additional acts of genocide.<sup>230</sup>

The representative of Lebanon strongly denied that the Palestinian civilians had been killed by Lebanese armed elements and charged that the Lebanese troops had been thwarted in their effort to establish control over the city by the Israeli occupation that took place beginning on 15 September. He also said that the Lebanese army would undoubtedly welcome international forces in Lebanon, as had been suggested by various speakers.<sup>231</sup>

Numerous speakers expressed in varying degrees their dismay and revulsion at the atrocities committed against Palestinian civilians.<sup>232</sup> Several representatives called for measures under Chapter VII of the Charter to force Israel to desist from its aggression.<sup>233</sup>

The representative of Israel denied that Israeli forces had been involved in the murder of innocent civilians in the camps and claimed that the Lebanese troops had failed to take charge as provided for in the plan of the Special Envoy of the United States; when the Israeli command had discovered the bloodshed

the next morning, its troops had surrounded all three camps in order to protect the surviving civilians from further attacks.<sup>234</sup>

Subsequently, the President suspended the meeting in order to enable the members to enter into consultations on the matter. When the meeting was resumed, the President drew attention to the draft resolution that had been prepared in the course of consultations among the members.<sup>235</sup> The draft resolution was put to the vote at the same meeting and adopted unanimously, with 15 votes in favour, as resolution 52 I (1982).<sup>236</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council.*

*Appalled at the massacre of Palestinian civilians in Beirut, Having heard the report of the Secretary-General at its 2396th meeting,*

*Noting that the Government of Lebanon has agreed to the dispatch of United Nations observers to the sites of greatest human suffering and losses in and around that city,*

1. *Condemns* the criminal massacre of Palestinian civilians in Beirut;

2. *Reaffirms* once again its resolutions 512 (1982) and 513 (1982), which call for respect for the rights of the civilian populations without any discrimination, and repudiates all acts of violence against those populations;

3. *Authorizes* the Secretary-General, as an immediate step, to increase the number of United Nations observers in and around Beirut from ten to fifty, and insists that there shall be no interference with the deployment of the observers and that they shall have full freedom of movement;

4. *Requests* the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Government of Lebanon, to ensure the rapid deployment of those observers in order that they may contribute in every way possible within their mandate to the effort to ensure full protection for the civilian populations;

5. *Requests* the Secretary-General, as a matter of urgency, to initiate appropriate consultations and, in particular, consultations with the Government of Lebanon on additional steps which the Security Council might take, including the possible deployment of United Nations forces, to assist that Government in ensuring full protection for the civilian populations in and around Beirut and requests him to report to the Council within forty-eight hours;

6. *Insists* that all concerned must permit United Nations observers and forces established by the Security Council in Lebanon to be deployed and to discharge their mandates and, in this connection, solemnly calls attention to the obligation of all Member States, under Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations, to accept and carry out the decisions of the Council in accordance with the Charter;

7. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council informed on an urgent and continuing basis.

In pursuance of resolution 521 (1982), the Secretary-General submitted a report dated 20 September 1982,<sup>237</sup> in which he stated that he had been informed on 20 September that the Israeli Cabinet had decided to concur with the dispatch of an additional 40 United Nations observers to the Beirut area. He reported that 25 of those had already arrived in Beirut at 1230 hours Greenwich mean time. He also outlined developments in west Beirut from 18 to 20 September, as reported by OGB.

The Secretary-General stated that he had requested the Commander of UNIFIL to comment on the possibility of sending UNIFIL units to the Beirut area, should the Lebanese Government so request and the Council so decide. He had been informed that, if required it would be possible to send to Beirut a group of about 2,000 men without seriously affecting the capacity of UNIFIL to perform its own interim tasks in southern Lebanon.

The Secretary-General stated further that, on 20 September 1982, the representative of Lebanon had

informed him that his Government had formally requested the reconstitution of the multinational force. He noted that, on 20 September, the Observer for the PLO had informed him that the PLO insisted that military forces, or agreed multinational forces, should be deployed immediately to undertake the effective safeguards. He also noted that on the same day the President of the United States had announced that he had decided, together with the Governments of France and Italy, to send the multinational force back to Beirut for a limited period.

In two addenda to his report, dated 27 and 30 September,<sup>238</sup> the Secretary-General reported that as of 22 September all the additional observers had arrived in Beirut. He gave an account of developments in the Beirut area from 20 to 27 September and from 27 to 30 September, respectively, as reported by OGB.

**Decision** of 18 October 1982 (2400th meeting): resolution 523 (1982)

At its 2400th meeting, on 18 October 1982, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL dated 14 October 1982<sup>239</sup> in its agenda.

In his report, the Secretary-General reviewed developments relating to the functioning of UNIFIL since the adoption of resolution 519 (I 1982) on 17 August. Describing the situation in southern Lebanon, the Secretary-General noted that, throughout the period under review, the UNIFIL area had remained quiet and no armed clashes had been observed. He stated that the presence and activities of IDF within the UNIFIL area of deployment had significantly decreased and the activities of the *de facto* forces (Christian and associated militias) and the new local groups, armed and uniformed by the Israeli forces, had been effectively contained. He added that UNIFIL not only had provided protection and humanitarian assistance to the local population, but had also extended the fullest co-operation possible to the humanitarian efforts of the various United Nations programmes and ICRC. He indicated that logistic support of the Force had continued to be **problematic** owing to the restrictions imposed by the Israeli forces on UNIFIL freedom of movement, although some improvements had occurred since 11 October.

The Secretary-General stated that, despite the difficulties faced by UNIFIL, it had carried out its interim tasks with dedication and efficiency. He expressed the view, however, that the existing situation was clearly unsatisfactory. While the original mandate of the Force remained valid even in the current circumstances, he stated that it was obvious that the conditions under which UNIFIL was expected to carry out its mandate had radically changed. He added that it had not been possible, owing to the attitude of the Israeli authorities, for UNIFIL to play a useful role in the humanitarian assistance field outside its areas of deployment.

The Secretary-General expressed his deep conviction that the withdrawal of UNIFIL in the existing circumstances would have highly undesirable consequences. He therefore recommended that the Council extend the mandate for a further limited period. He noted that the Government of Lebanon had expressed the view that the mandate of UNIFIL should be extended for a period of three months and that the Secretary-General should consult with the Lebanese

Government during that time on ways and means of redefining the mandate to enable the Force to fulfil its original mission. While the attitude of the Israeli Government as expressed to him had not been in favour of the continued activity of UNIFIL, the Secretary-General expressed his hope that, if the Council decided to extend the mandate of the Force, the Israeli authorities would extend their co-operation to UNIFIL.

At the 2400th meeting, on 18 October 1982, the President of the Council invited the representative of Lebanon, at his request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.<sup>3</sup> At the same meeting, the Council also decided, by vote and in accordance with its previous practice, to invite the representative of the PLO to participate in the deliberations without the right to vote.<sup>240</sup>

At the same meeting, the Council heard a statement by the President of Lebanon, who renewed the trust of his Government and people in the international community and in the Council's ability to provide protection against aggression. He stressed the importance of UNIFIL as an interim Force and of its mandate to restore peace and security in southern Lebanon and to assist the Lebanese Government in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area. He affirmed the solidarity of the Lebanese people, who were confident that peace in Lebanon did not have to await an overall Middle East solution, with the Arab world and its commitment to the legitimate rights of the Palestinians and the non-acquisition of territories by force and war.<sup>241</sup>

Following the statement by the President of Lebanon, the meeting was suspended.<sup>242</sup> When the meeting was resumed, the President of the Council drew the attention of the members to a draft resolution<sup>243</sup> prepared in the course of the Council's consultations. The President then put the draft resolution to the vote; it received 13 votes in favour, none against, and 2 abstentions, and was adopted as resolution 523 (1982).<sup>244</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council,*

*Having heard the statement of the President of the Republic of Lebanon,*

*Recalling its resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978) and 519 (1982),*

*Reaffirming its resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), as well as all subsequent resolutions on the situation in Lebanon,*

*Having studied the report of the Secretary-General and taking note of its conclusions and recommendations,*

*Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,*

1. *Decides* to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further interim period of three months, that is, until 19 January 1983;

2. *Insists* that there shall be no interference under any pretext with the operations of the Force and that it shall have full freedom of movement in the discharge of its mandate;

3. *Authorizes* the Force during that period to carry out, with the consent of the Government of Lebanon, interim tasks in the humanitarian and administrative fields, as indicated in resolutions 511 (1982) and 519 (1982), and to assist the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the security of all the inhabitants of the area without any discrimination;

4. *Requests* the Secretary-General, within the three-month period, to consult with the Government of Lebanon and to report to the Security Council on ways and means of ensuring the full implementation of the mandate of the Force as defined in resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978), and the relevant decisions of the Council;

5. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the progress of his consultations.

In his report covering the period from 21 May to 18 November 1982,<sup>245</sup> the Secretary-General informed the Council that with the cooperation of both parties the Force had continued to carry out the tasks assigned to it and had been able to contribute to the maintenance of the cease-fire. He cautioned that the prevailing quiet was precarious and that, until further progress could be made towards a just and lasting peace, the situation in the Israel-Syria sector, and in the Middle East as a whole, would remain unstable and potentially dangerous. Therefore, the continued presence of UNDOF was essential not only to maintain quiet but to provide an atmosphere conducive to further efforts towards the achievement of peace. With the agreement of the Governments of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel, the Secretary-General recommended to the Council that it extend the mandate of UNDOF for a further period of six months.

At the 2403rd meeting, on 29 November 1982, the President put the draft resolution,<sup>246</sup> which had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations, to the vote; it received 15 votes in favour and was adopted unanimously as resolution 524 (1982).<sup>247</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council,*

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

*Decides.*

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

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 31 May 1983;

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

Following the adoption of the resolution, the President made the following complementary statement on behalf of the Council:<sup>248</sup>

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 27, that "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". This statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council.

Decision of 18 January 1983 (2411th meeting): resolution 529 (1983)

At its 2411th meeting, on 18 January 1983, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL dated 13 January 1983<sup>249</sup> in its agenda.

In his report, the Secretary-General reviewed developments relating to the functioning of UNIFIL since the adoption of resolution 523 (1982). Describing the situation in southern Lebanon, the Secretary-General stated that the presence and activities of IDF in the UNIFIL area had been generally limited, although IDF had further developed its logistic facilities in the area. He reported that a series of incidents involving the *de facto* forces, including armed incursions, acts of harassment and kidnapping of a soldier, had taken place, but that attempts of the *de facto* forces to operate within the UNIFIL area had remained relatively limited. Noting that IDF had continued the recruitment and arming of selected villagers in the UNIFIL area, he reported that the Force had made strong representations to the Israeli authorities about the arming of such groups.

The Secretary-General indicated that, while the number of displaced persons who had sought refuge in the UNIFIL area had continued to decrease and humanitarian assistance of an emergency nature had been discontinued, the Force had maintained its active co-operation with the regional authorities of the Lebanese Government, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and ICRC. He added that the Israeli authorities still imposed restrictions on the freedom of movement of UNIFIL and prevented the Force from extending humanitarian assistance outside its area of operation.

The Secretary-General expressed the view that UNIFIL would be able to hand over its responsibilities to the Lebanese authorities only after the issue of Israeli withdrawal had been successfully settled, and stressed that the presence of the Force was an important factor in ensuring the well-being of the civilian population of its area of deployment. He informed the Council that the Lebanese Government had requested the extension of the UNIFIL mandate for a further period of six months and stated that he considered it essential that the mandate should be extended, as a premature withdrawal of the Force would unquestionably have grave consequences. The Secretary-General therefore recommended a further extension of the mandate of UNIFIL. He mentioned that the Government of Israel had expressed the view that UNIFIL should not at the time be extended for more than two or three months. He also drew attention to the financial difficulties faced by the Force.

At the 241 Ith meeting, the President invited the representatives of Israel, Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.<sup>3</sup> The Council considered the item at that meeting.

At the beginning of the meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council members to the draft resolution<sup>250</sup> sponsored by Jordan.

The representative of Lebanon pointed out that his Government was asking the Council to extend UNIFIL for another six months because a longer period would give UNIFIL more stability and some of the tasks could only be carried out over a longer time span. He added that his Government also requested that the zone of operation of UNIFIL be extended to the whole of Lebanese territory so that UNIFIL could help the State to re-establish its authority throughout the whole country.<sup>251</sup>

The representative of Jordan recalled that UNIFIL had been set up in 1978 in order to ensure the withdrawal of the Israeli forces and enable the Lebanese Government to exercise full sovereignty over its territory, that four years later the Israeli occupation in Lebanon had expanded and that there were still practices, especially on the part of Israel, that were incompatible with the principle of preserving the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon. In view of these prevailing conditions, he urged the Council to accede to the Lebanese request and to adopt the draft resolution accordingly.<sup>251</sup>

The representative of the Netherlands warned that the withdrawal of UNIFIL would have grave destabilizing consequences and suggested that it should remain in the area so as to be available to play a role in any future security arrangements. He deplored the practice of limiting the freedom of movement of

UNIFIL personnel and urged the Israeli Government to stop hindering the Force from performing its duties. He also pointed to the increasing shortfall in the UNIFIL budget and the growing burden on the troop-contributing countries.

He added that his Government considered several objectives as significant for its future participation in the peace-keeping force, namely: (a) some noticeable progress should be made in establishing and increasing the authority of the Lebanese Government in the country; (b) there should be improvement in the prospect of withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon; and (c) a future role for UNIFIL in the security arrangements in southern Lebanon required its effective deployment along the Lebanese-Israeli border, free from unauthorized foreign troops or *de facto* forces. He demanded in conclusion that the peace-keeping operations of UNIFIL be clearly defined.<sup>251</sup>

The representative of Israel affirmed his Government's view that in the new circumstances UNIFIL as established in 1978 had outlived its usefulness and that the security arrangements involving Israel and Lebanon could and should be arrived at through negotiations between the two Governments.<sup>251</sup>

At the same meeting, the draft resolution sponsored by Jordan was put to the vote and adopted by 13 votes to none, with 2 abstentions, as resolution 529 (1983).<sup>252</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council,*

*Recalling its resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978), and all subsequent resolutions on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon,*

*Recoiling further its resolutions 508 (1982) and S09 (1982),*

*Having taken note of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the President of the Security Council and to the Secretary-General of 13 January 1983, and of the statement he made at the 241 Ith meeting of the Council,*

*Having studied the report of the Secretary-General and taking note of his observations,*

*Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,*

1. *Decides to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further interim period of six months, that is, until 19 July 1983;*

2. *Calls upon all parties concerned to co-operate with the Force for the full implementation of the present resolution;*

3. *Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the progress made in this respect.*

Following the adoption of the resolution, the representative of the United States welcomed the renewal of the UNIFIL mandate as a positive element in the negotiations between the Lebanese Government and other parties designed to restore Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity and to prevent any repetition of the recent tragic conflict.<sup>251</sup>

The representative of the Soviet Union recalled that the problem of Lebanon which arose as a result of massive Israeli aggression remained unsettled and that Israel continued to occupy a significant part of Lebanese territory. He pointed out in particular that the recent invasion in June 1982 had resulted in Israel occupying more than 40 per cent of Lebanese territory. He expressed his Government's wish to see the Council's resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), which had been adopted unanimously, fully implemented by all Council members as their implementation was the key to the solution of the problem.<sup>251</sup>

Decision of 26 May 1983 (2445th meeting): resolution 531 (1983)

At its 2445th meeting, on 26 May 1983, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF dated 20 May 1983<sup>253</sup> in the agenda.

In his report, the Secretary-General described the activities of the Force for the period 19 November 1982 to 20 May 1983. The Secretary-General indicated that UNDOF had continued to perform its functions effectively, with the co-operation of the parties, and that, during the period under review, the situation in the Israel-Syria sector had remained quiet. Nevertheless, the Secretary-General stated, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continued to be potentially dangerous and was likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem could be reached, as called for by the Council in resolution 338 (1973). In the existing circumstances, the Secretary-General considered the continued presence of UNDOF in the area to be essential. He therefore recommended that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, until 30 November 1983, and pointed out that the Governments concerned had expressed their agreement.

At the 2445th meeting, the President drew attention to a draft resolution,<sup>254</sup> which had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations, and put it to the vote. It received 15 votes in favour and was adopted unanimously as resolution 53 I (1983).<sup>255</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council.*

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

*Decides:*

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

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 30 November 1983;

(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).

On behalf of the Council, the President then made the following complementary statement:<sup>256</sup>

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 26, that "despite the present quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached". That statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council.

**Decision** of 18 July 1983 (2456th meeting): resolution 536 (1983)

At the 2456th meeting, on 18 July 1983, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL dated 12 July 1983<sup>257</sup> in the agenda.

The report contained an account of developments relating to UNIFIL for the period from 19 January to 12 July 1983. The Secretary-General pointed out that during the reporting period the UNIFIL area was generally quiet, with the exception of several incidents involving IDF soldiers and de facto forces entering the UNIFIL area with their weapons. UNIFIL continued to operate its check-points and to patrol its area of deployment and co-operated with the Lebanese authorities and United Nations agencies in extending humanitarian assistance to the population. He stated that UNIFIL continued to carry out the interim tasks laid down by him and

endorsed by the Council after the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in June 1982.

The Secretary-General affirmed that UNIFIL remained an important element of stability in southern Lebanon under the prevailing conditions. Although the circumstances under which the Force was established had been radically altered as a result of the Israeli invasion, the task of assisting the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in southern Lebanon remained especially relevant in the given situation. The Secretary-General warned that, before the Lebanese Government was in a position to assume effective control of the area, a withdrawal of UNIFIL would unquestionably be a serious blow to the prospect of an early restoration of the authority of the Lebanese Government in southern Lebanon as well as to the welfare of the inhabitants of the UNIFIL area of deployment. The Secretary-General considered it essential that the mandate of UNIFIL should once again be extended on an interim basis, bearing in mind the request for extension of the Lebanese Government.

At the beginning of the 2456th meeting, on 18 July 1983, the President invited the representative of Lebanon, at his request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.<sup>3</sup> The Council considered the item at that meeting.

The President drew the attention of the Council members to a draft resolution,<sup>258</sup> which had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations, and to a letter dated 5 July 1983<sup>259</sup> from the representative of Lebanon, in which he conveyed the request of his Government that the UNIFIL mandate be extended for another interim period of three months.

After a very brief suspension of the meeting, due to technical difficulties,<sup>260</sup> the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lebanon stated that since the establishment of UNIFIL in 1978 his country had witnessed dramatic changes, with the fighting between the PLO and Israel continuing on and off in varying degrees of intensity. While the political and military situation had become more difficult after June 1982, UNIFIL had remained a steadfast element preserving in the face of chaos the hope of peace, stability and legitimacy. He explained that his Government had requested the extension of the UNIFIL mandate for another three months as it expected ongoing negotiations to bring some clarification with regard to the future of Lebanon and especially the restoration of its sovereignty and territorial integrity. Lebanon's goal remained the withdrawal of all unauthorized forces from its territory and the ability of all Lebanese to live in peace and freedom.<sup>260</sup>

At the same meeting, the draft resolution prepared in the course of consultations was put to the vote and adopted, with 13 votes in favour, none against, and 2 abstentions, as resolution 536 (1983).<sup>261</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council.*

*Having heard the statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lebanon,*

*Recalling its resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978), and all subsequent resolutions on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon,*

*Recalling further its resolutions 508 (1982), 509 (1982) and 520 (1982), as well as all its other resolutions on the situation in Lebanon,*

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

**Having taken note** of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the President of the Security Council of 5 July 1983,

**Having studied** the report of the Secretary-General and taking note of his observations and recommendation expressed therein,

**Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,**

1. **Decides** to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further interim period of three months, that is, until 19 October 1983;

2. **Calls** upon all parties concerned to co-operate with the Force for the full implementation of its mandate as defined in resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) and the relevant decisions of the Security Council;

3. **Requests** the Secretary-General to report to the Council on the progress made in this respect.

Following the adoption of the resolution, the representative of France expressed deep concern about the change of circumstances under which UNIFIL had been forced to work, in particular the fact that an Israeli battalion had been stationed within the UNIFIL zone of deployment, and renewed his Government's support for UNIFIL. He also indicated that France would prefer to see the multinational force stationed in Beirut replaced by a United Nations force.<sup>261</sup>

The representative of the Soviet Union pointed out that the decision at that meeting represented the thirteenth case of extending the UNIFIL mandate since 1978, eloquent testimony to the absence of any improvement in the situation in Lebanon. He criticized in particular that the Israeli troops continued to support its puppets in southern Lebanon and to provoke incidents with UNIFIL personnel, in defiance of the clear decisions taken by the Council.<sup>261</sup>

The representative of the Netherlands announced that his Government had once more agreed to the extension of the UNIFIL mandate, but would withdraw its troops from Lebanon at the expiration of the new three-month period, unless new circumstances enabled it to reconsider its position.<sup>261</sup>

The representative of the United Kingdom concurred with the representatives of France and the Netherlands in regard of the future of UNIFIL as more of a humanitarian than peace-keeping operation.<sup>261</sup>

**Decision** of 12 September 1983 (2475th meeting): adjournment

By letter dated 9 September 1983,<sup>262</sup> the representative of Lebanon requested an urgent meeting of the Council. He referred to an earlier letter dated 2 September,<sup>263</sup> in which he had informed the Secretary-General about the withdrawal of Israeli troops from parts of Mount Lebanon and had conveyed his Government's determination to obtain the removal of all foreign troops from Lebanon and its request for assistance from LAS in that regard. He indicated that since the Israeli withdrawal hostilities had been escalating and the urgency of the need for an end to the fighting and violence had become still greater. He also transmitted his Government's wish for the Council to declare a cease-fire and to take the necessary measures for its implementation.

At its 2475th meeting, on 12 September 1983, the Council included the letter dated 9 September 1983 in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President invited the representative of Lebanon, at his request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

The President drew attention to the letter dated 2 September 1983 from the representative of Lebanon and to the report of the Secretary-General<sup>264</sup> on the situation in the Beirut area, in which the developments relating to the withdrawal of the Israeli troops from the Beirut area were summarized based on information received from OGB.

The representative of Lebanon informed the Council members about several points that had been discussed by his Government in view of the continuing destruction and bloodshed in Lebanon. He reported that Lebanon wanted to continue to exist as an independent and unified country, maintain its unique pluralist character, remove the non-Lebanese dimension of the conflict and determine its future freely. In order to enable the country to implement those intentions, Lebanon needed from the Council an immediate and effective cessation of all hostilities and the withdrawal of all illegitimate foreign forces.<sup>265</sup>

Following the statement by the representative of Lebanon, the 2475th meeting was adjourned.

On 19 September 1983, the representative of Lebanon submitted a draft resolution,<sup>266</sup> under which, in the preambular part, the Council, *intra alia*, would have expressed deep concern over the continuing deterioration of the situation in Lebanon and the repeated acts of violence; expressed deep grief at the extensive loss of life, human sufferings and destruction; reiterated its strong support for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries; and borne in mind that the grave situation confronting Lebanon endangered peace and security in the region.

In the operative part, the Council would have (a) called for an immediate cease-fire and a prompt cessation of all hostilities throughout Lebanon; (b) called upon all parties to refrain from all acts which violated Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity and which endangered its people's safety and unity; (c) authorized the Secretary-General to deploy immediately and in consultation with the Government of Lebanon an adequate number of United Nations observers to monitor the situation in the areas of hostilities and requested all parties to co-operate fully with the United Nations observers in the implementation of their mandate; (d) called upon all involved to facilitate the activities of ICRC, the United Nations Coordinator of Assistance for the Reconstruction and Development of Lebanon and all United Nations agencies concerned in humanitarian activities in all areas of hostilities, in order to evacuate the dead and wounded and provide food, medical supplies and humanitarian assistance; (e) called upon all States and parties to support the Lebanese Government in its efforts to ensure the complete and immediate withdrawal of all non-Lebanese forces whose presence in Lebanon did not have the approval of the Government of Lebanon; (f) requested the Secretary-General, as a matter of urgency, to initiate appropriate consultations, and in particular with the Government of Lebanon, on additional steps, including the possible deployment of United Nations forces, to assist that Government in its efforts to ensure peace and public order and secure the full protection of the civilian population in all areas of hostilities; (g) requested the Secretary-General to report to the Council on the implementa-



tion of the resolution within 72 hours; and (h) decided to remain seized of the matter.

In a letter dated 19 September 1983,<sup>267</sup> the representative of Lebanon referred to the draft resolution submitted by his delegation and to a meeting on the same day with the Council President and indicated that his delegation left it to the President's discretion to submit the draft to a vote at an appropriate time, when a positive response was likely to be obtained or if any of the members of the Council felt that further action on the case was rendered necessary in the light of new developments. He added that his delegation shared the concern of the President and the Secretary-General that the Council should have been unable, when confronted with a tragedy of such magnitude, to respond with a positive contribution to the cause of peace in Lebanon.

**Decision** of 18 October 1983 (2480th meeting): resolution 538 (1983)

**Decision** of 11 November 1983 (2496th meeting): President's statement

At its 2480th meeting, on 18 October 1983, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL dated 12 October 1983<sup>268</sup> in its agenda.

In his report, the Secretary-General gave an account of developments relating to UNIFIL for the period from 13 July to 12 October 1983. He stated that during the reporting period the UNIFIL area had been generally quiet. He pointed out that recent events in the Aley and Shouf regions had had no direct impact on the UNIFIL area of deployment, except for an influx of displaced persons from those regions. During the period, UNIFIL had continued to carry out the interim tasks laid down by him and endorsed by the Council after the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in June 1982, and in that context it had continued its efforts to provide protection and humanitarian assistance to the local population and to prevent activities that would hamper the restoration of the authority of the Lebanese Government in its area. He added that the capability of UNIFIL to achieve those objectives was contingent upon the co-operation of the Israeli authorities, who, as the occupying Power, were in control of the area.

The Secretary-General affirmed that UNIFIL remained an important element of stability in southern Lebanon, as its presence also represented the commitment of the United Nations to support the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and to help bring about the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from Lebanese territory, in accordance with resolutions 425 (1978) and 509 (1982). He warned that a withdrawal of the Force from its area of operation under the given circumstances would be a serious blow to the prospect of restoring the authority of the Lebanese Government, as well as to the security and welfare of the local population. He recommended to the Council that it should extend the mandate of UNIFIL, once again, for another interim period, bearing in mind the request of the Lebanese Government. He also called the attention of the Council to the increasing financial difficulties faced by the Force and reported that the accumulated shortfall in the UNIFIL Special Account had risen from \$168.5 million at the time of the last report to some \$173.9 million as of the beginning of October 1983.

At the same meeting, the President invited the representatives of Israel, Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic and, at the 2496th meeting, on 11 November 1983, the representative of the Sudan, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.<sup>3</sup> The Council considered the issue during the 2480th, 2495th and 2496th meetings, on 18 October and 11 November 1983.

At the beginning of the 2480th meeting, the President drew the attention of the members to a draft resolution,<sup>269</sup> which had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.

At the same meeting, the representative of Lebanon emphasized the need for the continued presence of UNIFIL in southern Lebanon, both as a demonstration of the commitment of the United Nations to Lebanon's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and as a fundamental factor for stability in the region. The requested approval of the renewal of the UNIFIL mandate for a further six months would enable the Lebanese authorities to restore legitimacy in the south and to seek to bring about the withdrawal of all unauthorized forces from all Lebanese territory.<sup>270</sup>

The President put the draft resolution to the vote; it received 13 votes in favour and none against, with 2 abstentions, and was adopted as resolution 538 (1983).<sup>271</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council,*

*Having heard* the statement of the representative of Lebanon.

**Recalling** its resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) and all subsequent resolutions on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon,

**Recalling further** its resolutions 508 (1982), 509 (1982) and 520 (1982), as well as all its other resolutions on the situation in Lebanon,

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

**Having studied** the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and taking note of the conclusions and recommendations expressed therein,

**Taking note** of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon 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 19 April 1984;

2. **Calls** upon all parties concerned to cooperate fully with the Force for the full implementation of its mandate, as defined in resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) and the relevant decisions of the Security Council;

3. **Requests** the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the progress made in this respect.

Following the adoption of the resolution, the representative of the Netherlands recalled that his Government had considered the withdrawal of its UNIFIL battalion from Lebanon as of 19 October and pointed out that the situation in Lebanon had not changed during the period covered by the latest report. He noted with appreciation the success of UNIFIL in providing humanitarian assistance to the local population and in trying to help restore the authority of the Lebanese Government. His Government realized that to withdraw from UNIFIL would have an adverse effect on efforts of the United Nations to contribute to a solution of the crisis in Lebanon and emphasized the undiminished interest of his country in United Nations peace-keeping. He expressed hope that a more meaningful role could be devised for UNIFIL and voiced his Government's

decision to retain a limited contingent with the United Nations Force. He further appealed to all Member States to pay their assessment for UNIFIL without delay since the financial foundations of the Force had continued to deteriorate **severely**.<sup>270</sup>

The representative of France pointed out that the **objectives** set out for the Force under resolution 425 (1978) had not always been attained and deplored that after the **Israeli** invasion of June 1982 an operational battalion of its soldiers was present in the zone controlled by UNIFIL. He expressed his Government's wish to give UNIFIL new tasks and mentioned that similar use could be made of the available UNTSO personnel in the **area**.<sup>271</sup>

The representative of the Soviet Union noted that the Security Council had dealt for the fourteenth time with the question of the extension of the UNIFIL mandate and saw that as testimony to the explosive situation in Lebanon. He accused Israel of clear steps to perpetuate its occupation of areas of southern Lebanon and indicated that the so-called multinational force was also consolidating its position on Lebanese soil, with United States Marines as backbone. In view of the fact that the date for the departure of the multinational force was long past, he **referred** to concerns expressed by the **Secretary-General** about the trend towards the creation of such **forces**.<sup>271</sup>

The representative of the United Kingdom expressed concern about the lack of progress with regard to the restoration of Lebanon's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and joined in the warning by the representative of the Netherlands regarding the financial shortfall in the UNIFIL special **account**.<sup>271</sup>

The representative of Israel stated that the resolution adopted by the Council at the meeting had not changed the UNIFIL mandate) **although** the situation had indeed been altered drastically. He reiterated his Government's view that UNIFIL had outlived its usefulness and its presence was no longer called for in southern Lebanon. He also **affirmed** his **Government's** willingness to proceed towards full and speedy implementation of the Israeli-Lebanese agreement of 17 May 1983 aimed at the restoration of Lebanese **sovereignty**.<sup>271</sup>

At its 2495th meeting, on 11 November 1983, the Council resumed its consideration of the **item**, and completed its deliberations at the 2496th meeting on the same day.

At the beginning of the 2496th **meeting** on 11 November 1983, the President made the **following statement**<sup>272</sup> on behalf of the members of the Council:

The members of the Security Council wish to express their profound concern at the recent and current developments in northern Lebanon which have caused and are still causing widespread suffering and loss of human life. The members appeal to all parties concerned to exercise the utmost restraint and seek freely to attain, and to respect, an immediate cessation of hostilities, to settle their differences exclusively by peaceful means and to refrain from the threat or use of force. The members of the Council highly appreciate the work of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and of the International Committee of the Red Cross in providing emergency humanitarian assistance to Palestinian and Lebanese civilians in and around the city of Tripoli. The members of the Council will continue to follow the situation in Lebanon with the greatest attention.

**Decision** of 23 November 1983 (2501st meeting): resolution 542 (1983)

By letter dated 22 November 1983,<sup>273</sup> the representative of France invoked Article 35 of the Charter and rule 2 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Council and requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the situation in northern Lebanon.

At its 2501st meeting, on 23 November 1983, the Council included the letter in its agenda. The President drew the attention of the Council members to a draft **resolution**,<sup>274</sup> which had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations, and put the draft resolution to the vote. It received 15 votes in favour and was adopted unanimously as resolution 542 (1983).<sup>275</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council.*

*Having considered* the situation prevailing in northern Lebanon, *Recalling* the statement made on this question by the President of the Security Council on 11 November 1983,

*Deeply concerned by the intensification of the fighting, which continues to cause great suffering and loss of human life,*

1. *Deplores* the loss of human life caused by the events taking place in northern Lebanon;

2. *Reiterates its call for the strict respect for the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;*

3. *Requests* the parties concerned immediately to accept a cease-fire and scrupulously to observe the cessation of hostilities;

4. *Invites* the parties concerned to settle their differences exclusively by peaceful means and to refrain from the threat or use of force;

5. *Pays tribute to the work done by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and by the International Committee of the Red Cross in providing emergency humanitarian assistance to the Palestinian and Lebanese civilians in Tripoli and its surroundings;*

6. *Calls upon* the parties concerned to comply with the provisions of the present resolution;

7. *Requests the Secretary-General to follow the situation in northern Lebanon, to consult with the Government of Lebanon, and to report to the Security Council, which remains seized of the question.*

**Decision** of 29 November 1983 (2502nd meeting): resolution 543 (1983)

At its 2502nd meeting, on 29 November 1983, the Council included the report of the **Secretary-General** on UNDOF dated 21 November 1983<sup>276</sup> in its agenda.

In his report, the Secretary-General described the activities of UNDOF for the period 21 May to 21 November 1983. The Secretary-General indicated that UNDOF had continued to perform its functions effectively, with the co-operation of the parties, and that, during the period under review, the **situation** in the Israel-Syria sector had remained quiet. Nevertheless, the Secretary-General stated, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continued to be potentially dangerous and was likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem could be reached, as called for by the Council in resolution 338 (1973). In the existing circumstances, the Secretary-General considered the continued presence of UNDOF in the area to be essential. He therefore recommended that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, until 31 May 1984, and pointed out that the Governments concerned had expressed their agreement.

At the same **meeting** the President drew attention to a draft **resolution**,<sup>277</sup> which had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations, and put it

to the vote; it received 15 votes in favour and was adopted unanimously as resolution 543 (1983).<sup>278</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council,*

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

*Decides.*

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

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 31 May 1984;

(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).

In connection with the resolution, the President then made the following complementary statement on behalf of the Council:<sup>279</sup>

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 26, that "despite the present quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached". That statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council.

**Decision** of 29 February 1984 (2519th meeting): rejection of a draft resolution

By letter dated 14 February 1984,<sup>280</sup> the representative of France requested, in accordance with rule 2 of the provisional rules of procedure, an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the situation in Beirut.

At its 2514th meeting, on 15 February 1984, the Council included the letter in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President invited, at the same meeting, the representatives of Italy and Lebanon, and at the 2516th meeting, on 23 February, the representative of Senegal, at their request, to participate in the discussion of the item without the right to vote.<sup>3</sup> The Council considered the issue during its 2514th to 2516th and 2519th meetings, from 15 to 29 February 1984.

The representative of France pointed out that the situation in the Beirut area had again become very serious and mentioned in particular the fate of the civilian population as a matter of greatest concern. He recalled that during the tragic summer of 1982 his delegation had proposed the establishment of a United Nations force in the Beirut area and that that draft resolution had failed owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council. The suggestion in a resolution adopted a few weeks later for the creation of such a force to assist the Lebanese Government in protecting the civilian population in Beirut would have taken too much time to be carried out. For those reasons, his Government had responded positively to the request by the Lebanese Government for French troops to join in the creation of a multinational force. Yet, as was evident in his letter dated 21 September 1982, addressed to the Secretary-General,<sup>281</sup> his Government maintained its wish for a United Nations force. He added that the time had come to review the issue of a new United Nations force and suggested that, in view of the clear need for such a force, it would be most suitable to assign certain detachments from UNIFIL to Beirut. Although France stood ready if asked by the United Nations to participate in such a force, it would appear preferable that the United Nations force

would contain no nationals of States that were permanent members of the Council. He proposed that the United Nations force be deployed to replace the multinational force, which should be withdrawn from Lebanon. Such a decision would be an effective contribution to the protection of the civilian population in Beirut and thus to the re-establishment of peace.<sup>282</sup>

At the 2515th meeting, on 16 February 1984, the representative of Egypt expressed support for the French proposal, as it would facilitate the end to bloodshed and the establishment of a cease-fire in Lebanon. All members of the Council should assist in seeking the withdrawal of the multinational force and in securing the rapid deployment of a United Nations force.<sup>283</sup>

The representative of the United Kingdom endorsed the French suggestion concerning an effective presence in and around Beirut and proposed that, in view of the role played by the United Nations observers in Beirut, thought be given to how to utilize their presence as a symbol of the international community. For that reason, his Government had submitted that the observers currently serving in Beirut could be somewhat increased in number and be assigned to undertake small confidence-building measures; furthermore, his Government would like to suggest the active use by the Secretary-General of his good-offices role; and lastly, the role of UNIFIL should be expanded to facilitate Israeli withdrawal from southern Lebanon.<sup>283</sup>

The representative of the United States stated that her Government shared the view expressed by France that the international community should assume greater responsibility for assisting the Lebanese people and welcomed the British suggestions. She expressed strong support for the United Nations peace-keeping role in Lebanon and singled out the record of UNIFIL as well as of the observers in Beirut and reiterated her Government's readiness to expand and strengthen those activities. In view of the consistent United States support for United Nations peace-keeping, her delegation stood ready to enter into serious discussions concerning the composition and deployment of United Nations forces throughout Lebanon.<sup>283</sup>

The representative of Italy, whose Government had joined in the multinational force in Beirut, stressed that Italy had always held the view that a United Nations presence, if feasible, should replace the multinational force and that, as the urgent intervention of the United Nations was required, the issue should be carefully looked into with which mandate and under which conditions a new United Nations force could be set up to safeguard humanitarian and political interests.<sup>283</sup>

The representative of the Netherlands also welcomed the French proposals as an indication for the way the United Nations must play a larger role to bring peace to the Beirut area. He cautioned, however, that one should not embark too hastily on a United Nations peace-keeping mission there and underlined what the Secretary-General had described as conditions for such an operation, namely: that the peace-keeping forces should be deployed with the permission of the host country and with the consent of all parties involved; that peace-keeping missions should be given a clearly defined mandate; and that such a force needed the full backing of the Council.

He hoped that careful reflection would benefit constructive proposals leading to a stable cease-fire in Beirut and expressed his appreciation for the British suggestions concerning some limited **steps**.<sup>283</sup>

At the 2516th meeting, on 23 February 1984, the representative of Lebanon recalled that his **Government** had requested, in a draft resolution submitted in September 1983, that the Council dispatch international observers to those areas from which the Israeli army had withdrawn, and that that draft resolution was still before the Council. He stated his Government's support for the deployment of United Nations forces or observers to assist in restoring peace and stability in his country. **Although** Lebanon would welcome the establishment of a **force** in the Beirut region alone, it held that any such force should have the means to undertake its task in all parts of Lebanon. He emphasized that his Government was nevertheless keen on seeing an international force in Lebanon and was ready to co-operate with the Council in drawing up and implementing any draft resolution that would effectively contribute to putting an end to the crisis in **Lebanon**.<sup>284</sup>

At the 2519th meeting, on 29 February 1984, the representative of France introduced a revised draft **resolution**,<sup>285</sup> which had resulted from painstaking, determined efforts among the members of the Council and reflected the **belief** of its supporters in the paramount role to be played by the United Nations in ending violence, decreasing tension and bringing about reconciliation and peace.

In the preamble of the draft **resolution**,<sup>286</sup> the Council would have expressed awareness of the importance of the action being carried out in Lebanon by the United Nations, both on behalf of peace and at the humanitarian level; recalled its resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) and the need for respect for the territorial integrity, unity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon, within its internationally recognized boundaries; noted the determination of Lebanon to secure the withdrawal of all **non-Lebanese** forces from Lebanon; earnestly desired a positive outcome of the dialogue of national reconciliation from which none was excluded, such dialogue being an indispensable basis for peace and security in Lebanon; expressed grave concern at the situation prevailing in Lebanon, and in particular in the Beirut **area**; and expressed the conviction that the situation had grave consequences for peace and security in the region as a whole and might impede the attainment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

In the operative part of the draft resolution, the Council would have (a) issued an urgent appeal for an immediate cease-fire and the cessation of all hostilities throughout Lebanon and requested that they be strictly complied with; (b) requested the Secretary-General to make without delay all arrangements to enable OGB to monitor compliance with the cease-fire in the Beirut area; (c) decided, in agreement with the Government of Lebanon, to constitute immediately, under the **authority** of the Council, a United Nations force composed of **personnel** furnished by Member States other than the permanent members of the Council and selected, if appropriate, from contingents of UNIFIL—the force would have taken up a position in the Beirut area, in co-ordination with the Lebanese authorities concerned, as soon as all elements of the multinational force would have withdrawn from Lebanese territory and territorial waters, and the United Nations force

would have had the mission of monitoring compliance with the cease-fire and helping to protect the civilian populations, including in the Palestinian refugee camps, and, without intervening in the internal **affairs** of Lebanon for the benefit of any party whatever, would thereby have assisted in re-establishing the peace necessary for the restoration of the territorial integrity, unity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon; (d) requested Member States to refrain from any intervention in the internal affairs of Lebanon and any action, in particular military action, that might jeopardize the **re-establishment** of peace and security in Lebanon, and to facilitate the task of the United Nations force; and (e) invited the Secretary-General to report to it within 48 hours on the implementation of the **resolution**.<sup>287</sup>

At the same meeting, the representative of the Soviet Union recalled the tragic days in the summer of 1982 when Israel massively invaded Lebanon, and pointed to the various Council resolutions in which immediate Israeli withdrawal had been demanded. He accused the United States of collaborating with the Israeli Government and worsening the **danger** **facin** the Lebanese Government and people. He noted that his Government had proposed as early as July 1982 to use **UNIFIL** contingents in the Beirut **region** and had supported the dispatch of a United Nations force in September 1982, following the massacre in the Sabra and Shatila camps; the latter suggestion, a draft resolution before the Council, had been defeated owing to the **negative** vote of the United States, which subsequently sent its Marines and contingents supplied by members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to Lebanon. He reiterated that the settlement in Lebanon should be achieved on the basis of Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982). He criticized the draft before the Council for several reasons: it should have spelt out more **clearly** the need to withdraw the **multinational** force and foreign warships from the area and should have offered a guarantee that the multinational force would not resume interference in the internal affairs of Lebanon. Some members had not been willing to provide those assurances. As there were a few other ambiguities, his delegation would have wished for some more time to clarify the remaining issues, but as the draft resolution had been finally introduced without further consideration of the position of the Soviet Union, his delegation would have to vote against the draft in its current form.<sup>\*\*\*</sup>

The representative of India stated that the Council should have had a little more time to resolve some remaining problems and regretted that that had not been **possible**.<sup>289</sup>

The representative of the United States pointed to the long and distinguished record of United Nations peace-keeping efforts in the Middle East and elsewhere in the world and called them an important adjunct to the primary purposes of the Charter. She added that those efforts had so far never proved inconsistent with the rights of any nations or any **peoples** and deplored that no new peace-keeping **force** would be established on that day by the Council. As the representative of the **Soviet** Union had announced his veto, she indicated that further comments on the draft would serve no useful **purpose**.<sup>288</sup>

At the same meeting, the President put the revised French draft resolution to the vote; it received 13 votes in favour and 2 against and was not adopted

owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.<sup>290</sup>

Following the vote, the representative of the Netherlands cited Article 24 of the Charter and expressed deep regret that the Council had failed to live up to the Charter mandate as well as to the expectations of the peoples of the world. He hoped that the Council could soon recover from this set-back and succeed in placing a peace-keeping force in the Beirut area.<sup>288</sup>

The representative of the United Kingdom stated that he failed to understand that anything of what had been said in the meeting justified a veto on a limited United Nations action requested by Lebanon and that he believed that many non-aligned countries would be greatly concerned about how easily the Council could be blocked in the attempt to exercise its duties under the Charter. He wondered why the delegation which had cast a negative vote had tried to restrict the Council discussion to the smallest geographical area possible, but had referred to actions far outside the city of Beirut. He affirmed his Government's conviction that the United Nations should play an extended role in Lebanon, but also stressed that all Members should strive to ensure that the Lebanese people could choose their own Government and adjust their internal affairs without external interference. He assured the Council that his delegation remained committed to an effort to use the Council and the United Nations for the job they were intended to do.<sup>288</sup>

The representative of France expressed deep regret that the draft resolution had not been adopted, and that the Council was not fulfilling its mission under the Charter, as it could not reach a decision in those circumstances.<sup>288</sup>

The representative of Lebanon appealed to the Council to reconsider the positions taken during the meetings and to respond positively and as soon as possible to any new initiative in view of the serious condition of Lebanon and in fulfilment of the principles of the Charter.<sup>288</sup>

Decision of 19 April 1984 (2530th meeting): resolution 549 (1984)

At its 2530th meeting, on 19 April 1984, the Council included in its agenda the report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL dated 9 April 1984.<sup>291</sup>

The report contained an account of developments relating to UNIFIL from 13 October 1983 to 9 April 1984. The Secretary-General pointed out that the situation in the UNIFIL area of southern Lebanon had remained relatively peaceful, while the situation in the rest of Lebanon had been cause for great concern in the last six months. He stated that the presence of UNIFIL was regarded as essential by the Lebanese Government and had been of benefit to the much-increased population of that area. He referred to a letter dated 9 April 1984<sup>292</sup> from the representative of Lebanon addressed to him in which the wish of the Government for an extension of the mandate of UNIFIL for another six months had been conveyed. He concurred with that request and recommended that the mandate be renewed.

The Secretary-General noted that, however beneficial the role of UNIFIL might be, it did not measure up to the original mandate or to the intentions of later Council resolutions. For those reasons, he had considered further means to achieve the principal objectives by focusing on the common interests

which all concerned had in changing the situation for the better. A reversion to genuine peace and normality in southern Lebanon would be in the interest of virtually all concerned. The Government of Lebanon and the people of southern Lebanon desired the restoration of Lebanese sovereignty and authority up to the international border as early as possible. Israel, while expressing its desire to withdraw its forces from Lebanon, was concerned over the security of its northern border after its withdrawal. The security of the Palestinian refugees, especially in the camps in the Sidon area, was a matter of grave concern and responsibility.

Taking into account all those concerns, the Secretary-General suggested that UNIFIL should be enabled to play an expanded role in attaining the objectives of Israel's withdrawal, peace and security in the region and the restoration of Lebanese authority and sovereignty up to the international boundary. A decision by the Council in that sense could provide the framework for the achievement of those objectives. He therefore proposed that the Council consider at the appropriate time a future course of action, including the following elements: (a) the temporary deployment of UNIFIL, with elements of the Lebanese army and internal security forces, in areas vacated by Israeli forces; (b) the immediate deployment of elements of UNIFIL in the Sidon area on Israeli withdrawal from that area, with a view to assuring the safety and security of the population, including Palestinian refugees in the camps in that area; and (c) the working out of the necessary arrangements to ensure that southern Lebanon would become a zone of peace under the sovereignty and authority of the Lebanese Government.

The Secretary-General acknowledged the difficulties of such a plan, but put it forward in view of the clear needs in southern Lebanon for the re-establishment of peaceful, normal conditions and economic prosperity.

In conclusion, he alerted the Council once again to the financial difficulties afflicting the work of UNIFIL and requested that the Governments of the more developed countries make available additional voluntary contributions to the UNIFIL Suspense Account.

The representatives of Lebanon and Israel were invited, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.<sup>3</sup> The Council considered the issue at its 2530th meeting, on 19 April 1984

At the same meeting the President drew attention to a draft resolution,<sup>293</sup> which had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations. He then put the draft to the vote; it received 13 votes in favour and none against, with 2 abstentions, and was adopted as resolution 549 (1984). It reads as follows:<sup>294</sup>

*The Security Council,*

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

*Having studied the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon of 9 April 1984 and taking note of the observations expressed therein,*

*Taking note of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the Secretary-General of 9 April 1984,*

*Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon.*

1. *Decides* to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further interim period of six months, that is, until 19 October 1984;

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 co-operate fully with the Force for the full implementation of its mandate;

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

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

Following the adoption of the resolution, the representative of the Soviet Union pointed out that the root causes of the dangerous situation in Lebanon needed to be re-examined again in view of the refusal by Israel to withdraw from all occupied Lebanese territory. He called upon the United Nations not to acquiesce in Israel's defiance and the inability of the peace-keeping force to perform the assigned task, the supervision of the Israeli withdrawal. If Israel persisted in its act of defiance, he suggested that the Council consider the adoption of effective measures in response to those circumstances.<sup>295</sup>

The representative of France expressed hope that the continued Israeli presence in the UNIFIL deployment area would be terminated soon and indicated that his Government was prepared to accept the Secretary-General's suggestion for a possible extension of the Force's mandate and deployment area.<sup>295</sup>

The representative of the Netherlands recalled that his Government had decided to maintain its contingent in UNIFIL since it was convinced that UNIFIL could play a bigger role, going beyond mere humanitarian assistance to the civilians in the area. He conveyed his Government's support for the ideas contained in the Secretary-General's report and for a discussion of how to apply those ideas for a strengthened role for UNIFIL. He again underlined the strong warning by the Secretary-General regarding its worsening financial condition.<sup>295</sup>

The representative of the United Kingdom stated that his Government supported both the Lebanese wish and the Secretary-General's proposals for a strengthened role for UNIFIL in southern Lebanon.<sup>295</sup>

The representative of Lebanon referred to his letter dated 9 April addressed to the Secretary-General and indicated his Government's strong support for the Secretary-General's recommendations regarding an enlarged and enhanced role for UNIFIL.<sup>295</sup>

The representative of Israel noted again that his Government regarded the continued presence of UNIFIL in the deployment area as superfluous, but added that its redeployment in the area north of the zone controlled by Israeli forces and as a buffer between the Syrian and Israeli forces could be useful.<sup>295</sup>

Decision of 21 May 1984 (2540th meeting): invitation of the PLO

By letter dated 17 May 1984,<sup>296</sup> the representative of Kuwait, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States at the United Nations for the month of May 1984, requested an urgent meeting of the

Council to consider the most recent act of aggression committed by Israel against the refugee camp of Palestinians at Ein El Hilweh in south Lebanon.

At its 2540th meeting, on 21 May 1984, the Council included the letter by the representative of Kuwait in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President invited the representatives of Israel, Kuwait and Lebanon, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.<sup>3</sup> At the same meeting, the Council also decided, by a vote and in accordance with its previous practice, to invite the representative of the PLO to participate in the deliberations, without the right to vote.<sup>297</sup> The Council further decided to extend invitations to the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People<sup>298</sup> and to Mr. Clovis Maksoud<sup>298</sup> under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.

The representative of Kuwait stated that on 15 May the Israeli occupation forces had surrounded the Palestinian refugee camp Ein El Helweh, in the southern part of Lebanon, demolishing about 30 houses in the camp and wounding or arresting dozens of Palestinians. He added that Israel should be called upon to put an end to the massacres, torture, imprisonment and dispersal of civilians in the occupied territories and to the destruction of their houses, and to protect those citizens and their goods until the future of the occupied areas had been finally decided. He urged the Council to shoulder its responsibility and to ensure the implementation of its resolutions on the matter and mentioned in particular those decisions regarding the violations of international law by the Israeli forces in the occupied areas, the withdrawal from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, the implementation of the Palestinians' right to self-determination and to their own State and the re-establishment of the territorial integrity, independence and security of Lebanon in connection with total Israeli withdrawal in accordance with resolution 509 (1982).<sup>298</sup>

The representative of Lebanon also described the Israeli attack on the Palestinian refugee camp and charged that approximately 150 people had been arrested and others wounded or killed. He called upon the Council to put an end to that state of affairs, by enforcing its resolutions providing for Israeli withdrawal and for transformation of the south into a zone of peace and security.<sup>298</sup>

The representative of the PLO wondered why the Commissioner-General of UNRWA had notified the Secretary-General only much later about the Israeli attack and referred to the information that the Israeli responsible officer had refused to receive the UNRWA official during the time of the attack. He also asked the Council to condemn Israel for that criminal act in south Lebanon and to impose mandatory sanctions on Israel. He added that the establishment of another commission to investigate the Israeli deeds would be of little use because Israel would again refuse to co-operate with the investigating group. In that connection he referred to a report of the Special Commission established under resolution 446 (1979) which had not been taken up by the Council because the members were not agreed on how to handle that report about Israeli practices in occupied territories.<sup>298</sup>

The representative of India stressed that the bloodshed should be immediately ended and that

Israel should be made to carry out its international obligations, including its withdrawal from south Lebanon and a stop to the illegal settlements in the occupied territories. He supported the call for an international peace conference on the Middle East to advance towards a comprehensive and just solution and committed his Government's full co-operation as the current Chairman of the Movement of **Non-Aligned Countries**.<sup>298</sup>

**Decision** of 30 May 1984 (2544th meeting): resolution 551 (1984)

At its 2544th meeting, on 30 May 1984, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF dated 23 May 1984<sup>299</sup> in its agenda.

In his report, the Secretary-General described the activities of UNDOF for the period 22 November 1983 to 21 May 1984. The Secretary-General indicated that UNDOF had continued to perform its functions effectively, with the co-operation of the parties, and that **during** the period under review the situation in the Israel-Syria sector had remained quiet. The Secretary-General stated that, despite the existing quiet in the sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continued to be potentially dangerous and was likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive, just and durable peace settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem could be reached, as called for by the Council in resolution 338 (1973). In the prevailing circumstances, the Secretary-General considered the **continued** presence of UNDOF in the area to be essential. He therefore recommended that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, until 30 November 1984, and pointed out that the Governments concerned had given their assent.

At the 2544th meeting, the President drew attention to a draft **resolution**,<sup>300</sup> which had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations. He then put the draft resolution to the vote; it received 15 votes in favour and was adopted unanimously as resolution 551 (1984).<sup>301</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council,*

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

*Decides:*

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

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 30 November 1984;

(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).

On behalf of the Council, the President made the **following statement**<sup>302</sup> regarding resolution 551 (1984):

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 26: "despite the present quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continues to **be** potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached". That statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council.

**Decision** of 6 September 1984 (2556th meeting): rejection of a draft resolution

By letter dated 24 August 1984,<sup>303</sup> the representative of Lebanon requested an urgent meeting of the

Council to consider all practices and measures taken by the Israeli **occupying** authorities in southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya region.

At the **2552nd** meeting, on 29 August 1984, the Council included the letter in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President invited the following, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote: at the **2552nd** meeting, the representatives of Israel, Kuwait, Lebanon and the Syrian Arab **Republic**;<sup>304</sup> at the **2553rd** meeting, the representatives of Qatar, the Sudan, the United Arab Emirates and **Yemen**;<sup>305</sup> at the **2554th meeting**, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran;<sup>306</sup> and at the 2555th meeting, the representatives of Cuba, Democratic Yemen and **Turkey**.<sup>307</sup> The Council, at its **2552nd** meeting, also extended invitations under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure to the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian **People**<sup>308</sup> and to Mr. Clovis **Maksoud**.<sup>308</sup> The Council considered the item at its **2552nd** to **2556th** meetings, from 29 August to 6 September 1984.

At the **2552nd** meeting, the representative of Lebanon stated that the Council should be informed about the situation of the people in Lebanon and especially of the inhabitants of the south, numbering more than **800,000**, who were suffering from Israel's occupation and **unjust** arbitrary practices. His delegation was lodging a complaint with regard to the Israeli practices in the hope that the members of the Council would understand and shoulder their **responsibilities**. He then offered a detailed picture of the many ways in which the Israeli occupation forces were oppressing the Lebanese population in violation of numerous provisions of the Fourth Geneva **Convention** of 12 August 1949, The Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In conclusion, he requested that the Council: (a) implement its resolutions on complete Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon, the immediate cessation of Israeli practices against the inhabitants of the south, the western **Bekaa** and the Rashaya region and respect for their **legitimate** right to live in **peace**, security and **dignity**; (b) compel Israel to **lift** its siege of the **occupied** territories; (c) insist on the necessity for Israel to respect the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the norms of international law, the Geneva Conventions of 1949, other **international** conventions and The Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907; and (d) stress Lebanon's inalienable right to its **waters**.<sup>308</sup>

The representative of Israel stated that there was not the slightest justification for the Lebanese complaint and for the Council meeting and **charged** that the Lebanese Government, under pressure from the Syrian Arab Republic, had started a propaganda campaign with regard to the alleged impairment of security in southern Lebanon in order to divert international attention from the worsening situation in the area of Beirut. He underlined that the **Government** of Lebanon, under international law, had the duty to prevent its territory from being used for terrorist attacks against another State and that the State under such attacks had the right to take appropriate self-defence measures to protect itself and its **citizens**.<sup>308</sup>

At the 2556th meeting, on 6 September 1984, the President drew the **attention** of the Council to a **draft**



**resolution**<sup>309</sup> that had been submitted by Lebanon. In the preambular part of the draft resolution, the Council would have, *inter alia*, reaffirmed previous resolutions on Lebanon and recalled the relevant provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and stressed the humanitarian principles of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and the obligations arising from the regulations annexed to The Hague Convention of 1907.

In the operative part., the Council would have (a) reiterated its call for strict respect for the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries; (b) affirmed that the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 applied to the territories occupied by Israel in southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district, and that the occupying Power was duty-bound to respect and uphold the provisions of the said Convention and of other norms of international law; (c) called upon Israel, the occupying Power, to respect strictly the rights of the civilian population in the areas under its occupation in southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district, and to comply strictly with the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949; (d) demanded that Israel immediately lift all restrictions and obstacles to the restoration of normal conditions in the areas under its occupation in violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, particularly concerning the closing of roads and crossings, the limitation of freedom of movement of individuals and the normal flow of persons and goods between those areas and the rest of Lebanon, and the obstruction to the normal conduct of Lebanese Government institutions and personnel; (e) urged all States parties to the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 to make every effort to ensure respect for and compliance with the provisions thereof in southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district; and (f) decided to remain seized of the question.

At the same meeting, the representative of Malta formally requested, in accordance with rule 38 of the provisional rules of procedure, that the draft resolution submitted by Lebanon be put to the vote.<sup>310</sup>

Prior to the vote, several delegations, who indicated support for the draft resolution, stated their reservations regarding the lack of balance in the text, especially in the light of the serious situation in parts of Lebanon other than the south.<sup>311</sup>

At the same meeting, the draft resolution was put to the vote; it obtained 14 votes in favour and 1 against and was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.<sup>312</sup>

Following the vote, the representative of the United States explained that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution, which it saw as one-sided and unbalanced in that it addressed humanitarian and security issues only in southern Lebanon but failed to refer to similar problems in other parts of Lebanon, to take account of the view that Israel was in compliance with the appropriate rules of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and The Hague Protocols of 1907 and to call for the removal of all foreign forces from Lebanese territory.<sup>310</sup>

Decision of 12 October 1984 (2559th meeting): resolution 555 (1984)

At its 2559th meeting, on 12 October 1984, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL dated 9 October 1984<sup>313</sup> in its agenda.

The report of the Secretary-General contained an account of developments relating to UNIFIL from 10 April 1984 to 9 October 1984. The Secretary-General noted that the situation in the UNIFIL area in southern Lebanon had remained relatively peaceful in the last six months and that the Government of Lebanon and the people of southern Lebanon had made it clear that the presence of UNIFIL was important to them. He referred to a letter dated 8 October in which the representative of Lebanon had informed him in writing of the Government's request that the mandate of UNIFIL be extended for a further period of six months and stated his own recommendation to that effect.

The Secretary-General further recalled his previous comments regarding an expanded role for UNIFIL and its contribution to the objectives of Israeli withdrawal and of restoring Lebanese authority and sovereignty up to the internationally recognized boundary. He listed in this connection once more the three specific steps in the redeployment of UNIFIL that would result in such an expanded role for the Force. He reported that after his own visit to the area in June 1984 and a follow-up visit by the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat, he had gained the impression that there was general agreement on the objectives formulated by him and on the importance of an expanded UNIFIL mandate for the implementation of those goals. In view of the relatively favourable situation in regard to the withdrawal of Israeli forces from southern Lebanon, he warned that the opportunity should not be missed, as that would result in a further deterioration in the area. He also made mention of the fragility of UNIFIL in terms of the circumstances under which the Force had to operate in southern Lebanon and under the impact of the financial difficulties faced by the operation.

Following the adoption of the agenda, the President invited the representative of Lebanon, at his request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.<sup>3</sup> The Council considered the issue at its 2559th meeting, on 12 October 1984.

At the same meeting, the President drew attention to the text of a draft resolution,<sup>314</sup> which had been drawn up in the course of the Council's consultations. He put the draft resolution to the vote; it received 13 votes in favour and none against, with 2 abstentions, and was adopted as resolution 555 (1984).<sup>315</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council,*

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

*Having studied the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon of 9 October 1984, and taking note of the observations expressed therein,*

*Taking note of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General of 8 October 1984.*

*Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,*

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

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

3. *Reemphasizes 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 (I 978), and calls upon all parties concerned to co-operate fully with the Force for the full implementation of its mandate;

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

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

Decision of 28 November 1984 (2563rd meeting): resolution 557 (1984)

At its 2563rd meeting, on 28 November 1984, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF dated 16 November 1984<sup>316</sup> in its agenda.

In his report, the Secretary-General described the activities of UNDOF for the period 22 May 1984 to 16 November 1984. He indicated that UNDOF had continued to perform its functions effectively, with the co-operation of the parties, and that during the period under review the situation in the Israel-Syria sector had remained quiet. The Secretary-General stated that despite the present quiet in the sector the situation in the Middle East as a whole continued to be potentially dangerous and was likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive, just and durable peace settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem could be reached, as called for by the Council in resolution 338 (1973). In the prevailing circumstances, the Secretary-General considered the continued presence of UNDOF in the area to be essential. He therefore recommended that the Council extend the mandate of the Force for a further period of six months, until 31 May 1985, and pointed out that the Governments concerned had given their assent.

At the 2563rd meeting, on 28 November 1984, the President drew attention to a draft resolution,<sup>317</sup> which had been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations. He then put the draft resolution to the vote; it received 15 votes in favour and was adopted unanimously as resolution 557 (1984).<sup>318</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council.*

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

*Decides.*

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

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 31 May 1985;

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

On behalf of the Council, the President then made the following complementary statement<sup>319</sup> regarding resolution 557 (I 984):

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 26: "despite the present quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached". That statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> S/14391, OR, 36th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1981.

<sup>2</sup> S/14354 (letter dated 30 January 1981), *ibid.*, and S/14381 (letter dated 24 February 1981), *ibid.* See also letters dated 2 February and 8 and 10 March 1981, in which the representative of Israel brought to the attention of the Council various incidents in which PLO activists based in Lebanon were said to have attacked Israeli communities (S/14355, S/14394 and S/14398, *ibid.*).

<sup>3</sup> For details, see chap. III of the present *Supplement*.

<sup>4</sup> 2265th mtg., paras. 7-26.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 27-44.

<sup>6</sup> S/14407, OR, 36th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1981.

<sup>7</sup> S/14414, *ibid.*, *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*, 1981.

<sup>8</sup> S/14482, *ibid.*, Suppl. for April-June 1981.

<sup>9</sup> S/14484, adopted without change as resolution 485 (1981).

<sup>10</sup> For the vote, see 2278th mtg., para. 10.

<sup>11</sup> S/14485, OR, 36th yr., *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*, 1981.

<sup>12</sup> S/14537, *ibid.*, Suppl. for April-June 1981.

<sup>13</sup> S/14557, adopted without change as resolution 488 (1981).

<sup>14</sup> For the vote, see 2289th mtg., para. 3.

<sup>15</sup> 2289th mtg., paras. 5-13.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 1-3 l.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 32-39.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 40-5 l.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 61-68.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 72-78.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 80-86.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 87-92.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 93 and 94.

<sup>24</sup> S/14572, OR, 36th yr., *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*, 1981.

<sup>25</sup> S/14596, *ibid.*, Suppl. for July-Sept. 1981.

<sup>26</sup> S/14586, *ibid.*

<sup>27</sup> S/14591 and S/14594, *ibid.*

<sup>28</sup> 2292nd mtg. for the discussion and the vote on the invitation to the PLO. For further details, see chap. III of the present *Supplement*.

<sup>29</sup> 2292nd mtg. For details, see chap. III of the present *Supplement*.

<sup>30</sup> 2292nd mtg., paras. 14-19.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 2 l-36.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 38-63.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 65-75.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 77-102.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 103-1 l. 6.

<sup>36</sup> S/14599, OR, 36th yr., *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*, 1981.

<sup>37</sup> S/14604, subsequently adopted without change as resolution 490 (1981).

<sup>38</sup> 2293rd mtg., paras. 5-12.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 1-5-2 l.

<sup>40</sup> For the vote, see *ibid.*, para. 2 l.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 23-38.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 39-44.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 45-54.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 62-82. For a detailed discussion of the concept of self-defence developed by the representative of Egypt, see chap. XI, part III, of the present *Supplement*.

<sup>45</sup> 2293rd mtg., paras. 95-141.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 143-166. The call for such sanctions was also supported by the representatives of Democratic Yemen (*ibid.*, paras. 171-181) and Yemen (*ibid.*, paras. 183-196).

<sup>47</sup> S/14759, OR, 36th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1981.

<sup>48</sup> S/14761, adopted without change as resolution 493 (1981).

<sup>49</sup> For the vote of the Security Council, see 2311th mtg., para. 2.

<sup>50</sup> S/14764, OR, 36th yr., *Resolutions and Decisions* 1981.

<sup>51</sup> S/14789 and Corr. 1, *ibid.*, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1981.

<sup>52</sup> 2320th mtg., para. 2. For further details, see chap. 111 of the present *Supplement*.

<sup>53</sup> S/14792, OR, 36th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1981.

- <sup>54</sup> 2320th mtg., paras. 5-20.
- <sup>55</sup> The Israeli representative referred here to document S/1 2620/Add.5, OR, 33rd yr., Suppl. for April-June 1978.
- <sup>56</sup> 2320th mtg., paras. 31-37.
- <sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 49-65.
- <sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 66-81.
- <sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 91-97.
- <sup>60</sup> S/14803, adopted without change as resolution 498 (1981).
- <sup>61</sup> For the vote, see 2320th mtg., para. 98.
- <sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 106-112.
- <sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 113-118.
- <sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 120-130.
- <sup>65</sup> S/14869, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1982.
- <sup>66</sup> S/14875, *ibid.*
- <sup>67</sup> S/14792, *ibid.*, 36th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1981.
- <sup>68</sup> See 2331st mtg., paras. 3-10, for the discussion and the vote on the invitation to the PLO. For further details, see chap. III of the present Supplement.
- <sup>69</sup> 2331st mtg., paras. 11 and 12. For details, see chap. III of the present Supplement.
- <sup>70</sup> 2331st mtg., paras. 15-39.
- <sup>71</sup> S/14888, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1982.
- <sup>72</sup> 2332nd mtg., paras. 5-27.
- <sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 28-38.
- <sup>74</sup> S/14890, adopted without change as resolution 501 (1982).
- <sup>75</sup> For the vote, see *ibid.*, para. 88. For details, see chap. IV of the present Supplement.
- <sup>76</sup> 2332nd mtg., paras. 106-113.
- <sup>77</sup> S/14962, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1982. The Government of Lebanon expressly reserved its right to call for an urgent meeting of the Council should the escalation continue or the situation deteriorate.
- <sup>78</sup> S/14989, *ibid.*
- <sup>79</sup> S/14995, OR, 37th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1982.
- <sup>80</sup> S/14996, *ibid.*, Suppl. for April-June 1982.
- <sup>81</sup> S/15079, *ibid.*
- <sup>82</sup> S/15118, adopted without change as resolution 506 (1982).
- <sup>83</sup> For the vote, see 2369th mtg., para. 2.
- <sup>84</sup> S/15124, OR, 37th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1982.
- <sup>85</sup> S/15161, *ibid.*, Suppl. for April-June 1982.
- <sup>86</sup> S/15162, *ibid.*
- <sup>87</sup> S/15163, *ibid.*, Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1982.
- <sup>88</sup> See 2374th mtg., paras. 2-8, for the discussion and the vote on the invitation to the PLO. For further details, see chap. III of the present Supplement.
- <sup>89</sup> 2374th mtg., paras. 9 and 10. For details, see chap. III of the present Supplement.
- <sup>90</sup> S/15168, adopted without change as resolution 508 (1982).
- <sup>91</sup> S/15164, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1982.
- <sup>92</sup> 2374th mtg., paras. 14-22.
- <sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 23-26.
- <sup>94</sup> For the vote, see 2374th mtg., para. 27.
- <sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 29-32.
- <sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 33-37.
- <sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 39-46.
- <sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 48-58.
- <sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 59-69.
- <sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 72-78.
- <sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 80-89.
- <sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 91-98.
- <sup>103</sup> S/15171, adopted without change as resolution 509 (1982).
- <sup>104</sup> S/15174, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1982.
- <sup>105</sup> See 2375th mtg., paras. 4-14, for the oral report of the Secretary-General.
- <sup>106</sup> See *ibid.*, paras. 1 J-20, for the introduction of draft resolution S/15171.
- <sup>107</sup> 2375th mtg., paras. 22-67.
- <sup>108</sup> For the vote, see *ibid.*, para. 91. See also chap. IV of the present Supplement.
- <sup>109</sup> 2375th mtg., paras. 100-108.
- <sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 109-115.
- <sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 116-123.
- <sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 136-145.
- <sup>113</sup> S/15178, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1982.
- <sup>114</sup> 2376th mtg., paras. 4-16.
- <sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 18-23.
- <sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 25-35.
- <sup>117</sup> S/15185, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1982.
- <sup>118</sup> 2377th mtg., paras. 3-22.
- <sup>119</sup> See *ibid.*, para. 23, for the vote. See also chap. IV of the present Supplement for further details.
- <sup>120</sup> 2377th mtg., paras. 25-28.
- <sup>121</sup> See *ibid.*: Ireland, paras. 29-38; Japan, paras. 39-42; President (France), paras. 83 and 84; and Soviet Union, paras. 43-47.
- <sup>122</sup> S/15194, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1982.
- <sup>123</sup> S/15194/Add.1, *ibid.*
- <sup>124</sup> S/15194/Add.2, *ibid.*
- <sup>125</sup> For the discussion and the vote on the invitation to the PLO, see 2379th mtg., paras. 2-7. For further details, see chap. III of the present Supplement.
- <sup>126</sup> 2379th mtg., para. 8. For details, see chap. III of the present Supplement.
- <sup>127</sup> S/15235, adopted without change as resolution 511 (1982).
- <sup>128</sup> For the vote, see 2379th mtg., para. 9. See also chap. IV of the present Supplement.
- <sup>129</sup> 2379th mtg., paras. 11-14.
- <sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 15-38.
- <sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 39-50.
- <sup>132</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 51-61.
- <sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 62-70.
- <sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 99-104.
- <sup>135</sup> For the full text of the Israeli letter, see the Secretary-General's report (S/15178), para. 5, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1982.
- <sup>136</sup> 2379th mtg., paras. 121-151.
- <sup>137</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 153-168.
- <sup>138</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 171-80.
- <sup>139</sup> S/15240, adopted without change as resolution 512 (1982).
- <sup>140</sup> 2380th mtg., paras. 4-9.
- <sup>141</sup> For the vote, see *ibid.*, para. 11. See also chap. IV of the present Supplement for further details.
- <sup>142</sup> The t&t introduced at the 2381st meeting was the second revision; for the full text, see S/15255/Rev.2, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1982. See *ibid.* for the original draft S/15255 and *ibid.* for S/15255/Rev.1. The text underwent considerable changes, with two operative paragraphs being added and major editorial changes throughout the text.
- <sup>143</sup> 2381st mtg., paras. 6-10.
- <sup>144</sup> See *ibid.*, para. 12, for the vote. See also chap. IV of the present Supplement for further details.
- <sup>145</sup> 2381st mtg., paras. 14-17.
- <sup>146</sup> S/15273, adopted without change as resolution 513 (1982).
- <sup>147</sup> S/15267 and Corr. 1, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1982.
- <sup>148</sup> For the vote, see 2382nd mtg., para. 6. See also chap. IV of the present Supplement.
- <sup>149</sup> S/15316, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1982.
- <sup>150</sup> S/15317, *ibid.* The draft resolution was not put to the vote.
- <sup>151</sup> 2384th mtg., paras. 7-26.
- <sup>152</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 28-51.
- <sup>153</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 52-77.
- <sup>154</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 79 and 80.
- <sup>155</sup> 2385th mtg., paras. 3-14.
- <sup>156</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 16-28.
- <sup>157</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 38-65.
- <sup>158</sup> S/15325, adopted without change as resolution 515 (1982).
- <sup>159</sup> 2385th mtg., paras. 66-72.
- <sup>160</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 74-76.
- <sup>161</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 77-82.
- <sup>162</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 83.
- <sup>163</sup> See *ibid.*, para. 110; the meeting was suspended for 10 minutes.

<sup>164</sup> For the procedural discussion, including several points of order and clarifications regarding the purpose of the consultations that the United States sought the longer suspension for, and the vote, see 2385th mtg., para. 122.

<sup>165</sup> For the vote on draft resolution S/15325, see 2385th mtg., para. 123.

<sup>166</sup> 2385th mtg., para. 125.

<sup>167</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 135-142.

<sup>168</sup> S/15330, adopted without change as resolution 516 (1982).

<sup>169</sup> See 2386th mtg., paras. 3-1 I, for the President's opening statement and the vote. For further details on the vote, see also chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

<sup>170</sup> 2386th mtg., paras. 1-1-3.

<sup>171</sup> S/15334, OR, 37th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1982*.

<sup>172</sup> S/15333, *ibid.*

<sup>173</sup> S/15334/Add.1, *ibid.*

<sup>174</sup> S/15342, *ibid.*, *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council. 1982*.

<sup>175</sup> 2388th mtg., para. 2.

<sup>176</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 3. Draft resolution S/15343 was subsequently considerably revised and then adopted as resolution 517 (1982). See OR, 37th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1982* for the original text.

<sup>177</sup> 2388th mtg., para. 4-9.

<sup>178</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 1030. In the original draft resolution (S/15343), the Council would have expressed deep shock and alarm regarding the atrocities committed by the Israeli force and the invasion of Beirut (preambular para.), condemned Israel for its failure to comply with Council resolutions (operative para. 3) and considered adopting effective ways and means in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations (old operative para. 7); it also would have contained several dates and deadlines regarding a report of the Secretary-General and the reconvening of the Council. The draft resolution contained seven operative paragraphs, whereas the revision had eight paragraphs, since a new paragraph 5 was added.

<sup>179</sup> 2388th mtg., paras. 31-39.

<sup>180</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 47-56.

<sup>181</sup> S/15343/Rev. 1, adopted without change as resolution 517 (1982).

<sup>182</sup> 2389th mtg., paras. 5-9.

<sup>183</sup> See *ibid.*, para. 16, for the vote. For details, see chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

<sup>184</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 30-35.

<sup>185</sup> S/15345, OR, 37th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1982*.

<sup>186</sup> S/15345/Add.1 and 2, *ibid.*

<sup>187</sup> S/15347, *ibid.* The draft resolution was revised and put to the vote, but failed of adoption, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.

<sup>188</sup> 2390th mtg., paras. 6-15.

<sup>189</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 16-35.

<sup>190</sup> 2391st mtg., paras. 14-19.

<sup>191</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 25-29.

<sup>192</sup> For the vote, see *ibid.*, para. 38. For details, see chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

<sup>193</sup> 2391st mtg., paras. 45-51.

<sup>194</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 52-56.

<sup>195</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 57 and 58.

<sup>196</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 73-77.

<sup>197</sup> S/15355, subsequently adopted, as orally revised, as resolution 518 (1982).

<sup>198</sup> 2392nd mtg., paras. B-10.

<sup>199</sup> S/15353, OR, 37th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1982*.

<sup>200</sup> S/15354, *ibid.*

<sup>201</sup> 2392nd mtg., paras. 1-19.

<sup>202</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 21-26.

<sup>203</sup> For the announcement regarding a short suspension, see 2392nd mtg., para. 72.

<sup>204</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 73.

<sup>205</sup> For the vote, see *ibid.*, para. 83. For details, see also chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

<sup>206</sup> S/15362, OR, 37th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1982*.

<sup>207</sup> S/15345/Add. 1, *ibid.*

<sup>208</sup> S/15357, *ibid.*

<sup>209</sup> S/15367, adopted without change as resolution 519 (1982).

<sup>210</sup> See 2393rd mtg., para. 3, for the vote. See also chap. VI of the present *Supplement*.

<sup>211</sup> S/15382, OR, 37th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1982*.

<sup>212</sup> S/15382/Add.1 and 2, *ibid.*

<sup>213</sup> S/15392, *ibid.*

<sup>214</sup> 2394th mtg., paras. 9-22.

<sup>215</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 52-61.

<sup>216</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 164-166.

<sup>217</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 169.

<sup>218</sup> S/15394/Rev. 1, subsequently adopted without change as resolution 520 (1982). The revised draft differed from the original draft in several respects: operative para. 1 was transferred to the preamble as its second paragraph; operative para. 2 became para. 1, with the words "and in particular its call upon all the parties to the conflict to cease immediately and simultaneously all military activities within Lebanon and across the Lebanese-Israeli border" deleted and replaced by "and 516 (1982) in all their components"; the fourth preambular para. was expanded beyond the words "political independence" and became operative para. 4; old operative paras. 3 and 4 became new operative paras. 2 and 3; old operative para. 5 calling upon Governments to ensure the implementation of the Council's relevant conditions was deleted; old operative para. 6 became new operative para. 7; and new operative paras. 5 and 6 were inserted. See S/15394, OR, 37th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1982* for the original text.

<sup>219</sup> 2395th mtg., paras. 3-5.

<sup>220</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 6.

<sup>221</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 7-16.

<sup>222</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 27-35.

<sup>223</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 36-48.

<sup>224</sup> For the President's declaration and the vote, see *ibid.*, paras. 54-57. For further details, see chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

<sup>225</sup> 1395th mtg., paras. 58-62.

<sup>226</sup> The report was issued on the same day as document S/15400, OR, 37th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1982*.

<sup>227</sup> For the statement of the Secretary-General, see 2396th mtg., paras. 7-24.

<sup>228</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 26-38.

<sup>229</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 39-48.

<sup>230</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 49-60.

<sup>231</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 74-83.

<sup>232</sup> See the statements by Greece, China, the President, Kuwait, Democratic Yemen, Poland, Spain, Egypt, the Syrian Arab Republic, France, Algeria, Ireland, the United Kingdom, Panama, Uganda and Guyana (2396th mtg.). See also in this connection the letter dated 18 September 1982, in which the representative of Greece requested an urgent meeting of the Council with a view to examining the critical situation in Lebanon (S/15401, OR, 37th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1982*).

<sup>233</sup> See 2396th mtg.: Algeria, paras. 154-158; and Syrian Arab Republic, paras. 126-142.

<sup>234</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 160-175.

<sup>235</sup> For the suspension and resumption of the meeting, see *ibid.*, para. 230. Draft resolution S/15402 was adopted without change as resolution 521 (1982).

<sup>236</sup> For the vote, see 2396th mtg., para. 247. See also chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

<sup>237</sup> S/15408, OR, 37th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1982*.

<sup>238</sup> S/15408/Add.1 and 2, *ibid.*

<sup>239</sup> S/15455, *ibid.*, *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1982*.

<sup>240</sup> 2400th mtg., paras. 2-1 I, for the discussion and the vote on the invitation to the PLO. For further details, see chap. III of the present *Supplement*.

<sup>241</sup> 2400th mtg., paras. 14-35.

<sup>242</sup> See *ibid.*, para. 36, for the suspension of the meeting.

<sup>243</sup> S/15458, adopted without change as resolution 523 (1982).

<sup>244</sup> For the vote, see 2400th mtg., para. 37. See also chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

<sup>245</sup> S/15493, OR, 37th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1982*.

<sup>246</sup> S/15503, adopted without change as resolution 524 (1982).

<sup>247</sup> For the vote, see 2403rd mtg., para. 1. See also chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

- <sup>248</sup> S/15504, OR, 37th yr., *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*, 1982.
- <sup>249</sup> S/15557, *ibid.*, 38th yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-March 1983*.
- <sup>250</sup> S/15564, adopted without change as resolution 529 (1983).
- <sup>251</sup> 241 lth mtg.
- <sup>252</sup> For the vote, *see ibid.* *See also* chap. IV of the present Supplement.
- <sup>253</sup> S/15777, OR, 38th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1983*.
- <sup>254</sup> S/15793, adopted without change as resolution 531 (1983).
- <sup>255</sup> *See* 2445th mtg. for the vote. *See also* chap. IV of the present Supplement.
- <sup>256</sup> S/15797, OR, 38th yr., *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*, 1983.
- <sup>257</sup> S/15863, *ibid.*, *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1983*.
- <sup>258</sup> S/15871, adopted without change as resolution 536 (1983).
- <sup>259</sup> S/15868, OR, 38th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1983*.
- <sup>260</sup> 2456th mtg.
- <sup>261</sup> *See ibid.* *See also* chap. IV of the present Supplement.
- <sup>262</sup> S/15974, OR, 38th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1983*.
- <sup>263</sup> S/15953, *ibid.*
- <sup>264</sup> S/15956, *ibid.*
- <sup>265</sup> 2475th mtg.
- <sup>266</sup> S/15990, OR, 38th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1983*.
- <sup>267</sup> S/15994, *ibid.*
- <sup>268</sup> S/16036, *ibid.*, *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1983*.
- <sup>269</sup> S/16046, adopted without change as resolution 538 (1983).
- <sup>270</sup> 2480th mtg.
- <sup>271</sup> *See ibid.* for the vote. For further details, *see also* chap. IV of the present Supplement.
- <sup>272</sup> S/16142, OR, 38th yr., *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*, 1983.
- <sup>273</sup> S/16178, *ibid.*, *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1983*.
- <sup>274</sup> S/16179, adopted without change as resolution 542 (1983). *See* S/16228, OR, 38th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1983*, for the report of the Secretary-General in pursuance of resolution 542 (1983), paragraph 7.
- <sup>275</sup> For the vote, *see* 2501st mtg.
- <sup>276</sup> S/16169, OR, 38th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1983*.
- <sup>277</sup> S/16187, adopted without change as resolution 543 (1983).
- <sup>278</sup> For the vote, *see* 2502nd mtg.
- <sup>279</sup> S/16188, OR, 38th yr., *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*, 1983.
- <sup>280</sup> S/16339, *ibid.*, 39th yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-March 1984*.
- <sup>281</sup> S/15420, *ibid.*, 37th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1982*.
- <sup>282</sup> 2514th mtg.
- <sup>283</sup> 25 15th mtg.
- <sup>284</sup> 2516th mtg.
- <sup>285</sup> S/16351/Rev.2, OR, 39th yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-March 1984*.
- <sup>286</sup> For the original draft and the first revision, *see ibid.* Since the changes in the different drafts were merely editorial, they are not presented here in detail.
- <sup>287</sup> *See* 25 19th mtg. for the French statement.
- <sup>288</sup> 2519th mtg.
- <sup>289</sup> *Ibid.* For similar complaints, *see* the statements by Malta and Nicaragua.
- <sup>290</sup> *See* 25 19th mtg. for the vote. *See also* chap. IV of the present Supplement.
- <sup>291</sup> S/16472, OR, 39th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1984*.
- <sup>292</sup> S/16471, *ibid.* The letter also contained an appeal by the Lebanese Government for new energetic efforts by the Council to promote the objectives of UNIFIL in southern Lebanon.
- <sup>293</sup> S/16491, adopted without change as resolution 549 (1984).
- <sup>294</sup> For the vote, *see* 2530th mtg. *See also* chap. IV of the present Supplement.
- <sup>295</sup> 2530th mtg.
- <sup>296</sup> S/16569, OR, 39th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1984*.
- <sup>297</sup> For the discussion and the vote (11 in favour and 1 against, with 3 abstentions), *see* 2540th mtg. For further details, *see* chap. III of the present Supplement.
- <sup>298</sup> 2540th mtg.
- <sup>299</sup> S/16573, OR, 39th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1984*.
- <sup>300</sup> S/16592, adopted without change as resolution 551 (1984).

- <sup>301</sup> For the vote, *see* 2544th mtg.
- <sup>302</sup> S/16593, OR, 39th yr., *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*, 1984.
- <sup>303</sup> S/16713, *ibid.*, *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1984*.
- <sup>304</sup> 2552nd mtg.
- <sup>305</sup> 2553rd mtg.
- <sup>306</sup> 2554th mtg.
- <sup>307</sup> 2555th mtg.
- <sup>308</sup> 2552nd mtg. For further details, *see* chap. III of the present Supplement.
- <sup>309</sup> S/16732, OR, 39th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1984*. The draft resolution was put to the vote and not adopted, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.
- <sup>310</sup> 2556th mtg.
- <sup>311</sup> *See* 2556th mtg., statements by the Netherlands, Peru and the United Kingdom.
- <sup>312</sup> For the vote, *see* 2556th mtg.
- <sup>313</sup> S/16776, OR, 39th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1984*.
- <sup>314</sup> S/16779, adopted without change as resolution 555 (1984).
- <sup>315</sup> For the vote, *see* 2559th mtg. *See also* chap. IV of the present Supplement.
- <sup>316</sup> S/16829, OR, 39th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1984*.
- <sup>317</sup> 5116845, adopted without change as resolution 557 (1984).
- <sup>318</sup> For the vote, *see* 2563rd mtg.
- <sup>319</sup> S/16847, OR, 39th yr., *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*, 1984.

#### B. THE SITUATION IN THE OCCUPIED ARAB TERRITORIES

Decision of 17 December 1981 (2319th meeting): resolution 497 (1981)

By letter dated 14 December 1981,<sup>1</sup> the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic requested an urgent meeting of the Council to discuss the decision of the Israeli Government to apply Israeli laws to the occupied Golan Heights.

At its 2316th meeting, on 16 December 1981, the Council included the letter in its agenda. The Council decided to invite the following, at their request, to participate without vote in the discussion of the question: at the 2316th meeting, the representatives of Cuba, Egypt, Israel, Kuwait, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey and Viet Nam; at the 2317th meeting, the representatives of India and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya; at the 2318th meeting, the representatives of Pakistan, Romania, Yugoslavia and Zaire; and at the 2319th meeting, the representatives of Indonesia and Senegal.<sup>2</sup> The Council also decided to extend an invitation to Mr. Clovis Maksoud under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure.) The Council considered the issue at its 2316th to 2319th meetings, on 16 and 17 December 1981.

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic informed the Council that on 14 December 1981 the Israeli Government had decided to annex the Syrian Golan Heights, occupied since June 1967, by enacting legislation imposing Israeli laws, jurisdiction and administration on that part of the Syrian Arab Republic. He denounced the Israeli action as an outright violation of international law prohibiting occupation and annexation as well as of the Charter of the United Nations, which banned the use of force and the acquisition of territory by force. He viewed the latest annexationist episode as another step in a process of colonization begun by Israel in 1967. He sharply condemned the Israeli action as a flagrant

violation of the Charter, of Council resolutions, in **particular** resolution 338 (1973), and of the **Israeli-Syrian** cease-fire and called upon the Council to resort to pertinent measures under Chapter VII of the Charter, especially **mandatory** sanctions, and to declare the Israeli decisions **null** and void. Otherwise, the situation might worsen, endangering further the region and the peace and security of the world at **large**.<sup>4</sup>

The representative of Israel stated that **the** area in question was very small but of greatest significance to the security of **the** people of Israel. He noted that the Syrian Arab Republic had, since 1948, claimed that there was no international boundary between it and Israel and that only the ultimate settlement could establish permanent boundaries. He described several major events **in** which the **Syrians** had bombarded **Israeli towns** and villages, and emphasized the vital interest of the Israeli side to be protected against strikes from the Golan Heights. He denounced the Syrian rejectionist attitude towards a comprehensive peace settlement with Israel under resolution 242 (1967). In view of **the need** to administer everyday activities in the area occupied since 1967 his Government and the Knesset had decided to regularize the situation on the Golan Heights by applying Israeli law, jurisdiction and administration to the area. He added that no responsible Government in Israel would agree to return to the totally insecure armistice lines that were obtained before 1967.<sup>5</sup>

The representative of Kuwait, speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States at the **United Nations**, charged that the new *fait accompli* **was** in line with the Israeli plan to annex all the occupied territories. The annexation of the Golan Heights violated the Charter principle **regarding** the **inadmissibility** of the acquisition of territory by **force** as **well as** the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. It **also** aggravated an already explosive situation in the Middle **East**.<sup>6</sup>

The representative of Egypt regarded the illegal Israeli action as a serious challenge to the prospects of stability and to the peace process in the Middle East. He pointed out that the extension of Israeli laws and jurisdiction over the occupied Golan Heights ran counter to resolution 242 (1967) reaffirming, *inferred*, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and to the agreement of disengagement between Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic of 30 May 1974.<sup>7</sup>

The representative of the **United Kingdom** affirmed that the Golan Heights belonged to the Syrian Arab Republic and formed part of the territories occupied **by** Israel in 1967; therefore the British Government considered the change of status of the Golan Heights as contrary to international law and tantamount to annexation and held all measures implementing the initiative to have no legal **validity**.<sup>8</sup>

At the 2317th meeting, on 16 December 1981, the representative of Cuba read out a communique adopted at the plenary meeting of **the** Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, in which it expressed deepest concern over the expansionist and annexationist policies of Israel regarding the Golan Heights and emphasized the principle that the acquisition of territory **by force** was inadmissible under international law; the communique also condemned the Israeli act as a flagrant violation of the Charter,

international law and relevant United Nations resolutions and supported the call of the Syrian Arab Republic for appropriate action by the Council in order to restore the full sovereignty of the Syrian Arab Republic over all its occupied territories. The representative of Cuba added that the Council should demand that Israel revoke that decision; otherwise, the United Nations should without delay impose on Israel the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the **Charter**.<sup>9</sup>

The representative of Lebanon warned against international relations being **governed** by the logic used by the representative of Israel in justifying the annexation of the Golan Heights, as there would be no limits to security obsessions and **expansionism**.<sup>10</sup>

The representative of the Soviet Union stated that it could not be denied that the Israeli decision contradicted all the norms of international law and constituted a gross violation of the Charter and its fundamental principles, including the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. His delegation resolutely condemned the **Israeli transgression** and asked that the Council pass a resolution declaring the Israeli measures illegal and invalid and **demanding** that Israel immediately retract annexation of the Golan Heights. If Israel refused to heed the will of the international community, the Council should convene and weigh the possibility of measures under Chapter VII of the Charter against Israel.<sup>11</sup>

The representative of France also condemned **the** Israeli act as tantamount to annexation and **a** direct attack on the sovereignty of the Syrian Arab Republic over territory that belonged to it and had been occupied in 1967. He called the act a violation of the principle of the non-acquisition of territory by force as laid down in resolution 242 (1967) and added that the Israeli law was completely null and void.<sup>12</sup>

At the 2318th meeting, on 17 December 1981, the representative of Zaire stated that the entire international community had condemned the act of annexation as violating United Nations resolutions and the principle of the inadmissibility **of** the acquisition of territories **by** force as well as major instruments of international law. He urged the members of the Council and particularly its five permanent members to seek a *sui generis* agreement to guarantee the existence and security of all States in the region, including that of a Palestinian Arab State, in view of a rapidly deteriorating situation in which **irrationality** and violence **seemed** to prevail over reason and the **desire for peace**.<sup>13</sup>

The President of the Council, speaking in his capacity as the representative of Uganda, joined the other speakers in **denouncing** the Israeli act as a clear case of annexation that was without any moral, political or legal justification and therefore totally **invalid**. He **cited** Article 2, paragraphs 4 and 3, of the Charter as well as article 47 of the fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and The Hague Convention No. VI of 1907 and pointed out that the Israeli measure had violated those principles of **international** law. He rejected the Israeli attempt to justify the annexation of the Golan Heights and depicted the new action as another step **in** a well-orchestrated programme of expansion, aggression and domination covering the whole of the Middle East. He indicated his delegation's support for the draft resolution

before the Council and stressed that Israel could achieve security only through a negotiated and comprehensive peace in the Middle East, beginning with a just settlement of the Palestinian question.<sup>14</sup>

Resuming his function as President, he then suspended the meeting for 10 minutes;<sup>15</sup> thereafter he drew the attention of the members to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's consultations,<sup>16</sup> which he put to the vote. The draft resolution received 15 votes in favour and was adopted unanimously as resolution 497 (1981).<sup>17</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council,*

*Having considered the letter of 14 December 1981 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic contained in document S/14791,*

*Reaffirming that the acquisition of territory by force is inadmissible, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the principles of international law and relevant Security Council resolutions,*

1. Decides that the Israeli decision to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights is null and void and without international legal effect;

2. Demands that Israel, the occupying Power, should rescind forthwith its decision;

3. Determines that all the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, continue to apply to the Syrian territory occupied by Israel since June 1967;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the implementation of the present resolution within two weeks and decides that, in the event of non-compliance by Israel, the Council would meet urgently, and not later than 5 January 1982, to consider taking appropriate measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

Following the vote, the representative of the United States explained that his delegation had supported the draft resolution because it reaffirmed previous Council resolutions spelling out the basis of a just and durable peace in the region. He mentioned in particular the withdrawal from occupied territories and the right of every State in the area to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries. He expressed deep regret at the Israeli action regarding the Golan Heights and stated that his Government did not accept as valid unilateral acts designed to change the status of territories occupied in 1967. He urged both Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic to seek to resolve their differences by negotiations within the framework of resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).<sup>18</sup>

The representative of Israel indicated that his Government could not accept the resolution and charged that the Syrian Arab Republic, in attacking Israel several times since its establishment, had violated the principle that force should not be used or threatened and that it had failed to observe the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes in rejecting negotiations with Israel.<sup>19</sup>

**Decision of 20 January 1982 (2329th meeting):**  
rejection of a draft resolution

**Decision of 28 January 1982 (2330th meeting):**  
resolution 500 (1982)

In pursuance of paragraph 4 of resolution 497 (1981), the Secretary-General submitted two reports<sup>20</sup> to the Council in which he informed the Council about his contacts with the Israeli Government and the clear negative reaction by Israel with regard to the cancellation of its measures on the Golan Heights.

At its 2322nd meeting, on 6 January 1982, the Council included resolution 497 (1981) and the report dated 31 December 1981 of the Secretary-General (S/14821) in its agenda. The Council decided to invite the following, at their request, to participate, without vote, in the discussion on the item: at the 2322nd meeting, the representatives of Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Israel, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Morocco, Senegal, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen and Yugoslavia; at the 2323rd meeting, the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Bangladesh, the German Democratic Republic, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the Sudan; at the 2324th meeting, the representatives of Hungary, Iraq, Pakistan and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic; at the 2325th meeting, the representatives of Bulgaria, Greece, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Portugal and Viet Nam; at the 2327th meeting, the representatives of Burundi, Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Mauritania, Oman and the United Arab Emirates; and at the 2329th meeting, the representative of Grenada.\*

At its 2322nd meeting, the Council also decided, by a vote, and in accordance with the Council's previous practice, to extend an invitation to the representative of the PLO to participate in the debate on the item.<sup>21</sup> At the same meeting, the Council further decided to extend an invitation to Mr. Clovis Maksoud under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure.\*\* The Council considered the item at its 2322nd to 2330th meetings, from 6 to 28 January 1982.

At the 2322nd meeting, on 6 January 1982, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic stated that the immediate rejection by Israel of resolution 497 (1981), also made clear in the two reports submitted by the Secretary-General, led the Syrian Government to resort again to the Council in order to compel Israel to rescind its grave breach of international law. He charged that Israel had systematically tried to erode the Israeli-Syrian Armistice Agreement of 1949 in order to undermine the involvement of the United Nations in the Palestinian question. He reiterated his Government's two principal conditions for peace in the Middle East: the unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all the occupied Arab territories, and the exercise by the Palestinian people of their right to self-determination and to their own national State. He proposed that since the Council's resolution had been flouted by Israel, the Council should invoke its powers under Articles 39 and 41 of Chapter VII of the Charter in response to what, under General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974, was clearly a case of aggression by Israel against the Syrian Arab Republic and other Arab neighbours. He also noted that Israel's policies contradicted the principles of the non-use of force and of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and added that, if the Council did not impose sanctions against Israel, his Government would reserve its right under Article 51 to deal with the Israeli aggression.\*)

The representative of Israel invoked the principles of the Charter prohibiting the use or threat of force and obligating members to settle their disputes by peaceful means and repeated his charges regarding the acts of aggression mounted by the Syrian Arab Republic against the people of Israel. He cited provisions from the Definition of Aggression annexed to General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX)



and called upon the Syrian Arab Republic to accept the Israeli invitation to unconditional negotiations between the two States.\*

At the 2328th meeting, on 14 January 1982, the representative of Jordan introduced the text of a draft resolution,\* which was sponsored by his delegation but reflected the unanimous support of LAS as well as support from the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. Under the draft resolution, in its **pream-**bular part, the Council would have, *in*fer *alia*, recalled its resolution 497 (1981), recalled General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), which, in its annex, defined an act of aggression as "the **invasion** or attack by the armed forces of a State of the territory of another State, or any military occupation, however temporary, resulting from such invasion or attack, or any annexation by the use of force of the territory of another State or part thereof", determined that the continued occupation of the Syrian Golan Heights since 1967 and its annexation by Israel on 14 December 1981 constituted a continuing threat to international peace and security, and acted in accordance with Articles 39 and 41 of the Charter.

In the operative part of the draft resolution, the Council would have (a) strongly condemned Israel for its failure to comply with Council resolution 497 (1981) and General Assembly resolution 36/226 B; (b) determined that Israeli measures in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights, culminating in Israel's decision of 14 December 1981 to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights, constituted an act of aggression under the provisions of Article 39 of the Charter; (c) decided that all Member States, in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter, should: (i) refrain from supplying Israel with any weapons and related military equipment and suspend any military assistance to Israel; and (ii) suspend economic, financial and technological assistance to Israel; (d) requested all Member States to consider suspending diplomatic and consular relations with Israel; (e) decided also to call upon all Member States to carry out the present decision of the Security Council, in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter; (f) urged, having regard to the principle stated in Article 2, paragraph 6, of the Charter, States not Members of the United Nations to act in accordance with the provisions of the resolution; (g) called upon all other United Nations bodies, the specialized agencies of the United Nations and their members to conform their relations with Israel to the terms of the resolution; (h) decided to establish, in accordance with Article 29 of the Charter, a committee of the Council to examine and report to the Council on the progress of the implementation of the resolution; and (i) requested the Secretary-General to submit a report to the Council on the Implementation of the resolution.<sup>26</sup>

At the 2329th meeting, on 20 January 1982, the representative of Ireland stated that his Government supported firm and clear measures in response to Israel's defiance of resolution 497 (1981), measures that would ensure that the Israeli claim to have annexed the Golan Heights would be without international legal effect. As the Israeli measures were legal and administrative, the Council should take specific legal countermeasures to ensure that the Israeli claims received no recognition. That could be done through the Council's reiterating that the Israeli decision was illegal and void, **determining** that States must give no recognition to it and deciding clearly

that all States should review their relations with Israel to ensure that no such recognition was given or implied. His delegation had worked towards a draft resolution on those lines, but regrettably agreement among all Council members had so far been impossible.

He then reviewed the draft submitted by Jordan and pointed out among other things that the meaning of the law-making function of the Council under Chapter VII of the Charter should be spelt out clearly and precisely with regard to the obligations incurred by the international community if the text were to be adopted. In view of the imprecise quality of the provisions in the draft resolution his delegation would abstain in the vote, although it agreed with a good part of the language proposed.\*

The representative of the United States called the draft resolution an aberration—even a **perversion**—of the purpose which the Council was called upon by Chapter VII to perform; she cited Article 39 and suggested that the draft resolution, instead of assigning a constructive role to the Council of preventing an aggravation of the situation, would exacerbate the situation. She renewed her Government's call for **negotiations** based on resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973) and 497 (1981) and indicated that her delegation opposed the Jordanian draft **resolution**.<sup>28</sup>

At the same **meeting**, the President put the revised draft **resolution**<sup>29</sup> to the vote; it received 9 votes in favour, 1 vote against and 5 abstentions and was not adopted owing to the **negative** vote of a permanent member of the Council.<sup>30</sup>

Following the vote, the representative of the United Kingdom explained that his delegation had abstained in the vote, as it considered a determination under Article 39 of the Charter that the Israeli action constituted an "act of aggression\*" too **far-reaching** and serious and recalled that even at the time of the Korean War the Council had not gone beyond the finding that the events in question constituted a breach of the peace. He added that his delegation would have preferred a consensus, without invoking Chapter VII, calling upon all States to deny recognition or assistance to Israel's decision. Since no consensus had been achieved so far on the issue, his delegation remained willing to work for the common objective of getting Israel to rescind its illegal **act**.<sup>31</sup>

The representative of Israel condemned the effort to exploit the Council's proceedings for the relentless warfare against his country and appealed once again to the Syrian Government to start negotiations with Israel to settle all the outstanding **issues** on the basis of resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).<sup>32</sup>

At the 2330th meeting, on 28 January 1982, when the Council resumed consideration of the issue at the request of the representative of **Jordan**,<sup>33</sup> the President drew attention to a draft **resolution**<sup>34</sup> sponsored by **Jordan**.<sup>35</sup>

The representative of Jordan stated that in view of the defeat of his first draft, which had prevented the Council from exercising its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, he wished to submit a new draft resolution calling for an emergency special session of the General Assembly and asked that the text be put to the **vote**.<sup>36</sup>

The representative of Israel rejected Jordan's call for an emergency special session of the General Assembly, as the regular session of the Assembly was due to resume at a date to be announced and the

resolution of the Assembly mentioned in the first Jordanian draft had been adopted in violation of Article 12, paragraph 1. Citing a number of relevant sources from earlier occasions regarding emergency special sessions, he suggested that such a step would be neither proper nor needed, but considered the abuse of the emergency mechanism under rule 8 of the Assembly's rules of procedure as inevitable.<sup>37</sup>

The President then put the draft resolution to the vote; it received 13 votes in favour and none against, with 2 abstentions, and was adopted as resolution 500 (1982).<sup>38</sup> It reads as follows:

*The Security Council.*

*Having considered the item on the agenda of its 2329th meeting, as contained in document S/Agenda/2329/Rev. I,*

*Taking into account that the lack of unanimity of its permanent members at the 2329th meeting has prevented it from exercising its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security,*

*Decides to call an emergency special session of the General Assembly to examine the question contained in document S/Agenda/2329/Rev. I.*

Following the adoption of the resolution, the representative of the United States stated that his delegation had abstained in the vote since no productive purpose could be served by debating the issue once again in an emergency special session of the General Assembly and since that debate would actually diminish the prospects for peace in the Middle East.<sup>39</sup>

The representative of France indicated that his delegation had joined in supporting the call for an emergency special session in order to allow for a far-ranging debate in the General Assembly on the question of the Golan Heights. But he warned against efforts to adopt such measures as sanctions in the Assembly as such decisions would contravene the principles of the Charter regarding the rules of competence of the Council as apart from those applicable for the Assembly.<sup>40</sup>

**Decision** of 2 April 1982 (2348th meeting): rejection of a draft resolution

By letter dated 22 March 1982,<sup>41</sup> the representative of Jordan, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States members of the League of Arab States at the United Nations, requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider what he described as the grave and rapidly deteriorating situation in the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories, including Jerusalem.

At its 2334th meeting, on 24 March 1982, the Council included the letter in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council decided to invite the following, at their request, to participate without vote in the discussion of the question: at the 2334th meeting, the representatives of Egypt, Israel, Pakistan, Senegal and the Syrian Arab Republic; at the 2338th meeting, the representatives of Morocco and Turkey; at the 2340th meeting, the representatives of the German Democratic Republic, India and Iran; at the 2344th meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Bangladesh, Cuba, Iraq, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Viet Nam, Yemen and Yugoslavia; and at the 2348th meeting, the representatives of Democratic Yemen and Saudi Arabia.<sup>2</sup>

At the 2334th meeting, the Council also decided, by a vote, and in accordance with the Council's previous practice, to extend an invitation to the representative of the PLO to participate in the debate

on the item.<sup>42</sup> At the same meeting, the Council further decided to extend an invitation to Mr. Clovis Maksoud under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure.<sup>43</sup> The Council considered the item at its 2334th, 2338th, 2340th, 2344th and 2348th meetings on 24, 26 and 30 March and 1 and 2 April 1982.

At the 2334th meeting, the representative of Jordan drew the attention of the Council and of the international community to the systematic martyrdom of the occupied territories and their Palestinian and other Arab victims and warned about the potential for disaster arising from that situation. He mentioned in particular the turmoil that had shaken various parts of the occupied Palestinian territories arising from the Palestinian resistance to Israel's determination to annex their territories. He criticized the inaction and complacency of the highest executive organ of the United Nations and blamed the Council for the not too distant emergence of a grave threat to peace and security out of that untenable situation. He requested the Council to shoulder its responsibilities towards the Palestinian people and see to it that Israel's illegal measures of oppression, confiscation and bloodshed were stopped and the Israeli occupation terminated.<sup>44</sup>

The representative of the PLO also stressed the most critical condition in the occupied territories and read out the text of a letter dated 23 March 1982 from the Chairman of the PLO addressed to the Secretary-General in which further Israeli transgressions were reported and the United Nations was urged to put an end to Israeli aggression and to implement its resolutions regarding the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable national rights.<sup>45</sup>

The representative of Senegal, speaking also in his capacity as Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, stated that in its report to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session,<sup>46</sup> the Committee had proposed (and the Assembly had subsequently endorsed) the following recommendations: (a) the Palestinians had the right to return to their homes and to recover the goods of which they had been stripped; (b) they had the right to self-determination without outside interference and the right to national independence; (c) they had the right to create an independent State in Palestine; (d) the question of Palestine was at the heart of the Middle East problem and no solution to the problem could be contemplated if it failed to take account of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people; (e) the exercise of those inalienable rights would contribute also to a final solution to the whole Middle East crisis; (f) the participation of the PLO, on an equal footing with all other parties on the basis of General Assembly resolutions 3236 (XXIX) and 3375 (XXX), was indispensable in all efforts, at all meetings and in all debates and all conferences on the Middle East organized under the auspices of the United Nations; (g) the acquisition of territory by force was inadmissible and Israel consequently had an obligation to withdraw totally and rapidly from all the occupied Arab territories; (h) the 1949 Fourth Geneva Convention must be applied; and (i) all States in the region had the right to live in peace.

He added that any approach to solving the Middle East crisis must necessarily take account of the elements he had outlined. He hoped that the draft resolution that would be submitted for the Council's

approval would include all necessary measures to contain the most recent troubles in the occupied territories.<sup>48</sup>

At the same meeting, the representative of Israel charged that constant provocations on the part of Jordan and the PLO had been subverting any movement towards peaceful coexistence in the region and **labelled** the request for the Council meeting a clear attempt to engender additional tensions and to attract support for the provocations in Judaea and **Samaria**. He suggested that a framework for the peaceful coexistence between Jew and Arab was clearly emerging and called upon the Council to welcome that promise of reconciliation between the two fraternal Semitic **peoples**.<sup>49</sup>

At the 2348th meeting, on 2 April 1982, the President drew attention to the text of a draft **resolution**<sup>50</sup> submitted by **Jordan**.<sup>51</sup> Under the draft, the Council would have considered the letter dated 22 March 1982 from the representative of Jordan and would have: (a) denounced measures imposed on the Palestinian population, such as dismissal of elected mayors by Israeli authorities, as well as the violation of the **liberties** and rights of the inhabitants of the occupied West Bank and the Gaza Strip, which had followed the measures taken by Israel with regard to the Golan **Heights**, and which could only damage the prospects for peace; (b) called upon Israel, the occupying Power, to rescind its decision disbanding the elected municipal council of Al-Bireh and its decision to remove from their posts the Mayors of Nablus and Ramallah; (c) reaffirmed that all the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949 continued to apply in full to all of the occupied territories; (d) called upon Israel to cease forthwith all measures applied in the West Bank, **includin** Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip and the Syrian Golan **Heights**, which contravened the provisions of that Convention; (e) called upon the Secretary-General to report to the Council not later than 7 April 1982 on the implementation of the resolution; and (f) decided to remain seized of the item.

The representative of **Israel** warned that the draft resolution did nothing to promote the cause of **peace** in the Middle East, but placed another obstacle in the path of peace. He added that although not a single word in the draft resolution supported understanding and conciliation, Israel would continue its efforts to create an atmosphere conducive to the peace process and to work towards the establishment of autonomy in Judaea, in **Samaria** and in the Gaza District in accordance with the Camp David **agreement**.<sup>52</sup>

At the same meeting, the President put the Jordanian draft resolution to the vote; it received 13 votes in favour and 1 against, with 1 abstention, and was not adopted owing to the **negative** vote of a permanent member of the **Council**.<sup>53</sup>

Following the vote, the representative of the United Kingdom expressed his regret that efforts to put together a text that would have **enjoyed** consensus support had not been successful. His delegation, however, had voted in favour of the Jordanian draft because it was in agreement with the text, especially **paragraph 1**, which faithfully reflected the views of the States members of the **European Community**.<sup>54</sup>

The representative of the United States explained that the Jordanian draft had not achieved the primary objective of the Council, which was to urge

restraint on the parties to avoid any new outbreak of violence. He deplored that no reference to **resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973)** had been inserted into the draft resolution sponsored by Jordan and that, instead, the text had used strongly denunciatory language and disregarded the complexity of the problem, thus compelling the United States to vote "**no**".<sup>55</sup>

The President, speaking in his capacity as representative of **Zaire**, also expressed regret that the Council had not arrived at a consensus whereby it could have put pressure on the opinion of the international community in order to promote peace in the region. Since his delegation had not had enough time to obtain instructions concerning the Jordanian text, he had abstained in the vote, but he reaffirmed the unswerving support of the **Republic of Zaire** for the Arab and Palestinian cause.<sup>56</sup>

Decision of 20 April 1982 (2357th meeting): rejection of a four-Power draft resolution

By letter dated 12 April 1982,<sup>57</sup> the representative of Morocco **conveyed** a request by His Majesty King Hassan II, King of Morocco and **Chairman** of the Al-Quds Committee of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, that an urgent meeting of the Council be called to consider what he described as the grave events taking place in occupied Palestinian territory and, most particularly, in the Holy City of Jerusalem.

In a letter dated 13 April 1982,<sup>58</sup> the representative of Iraq, current Chairman of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, also requested on behalf of the members of that organization an immediate meeting of the Council to consider the very grave situation that had arisen as a consequence of the deliberate armed attack against the sacred Al-Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem.

At its 2352nd meeting, on 13 April 1982, the Council included the two letters in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council decided to invite the following, at their request, to participate, without vote, in the discussion of the question: at the 2352nd meeting, the representatives of Iraq, Israel, Morocco, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and Turkey; at the 2353rd meeting, the representatives of Bangladesh, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran, Malaysia, the Sudan and the Syrian Arab Republic; at the 2354th meeting, the representatives of the Niger and **Senegal**; at the 2355th meeting, the representatives of **India**, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Somalia; at the 2356th meeting, the representatives of Djibouti and the United Arab Emirates; and at the 2357th **meeting**, the representative of **Kuwait**.<sup>59</sup> At the 2352nd meeting, the Council also decided, by a vote, and in accordance with the Council's previous practice, to extend an invitation to the representative of the PLO to participate in the debate on the **item**.<sup>59</sup>

At the same meeting, the Council further decided to extend an invitation to Mr. **Clovis Maksud** under rule 39 of the provisional rules of **procedure**.<sup>60</sup> The Council considered the item at its 2352nd to 2357th meetings, from 13 to 20 April 1982.

At the 2352nd meeting, the representative of Morocco thanked the Council for having accepted the request of King Hassan II, in his **capacity** as Chairman of the Al-Quds Committee, to **hold** an urgent **meeting** to consider the grave events taking place in Jerusalem, under Israeli military occupation. He read out a message from the King, in **which** the

bloody and sacrilegious action in front of the Al-Aqsa Mosque was described as rendering more dangerous a situation that already endangered international peace. The message provided a detailed account of the sudden shooting spree started by an Israeli soldier in uniform against a crowd of Moslem worshippers, killing at least two and wounding 22. It was argued that Israel's responsibility could not be disputed, as it was responsible at least for preventing, or wanting to prevent, such criminal acts, but had shown instead extreme passivity in regard to various terrorist movements, as witnessed in earlier attacks on the Mosque and other Moslem sites in Jerusalem. The King further condemned Israel's contempt for peaceful religious coexistence in Jerusalem and, on behalf of 41 Islamic nations, solemnly protested Israel's attempt to change the status and character of the Holy Places and to claim Jerusalem as the eternal capital of Israel. In the light of the most recent desecration of the Holy City, the King's message concluded with a request that the **file** on Jerusalem be **reopened**.<sup>61</sup>

The representative of Jordan also denounced the attack by a group of armed Israeli troops against the Al-Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock. He expressed strong doubt about the Israeli claim that the carnage had been carried out by a deranged individual who had very recently immigrated to Israel from America and had been in military service when he committed the murderous deed. He charged that the attacker had been protected by other Israeli soldiers and whisked away to safety after his journey of destruction. He informed the Council that his Government had declared a day of solemn protest in solidarity with the Palestinian people and the sanctity of the Holy Places. That step would be followed by other steps, until all the occupied territories had been returned to the Arabs and the full rights of the Palestinians had been fully **restored**.<sup>62</sup>

The representative of Israel stated that his **Government** and the world shared the sense of revulsion at the despicable act committed by a man who might well be mentally **deranged** and that the perpetrator would have to account for his deeds before a court of law. He deplored that certain countries had sought the Council meeting in order to exploit the misdeeds of one individual in order to fan the flames of religious hatred. Those same countries had over the years lent their support to a terrorist organization bent on destruction and murder in Israel and never condemned in any manner the banditry of the PLO. He underlined Israel's continued firm commitment to the protection of the Holy Places, in accordance with a law passed by the Knesset in 1967.<sup>63</sup>

The representative of the PLO offered a detailed account of the events at the Mosque and blamed the Israeli authorities for the incident that was reflective of Zionist methods and practices in Palestine. He renewed his organization's call for a **peaceful** settlement based on the recognition of the national inalienable right of the Palestinian people to **self-determination**, independence and the solution of their refugee **problem**.<sup>64</sup>

The representative of Iraq, speaking also in his capacity as Chairman of the Islamic Conference, denounced the criminal attack against the holy sanctuary as a manifestation of the colonialist mentality of the rulers in Tel Aviv. He expressed deep indignation at Israel's defiance of the resolutions of the **Council** and the General Assembly and called for

firm and decisive action by the Council to bring an end to the Israeli occupation of Arab territories, including the Holy City of **Al-Quds**.<sup>65</sup>

At the 2357th meeting, on 20 April 1982, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft **resolution**<sup>66</sup> sponsored by Iraq, Jordan, Morocco and Uganda.

Under the draft resolution, in its preambular part, the Council would have referred to the letter dated 12 April 1982 conveying the request of King Hassan II and to the letter dated 13 April 1982 of the representative of Iraq, as well as to the message of King Hassan II and the statements made before the Council reflecting the universal outrage caused by the acts of sacrilege at the **Haram Al-Sharif**, one of the holiest places of mankind; taken note of the statement received from the Islamic Higher Council in Jerusalem concerning the shooting of worshippers by armed Israelis within the precincts of the **Haram Al-Sharif**; borne in mind the unique status of Jerusalem and, in particular, the need for protection and preservation of the spiritual and religious dimension of the Holy Places in the city; **recalled** its relevant resolutions pertaining to the status and character of the Holy City of Jerusalem; expressed deep concern over the sacrilegious acts perpetrated against the sanctity of the **Haram Al-Sharif** in **Jerusalem** on 11 April 1982 and the criminal acts of **shooting** at worshippers, particularly inside the sanctuary of the Dome of the Rock and the Al-Aqsa Mosque; expressed deep grief at the loss and injury of **civilian** life as a result of those criminal acts; and affirmed once more that the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949 was applicable to all territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem.

In the operative part, the Council would have (a) condemned in the strongest terms the appalling acts of **sacrilege** perpetrated within the precincts of the **Haram Al-Sharif**; (b) deplored any act or **encouragement** of destruction or profanation of the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites in Jerusalem as tending to disturb world peace; (c) called upon Israel, the occupying Power, to observe and apply **scrupulously** the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention and the principles of international law governing military occupation and to refrain from causing any hindrance to the discharge of the established functions of the Islamic Higher Council in Jerusalem; (d) requested the Secretary-General as he deemed appropriate to keep the Council fully informed on the implementation of the resolution; and (e) decided to remain seized of that serious matter.

At the same meeting, the draft resolution was put to the vote, received 14 votes in favour and 1 **against** and was not adopted owing to the **negative** vote of a permanent member of the Council.<sup>67</sup>

Following the vote, the **representative** of the United States stated that her **Government** strongly condemned the senseless act of violence that had occurred on 11 April 1982 at the Dome of the Rock. She stressed that the United States sought to decrease tensions in the area and prevent further acts of violence and added that the draft resolution would not have helped to achieve that **objective**. Her delegation had voted against the draft resolution because it would make new acts of violence more likely and because it contained language that implied that the responsibility for the **tertiary** event lay with

the Israeli authorities. In conclusion, she pointed out that the long-standing position of the United States on the status of Jerusalem was not affected by the vote.<sup>68</sup>

Decision of 2 August 1983 (2460th meeting): rejection of a **20-Power** draft resolution

By a letter dated 5 November I 1982,<sup>69</sup> the representative of Morocco, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States at the United Nations, requested that an urgent meeting of the Council be convened to consider what he termed the question of Israel's perseverance in its policy of establishing settlements in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories.

In a letter dated 9 November 1982,<sup>70</sup> the representative of the Niger, Chairman of the Group of States members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference at the United Nations, requested on their behalf and jointly with the Group of Arab States at the United Nations the **convening** of a Council meeting to discuss Israel's announcement of the establishment of new settlements in the occupied territories.

At its 2401st meeting, on 12 November 1982, the Council included the two letters in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the Council invited the representatives of Morocco, the Niger and Senegal, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to **vote**.<sup>71</sup>

At the same meeting, the Council also decided, by a vote, and in accordance with the Council's previous practice, to extend an invitation to the representative of the PLO to participate in the debate on the **item**.<sup>71</sup> The Council further decided to extend an invitation to the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People to participate, at his request, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of **procedure**.<sup>72</sup>

The Council began its consideration of the item at its **2401st** meeting, on 12 November 1982.

At the **2401st** meeting, the representative of Morocco stated that the meeting had been requested to take up the grave issue of the illegal Israeli settlements in occupied Arab territory which constituted an intolerable provocation against the **legitimate** inhabitants of those areas and necessitated **firmness** of the Council in **recalling** its decisions demanding respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and condemning Israel's violations of those principles in the troubled region of the Middle **East**.<sup>73</sup>

The representative of Jordan denounced the systematic and relentless Israeli policy of **incarcerating** the Palestinian people by colonization and **confiscations**. The annexation of Arab lands, initially creeping, but now openly admitted and leaping, consumed enormous financial and human resources! with a view to foreclosing any possibility of **achieving** a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. He offered a detailed account of the way the Israeli occupiers went about colonizing Arab land and cited **among** other sources the last **report**<sup>74</sup> of the Security Council Commission established under resolution 446 (I 1979), especially its conclusions regarding the Israeli settlement policy, and urged that the Commission be asked to report on recent developments **regarding** the accelerated establishment of new settlements.<sup>75</sup>

By a letter dated 8 February I 1983,<sup>76</sup> the representative of Jordan, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States at the United Nations, requested that the Council be convened immediately to

resume consideration of Israel's persistence in its policies of establishing settlements in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories.

At its 2412th meeting, on 11 February 1983, the Council added the letter to the agenda adopted at the **2401st** meeting and resumed consideration of the item. In addition to the representatives previously invited, the Council invited the following, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote: at the 2412th meeting, the representatives of Egypt, India, the Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen and Yugoslavia; at the 2413th meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Lebanon, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates, and at the 2414th meeting, the representatives of Democratic Yemen and **Greece**.<sup>77</sup> At the 2412th meeting, the Council also extended an invitation to Mr. **Clovis** Maksoud under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure.<sup>78</sup> The Council considered the item at its **2412th** to 2414th meetings from 11 to 16 February 1983.

At the 2412th meeting, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic warned with urgency that the Israeli annexation of occupied Arab territories had assumed the characteristics of an expansionist process that was seen as irrevocable by the Israelis and bound to result in the mass expulsion of the population in those areas. He gave the example of Jerusalem where more than 90,000 settlers had colonized the annexed portion of East Jerusalem and 30,000 others had settled more than 100 military outposts, thereby laying siege to the city. He pointed out that Israel's persistence in its annexation policy could only aggravate the volatile situation in the occupied territories. He called upon the Council to impose mandatory sanctions against Israel and to expel it from the family of the United Nations; if the Council failed to act, he suggested, some States might exercise their right to **self-defence** in order to repulse **aggression**.<sup>78</sup>

At the 2414th meeting, the representative of France stated that his Government condemned energetically the continuation of the Israeli settlements policy in the occupied territories and pointed out that the French refusal to accept any of the cases of the policy of **fait accompli** had been consistent since 1967, as it was contrary to the rules of international law. He called upon the Government of Israel to abide by the rules of international law and emphasized that lasting peace could be established in the area by dialogue, not by unilateral **measures**.<sup>79</sup>

At the end of the same meeting, the President announced that the date of the next meeting of the Council to continue consideration of the item would be determined in the course of consultations with members of the **Council**.<sup>80</sup>

By a letter dated 13 May 1983,<sup>81</sup> the representative of Qatar, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States at the United Nations, requested that the Council be urgently convened to resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

At its 2438th meeting, on 20 May 1983, the Council added the letter to the agenda adopted at the 2412th meeting and resumed consideration of the item. In addition to the representatives previously invited, the Council invited the representatives of Mali and Qatar, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to **vote**.<sup>82</sup>

At the same **meeting**, the representative of Qatar, speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States at the United Nations, stated that the situation in the occupied Arab territories continued to deteriorate as a result of the Israeli occupation policies. He noted with great regret that the United Nations not only had been unable to restore the usurped rights of the Palestinian people, but had also proved incapable of restraining the usurper. The reason for the failure of the United Nations could be attributed to the protection afforded to Israel by the United States. The effect of that political support had spread to the Council, where the **right** of veto, or the threat to use it, had transformed the Council into another forum for speeches without considering the most elementary rules of justice. He called upon the Council to remove the restrictions that had so far prevented the imposition of sanctions against Israel under Chapter VII of the **Charter**.<sup>82</sup>

At the end of the same meeting, the President announced that the Council would continue its consideration of the item on a date to be set after consultations with the **members**.<sup>83</sup>

In a letter dated 27 July 1983,<sup>84</sup> the representative of Democratic Yemen, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States at the United Nations, requested an immediate meeting of the Council to discuss the situation in the occupied Arab territories.

At its 2457th meeting, on 28 July 1983, the Council added the letter to the agenda adopted at the 2438th meeting and resumed consideration of the item. In addition to the representatives previously invited, the Council invited the following, at their request, to participate in the discussion of the question without the right to vote: at the 2457th meeting, the representatives of Afghanistan and Malaysia; at the 2459th meeting, the representatives of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Djibouti, Iraq, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, the Sudan and Tunisia; and at the 2460th meeting, the representative of Israel.\* The Council considered the item at its 2457th to 2461st meetings, from 28 July to 2 August 1983.

At the 2457th meeting, the representative of Jordan stated that the annexation of the occupied Arab territories, especially the West Bank, was the central aim in the policy of the Israeli Government. **He** held Israel's settlement policy to be **illegal** and illegitimate, geared towards permanency of the new settlements. He charged that the recent atrocities in Hebron reflected the systematic terrorism in the occupied towns and villages, which served to empty systematically those areas that had been taken by Israel. He also suggested that accurate monitoring of the location of the Israeli settlements clearly revealed the long-range Israeli aims of disrupting any economic, demographic or geographic **continuity** between the Arab villages and cities. The use of religious, historic or security concerns served to distort the real purposes of **the** settlement policy.

He added that the Israeli settlement policies had forced **Israel** to follow an expansionist militaristic logic seeking to expand its security zone for those settlements and seeking living resources, especially water, in **the** occupied territories. He charged that there was a clear relationship between the failure of various peace endeavours and the escalation of the settlement programmes. He deplored the inability of the United Nations, especially the Council, to **re-**

**spond** appropriately to the worsening situation, but **expressed** determination to pursue peace through those institutions.<sup>85</sup>

At the **2459th** meeting, on 1 August 1983, the President drew attention to the text of a draft **resolution**<sup>86</sup> submitted by Algeria, Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen.

Under the draft resolution, in its preambular part, the Council would have referred to the statement of the representative of Jordan at the 2457th meeting and the letter dated 27 July 1983 from the representative of Democratic Yemen; stressed the urgent need to achieve a comprehensive, **just** and lasting peace in the Middle East; and **affirmed** that the situation in the occupied Arab territories remained grave and volatile, that the Israeli settlement policies and practices constituted a major obstacle to all efforts and initiatives towards a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East, and that the regulations annexed to The Hague Conventions of 1907 and the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949 were applicable to the Arab territories occupied by Israel in 1967, including Jerusalem.

In the operative part, the Council **would** have (a) reaffirmed all its relevant resolutions; (b) determined that the policies and practices of Israel in establishing settlements in the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied in 1967, including Jerusalem, had no legal validity, constituted a major and serious obstruction to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East and were in contravention of article 49 (6) of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War; (c) called once more upon Israel, the **occupying** Power, to abide scrupulously by the provisions of the above-mentioned Geneva Convention, to rescind its previous measures, to desist from taking any action that would result in changing the legal status and geographical nature and materially affecting the **demographic** composition of the Arab territories **occupied** in 1967 and, in particular, not to transfer parts of its own civilian population into the occupied Arab territories and to force transfers of Arab population from those territories; (d) strongly deplored the continuation and persistence of Israel in pursuing those policies and practices and called upon the Government and people of Israel to rescind those measures, to dismantle the existing **settlements**, to desist from expanding and enlarging the existing ones and, in particular, to cease on an urgent basis from the planning, construction and establishment of new settlements in Arab territories occupied in 1967, including Jerusalem; (e) rejected all Israeli arbitrary and illegal actions, especially those that resulted in the expulsion, deportation and forcible transfers of Arab populations from the occupied Arab territories; (f) condemned the recent attacks perpetrated against the Arab civilian **population** in the occupied Arab territories, **especially** the killing and wounding of students at the Islamic University of the Arab city of Al-Khalil on 26 July 1983; (g) called upon all States not to provide Israel with any assistance to be used specifically in connection with settlements in the occupied territories; (h) reaffirmed its determination,

in the event of non-compliance by Israel with the resolution, to examine practical ways and means in accordance with relevant provisions of the Charter to secure the full implementation of the resolution; (i) decided to keep the situation in the occupied Arab territories under constant and close scrutiny; and (j) requested the Secretary-General to report to the Council within three months on the implementation of the resolution.

At the 246 I st meeting, on 2 August 1983, the representative of Israel stated that his Government had unreservedly condemned the murders perpetrated in the city of Hebron, but wondered why the Council had not raised its voice when a few weeks earlier a Jewish student at a religious seminary in Hebron had been stabbed to death by several assailants. He further refuted charges of mass poisoning of Palestinian schoolgirls at several schools in the West Bank and explained that those incidents could not be blamed on the Israeli authorities. He appealed again to the Arab neighbours to recognize Israel's existence and its right to exist and to negotiate without prior conditions.<sup>87</sup>

At the same meeting, the representative of Jordan, on behalf of the States members of LAS, introduced the draft resolution co-sponsored by 20 States and called upon the Council to adopt the text, which was moderate and well-balanced.<sup>87</sup>

Before the vote, the representative of Zaire indicated that the draft resolution, if endorsed by the Council, like others in the past would not lead to actions and thereby would undermine the credibility of the Council. He added that paragraph 6 was not balanced and that his delegation would abstain in the vote.<sup>87</sup>

At the same meeting, the draft resolution was put to the vote, received 13 votes in favour and 1 against, with 1 abstention, and was not adopted, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.<sup>88</sup>

Following the vote, the representative of the United States said that the draft resolution had not adequately addressed the recent series of criminal attacks in the West Bank. Although his delegation supported several elements in the draft, other parts were wholly unacceptable to the United States, thus resulting in a negative vote. While the United States remained opposed to the Israeli settlements policy, there was nothing to sustain the implication in the text that Israel had carried out forcible transfers of Arabs from the occupied territories. He added that the settlements constituted an obstacle to a fair and lasting peace in the Middle East, but that his Government saw no sense in calling for the dismantling of the settlements before the peace negotiations were begun and in arguing whether or not the Israeli settlements were illegal. He deplored rhetoric and polarization in the United Nations as they exacerbated the relations between the protagonists, instead of inducing them to come to the bargaining table.<sup>87</sup>

**Decision** of 4 April 1983: statement of the President

By a letter dated 31 March 1983,<sup>89</sup> the representative of Iraq, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States at the United Nations, requested an urgent meeting of the Council to discuss the serious situation arising from the cases of mass poisoning in the occupied West Bank.

On 4 April 1983, the President made the following statement on behalf of the members of the Council:<sup>90</sup>

The members of the Security Council have met in informal consultations with great concern on 4 April 1983 to discuss cases of mass poisoning in the occupied Arab territory of the West Bank as referred to in document S/15673.

The members of the Council request the Secretary-General to conduct independent inquiries concerning the causes and effects of the serious problem of the reported cases of poisoning and urgently to report on the findings.<sup>91</sup>

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> S/14791, OR, 36th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1981.

<sup>2</sup> For details. see chap. III of the present Supplement.

<sup>3</sup> 2316th mtg., para. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., paras. 7-17.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., paras. 20-46.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., paras. 50-58.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., paras. 62-72.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., paras. 73-77.

<sup>9</sup> 2317th mtg., paras. 5-12.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., paras. 15-24.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., paras. 25-32.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., paras. 88-92.

<sup>13</sup> 2318th mtg., paras. 20-44.

<sup>14</sup> 2319th mtg., paras. 19-27.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., para. 28.

<sup>16</sup> S/14798, adopted without change as resolution 497 (1981).

<sup>17</sup> See 2319th mtg., para. 29, for the vote. For further details, see chap. IV of the present Supplement.

<sup>18</sup> 2319th mtg., paras. 31-35.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., paras. 37-40.

<sup>20</sup> S/14805, dated 21 December 1983, OR, 36th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1981, and S/14821, dated 31 December 1983, *ibid.*

<sup>21</sup> For the vote and discussion, see 2322nd mtg., pat-as. 17-22. See also chap. III of the present Supplement.

<sup>22</sup> 2322nd mtg., paras. 23 and 24.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., pat-as. 32-70. Similar views were expressed at the same meeting by Jordan, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Senegal; at the 2323rd meeting by Bangladesh, Cuba, Democratic Yemen and Sri Lanka and by Mr. Maksud; at the 2324th meeting by Algeria, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan, the Sudan, Yemen and Yugoslavia and by the PLO; at the 2325th meeting by the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Iraq, Morocco, Nicaragua, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Viet Nam; at the 2326th meeting by Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Guyana and Mongolia; at the 2327th meeting by Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Mauritania, Oman and Uganda; at the 2328th meeting by Burundi, China, Poland, Togo and the United Arab Emirates; and at the 2329th meeting by Grenada and the President, speaking in his capacity as representative of the USSR.

<sup>24</sup> 2322nd mtg., paras. 154-170.

<sup>25</sup> S/14832, OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1982. The draft was subsequently revised, but failed of adoption, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.

<sup>26</sup> 2328th mtg., paras. 3-19.

<sup>27</sup> 2329th mtg., paras. 124-152.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., paras. 156-161.

<sup>29</sup> In S/14832/Rev. 1, operative paragraph 4 was deleted, and operative paragraphs 5-9 were renumbered as 4-8. In the last preambular paragraph, the explicit invocation of Articles 39 and 41 was replaced by "relevant provisions of Chapter VII". For the text, see OR, 37th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1982.

<sup>30</sup> For the vote, see 2329th mtg., pan. 16. See also chap. IV of the present Supplement.

<sup>31</sup> 2329th mtg., paras. 168-174.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., pans. 196-199.

<sup>33</sup> That request was made at the end of the 2329th meeting, *ibid.*, paras. 222 and 223.

<sup>34</sup> S/14848, adopted without change as resolution 500 (1982).

<sup>35</sup> 2330th mtg., pam. 3.



- <sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 6 and 7.
- <sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 12-20.
- <sup>38</sup> For the vote, see *ibid.*, para. 22. See also chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.
- <sup>39</sup> 2330th mtg., paras. 26-31. The representative of the United Kingdom expressed similar concerns in explaining his delegation's abstention.
- <sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 35-38.
- <sup>41</sup> S/14917, OR, 37th yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-March 1982*.
- <sup>42</sup> For the vote and the statement by the President in his capacity as representative of the United States, see 2334th mtg., paras. 2-8. See also chap. 111 of the present *Supplement*.
- <sup>43</sup> 2334th mtg., paras. 9 and 10.
- <sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 14-29.
- <sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 33-55.
- <sup>46</sup> GAOR, 36th sess., *Suppl.* No. 35 (A/36/35), paras. 49-53.
- <sup>47</sup> General Assembly resolution 36/120 D.
- <sup>48</sup> 2334th mtg., paras. 60-65. Views similar to those expressed by the first three speakers were expressed at the same meeting by Egypt, Pakistan and the Syrian Arab Republic, and by Mr. Maksoud; at the 2338th mtg. by Jordan, Morocco and Turkey; at the 2340th mtg. by the German Democratic Republic and Iran; and at the 2344th mtg. by Algeria, Bangladesh, Cuba, India, Iraq, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Viet Nam, Yemen and Yugoslavia.
- <sup>49</sup> 2334th mtg., paras. 135-141.
- <sup>50</sup> S/14943, OR, 37th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1982*. The draft resolution failed of adoption owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.
- <sup>51</sup> 2348th mtg., para. 3.
- <sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 5-8.
- <sup>53</sup> For the vote, see *ibid.*, para. 9. See also chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.
- <sup>54</sup> 2348th mtg., paras. 11-15.
- <sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 16-20.
- <sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 66-73.
- <sup>57</sup> S/14967, OR, 37th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1982*.
- <sup>58</sup> S/14969, *ibid.*
- <sup>59</sup> For the vote and discussion, see 2352nd mtg., paras. 2-7. See also chap. III of the present *Supplement*.
- <sup>60</sup> 2352nd mtg., paras. 8 and 9.
- <sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 12-15.
- <sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 16-40.
- <sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 42-49.
- <sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 51-83.
- <sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 86-94. Similar views were expressed at the 2353rd mtg. by Malaysia, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia and by Mr. Maksoud; at the 2354th mtg. by Bangladesh, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran, Senegal, Sudan and Turkey; at the 2355th meeting by China, India and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya; at the 2356th mtg. by Djibouti, Somalia, the USSR and the United Arab Emirates; and at the 2357th mtg. by Kuwait and Poland.
- <sup>66</sup> S/14985, OR, 37th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1982*. The draft resolution was not adopted, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member.
- <sup>67</sup> See 2357th mtg., para. 101, for the vote. See also chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.
- <sup>68</sup> 2357th mtg., paras. 107-116.
- <sup>69</sup> S/15481, OR, 37th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1982*.
- <sup>70</sup> S/15483, *ibid.*
- <sup>71</sup> For the discussion and vote, see 2401st mtg., paras. 9-16. See also chap. III of the present *Supplement*.
- <sup>72</sup> See 2401st mtg., paras. 17 and 18.
- <sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 26-44.
- <sup>74</sup> S/14268, dated 25 November 1980, OR, 35th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1980*.
- <sup>75</sup> 2401st mtg., paras. 49-70. Similar views were expressed at the same meeting by the Niger, the PLO and the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.
- <sup>76</sup> S/15599, OR, 38th yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-March 1983*.
- <sup>77</sup> 2412th mtg.
- <sup>78</sup> *Ibid.* Similar views were expressed at the 2412th mtg. by Egypt, India, Yemen and Yugoslavia and by the PLO; at the 2413th mtg. by Algeria, China, Guyana, the Islamic Republic of

Iran, Jordan, Malta, Pakistan, Poland, Turkey and Zimbabwe; and at the 2414th mtg. by Cuba, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, Kuwait, Nicaragua and the United Arab Emirates, and by the President, speaking in his capacity as representative of the Soviet Union.

<sup>79</sup> 2414th mtg. Similar views were expressed at the same meeting by the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

<sup>80</sup> 2414th mtg.

<sup>81</sup> S/15764, OR, 38th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1983*.

<sup>82</sup> 2438th mtg. Similar views were expressed at the same meeting by India, the Syrian Arab Republic and the PLO. The spokesman for the PLO offered a very detailed description of recent violence in the occupied territories.

<sup>83</sup> 2438th mtg.

<sup>84</sup> S/15890, OR, 38th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1983*.

<sup>85</sup> 2457th mtg. Similar views were expressed at the same meeting by the representatives of Democratic Yemen, India and Pakistan, and by the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the Observer for the PLO; at the 2458th mtg. by the representatives of Egypt and the USSR; at the 2459th mtg. by the representatives of Bangladesh, China, Cuba, Kuwait and the Syrian Arab Republic and by Mr. Maksoud; at the 2460th mtg. by Afghanistan, Bahrain, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nicaragua, Poland, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan and Yugoslavia; and at the 2461st mtg. by Djibouti, the German Democratic Republic, Mauritania, Morocco and Togo.

<sup>86</sup> S/15895, OR, 38th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1983*. The draft was not adopted owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.

<sup>87</sup> 2461st mtg.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.* See also chap. IV of the present *Supplement*.

<sup>89</sup> S/15673, OR, 38th yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-March 1983*. See also the letter dated 30 March 1983 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (S/15667, *ibid.*) and the letter dated 3 April from the representative of Israel (S/15674, *ibid.*, *Suppl. for April-June 1983*) rejecting the changes.

<sup>90</sup> S/15680, OR, 38th yr., *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1983*. See also the letter dated 5 April 1983 from the representative of Israel rejecting the Council's statement (S/15683, *ibid.*, *Suppl. for April-June 1983*).

<sup>91</sup> The Secretary-General submitted a report dated 10 May 1983 to which a report of the Director-General of WHO was annexed (S/15756, *ibid.*).

#### 4. THE SITUATION IN CYPRUS

Decision of 4 June 1981 (2279th meeting): resolution 486 (1981)

On 27 May 1981, before the mandate of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) was due to expire, the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report<sup>1</sup> covering the period from 1 December 1980 to 27 May 1981. In his report, the Secretary-General stated that within the framework of the mission of good offices entrusted to him by the Council the intercommunal talks in Cyprus had continued in a generally constructive atmosphere, although with limited practical results. A more intensive pace for those deliberations was planned as from the beginning of July. The Secretary-General concluded that the continued presence of UNFICYP remained necessary, both in helping to maintain calm on the island and in creating the conditions under which the search for a peaceful settlement could best be pursued, and he therefore recommended to the Council that it extend the mandate of UNFICYP for a further period of six months. In an addendum\* issued on 4 June, the Secretary-General indicated that, following consultations, the parties concerned had signified their concurrence with the proposed extension.