

Middle East

30. The situation in the Middle East

A. Letter dated 13 April 1996 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1996/280)

Decision of 18 April 1996 (3654th meeting): resolution 1052 (1996) and rejection of a draft resolution

By a letter dated 13 April 1996 addressed to the President of the Security Council,¹ the representative of Lebanon requested the convening of an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the grave situation in Lebanon resulting from the large-scale Israeli bombardment of many towns and villages in his country, including the southern suburb of Beirut, causing alarming numbers of civilian dead and wounded, thousands of displaced persons and severe damage to property. He maintained that the bombardment constituted a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and the Charter of the United Nations and posed a great threat to international peace and security.

At its 3653rd meeting, held on 15 April 1996 in response to the request contained in a letter dated 13 April 1996 from the representative of Lebanon, the Security Council included the letter in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Chile), with the consent of the Council, invited the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Colombia, Cuba, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Morocco, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

The representative of Lebanon stated that his delegation was before the members of the Security Council to plead for the Council to take action to stop the Israeli military aggression against Lebanon, its

people, its territorial integrity, its independence and its sovereignty. Military aggression was a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations, international law and pertinent Security Council resolutions, particularly resolution 425 (1978) and the Armistice Agreement of 1949 between Lebanon and Israel. He stressed that, contrary to the claims of Israeli officials, the escalation was a result of persistent Israeli attacks and bombardments deep in Lebanese territory, killing men, women and children, and was a violation of the “so-called understanding” of July 1993 and hence attracted reaction from the Lebanese resistance. He maintained that the new cycle of violence could not be viewed apart from the overall situation in the south and in the Western Bekaa, and was not a question of who launched a rocket first, but was the result of the occupation by Israel, in flagrant violation of resolution 425 (1978). He reiterated that, while Lebanon stressed its firm condemnation of all forms of terrorism, it firmly supported the legitimate right of peoples to resist foreign occupation, and that the Lebanese were within their legitimate rights in defending themselves against occupation, human rights abuses and displacement. He asked the Council to order Israel to immediately stop its aggression against Lebanon and to withdraw all its reinforcements; to condemn the Israeli aggression against Lebanon; to force Israel to implement resolution 425 (1978); to provide, in cooperation with the Secretary-General, a massive programme of assistance to Lebanon and its people; and to remain seized of the matter as long as the Israelis did not abide by the order of the Council to halt their aggression.²

The representative of Israel noted that, since 1 February 1996, 8 Israelis had been killed and 29 more wounded by Hizbullah Islamic fundamentalist terrorists, and during the previous weeks, 36 more Israeli civilians had been injured in several waves of Katyusha rocket attacks fired by Hizbullah into northern Israel. Tens of thousands were living in shelters or had left the northern part of the State of Israel. He stressed that the primary obligation of Israel

¹ S/1996/280.

² S/PV.3653 and Corr. 1, pp. 2-5.

was to protect the security of all its citizens, and that as the Government of Lebanon did not have the ability, or the will, to control Hizbullah activities, Israel needed to defend the security of its north by all necessary measures. He reiterated that Israel had no territorial claim on Lebanon and had no intention of entering into battles with either the Syrian or the Lebanese armies. He observed that two trends were emerging in the Middle East: one that sought a peaceful resolution to the conflict, and another “inspired and supported by Iran, that [was] trying to kill the prospects for peace”. He noted that the stated goal of Hizbullah was not the removal of Israeli forces from southern Lebanon, but the destruction of Israel. He stressed that operations were being conducted solely against Hizbullah terrorist targets, but that Hizbullah positions were situated throughout Lebanon and were usually located in the midst of civilian population centres.³

The representative of France reaffirmed the right of all States in the region to live in security, and stated that his delegation understood the desire of Israel to keep its people safe from acts of violence. However, France deeply regretted that the ongoing military actions of the last few days had already led to the death of several dozen Lebanese civilians and forced hundreds of thousands of others to flee their homes in a mass exodus which endangered national reconstruction efforts. He stressed that France was convinced that the crisis could not be resolved by military means, and that only the implementation of resolution 425 (1978) could ensure respect for the security of the States of the region by re-establishing the complete sovereignty of Lebanon over its territory and thereby enabling the Government of Lebanon to participate fully in the maintenance of peace. He called on all parties concerned to demonstrate responsibility and restraint, and to order a ceasefire as soon as possible.⁴

The representative of Germany noted that, while self-defence was clearly legitimate, measures of self-defence could become illegal if they did not abide by the basic rule of law prescribing proportionality. He also maintained that measures of self-defence must not be directed against innocent civilians, a principle which was laid down in Article 33 of the Fourth Geneva Convention, to which both Israel and Lebanon

were parties. Any measure of self-defence needed to be proportionate not only in size, but also in direction. He stressed that, whereas all States were responsible for complying with resolution 425 (1978), the Government of Lebanon was responsible for doing all it could to prevent its territory from being used for attacks against persons protected by the four Geneva Conventions.⁵

The representative of China called on the Israeli side to immediately cease all military actions and urged all sides to exercise restraint, to settle their disputes through dialogue and consultation and to eschew force or the threat of force so as to safeguard peace and stability in the region.⁶

The representative of the Russian Federation expressed the belief that the military operations by Israel were an inappropriate reaction to the actions of extremists. He emphasized again the inadmissibility of the infringement of the territorial integrity and the violation of the sovereignty of Lebanon and stressed that it was necessary to halt immediately the military operations by Israel in Lebanon and the armed acts initiated from Lebanese territory against Israel. He also stressed that it was absolutely inadmissible that there be firing in the area where the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) was deployed.⁷

The representative of Italy spoke on behalf of the European Union and associated countries.⁸ He stated that the European Union expressed its grave concern at the escalation of military activity in Israel and Lebanon and about the security of UNIFIL and called on all sides to ensure that its safety was not put at risk. While reaffirming its commitment to the implementation of resolution 425 (1978), the European Union called upon all parties to show the greatest moderation and to cease military activities.⁹

The representative of the United States observed that Hizbullah attacks into northern Israel had once again compelled the Government of Israel to take steps deemed necessary to protect its people from direct threats emanating from Lebanese territory. The violence by Hizbullah had not only damaged Israel and

³ Ibid., pp. 6-7.

⁴ Ibid., pp. 7-8.

⁵ Ibid., p. 9.

⁶ Ibid., pp. 9-10.

⁷ Ibid., p. 10.

⁸ Ibid., p. 12 (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania and Slovakia).

⁹ Ibid., p. 12-13.

the prospects for a Middle East peace, it had also undermined the safety of people in Lebanon and the legitimacy of the State of Lebanon. She maintained that those who allowed the militia of Hizbullah to act with impunity in Lebanon needed to bear responsibility for the consequences, which included not only abuses to the State of Lebanon from within, but actions of self-defence by Israel in response to Hizbullah violence. She noted that the United States was engaged in an intensive diplomatic effort to restore calm and establish a more stable situation in the area which would enhance the security and well-being of the civilian population of both southern Lebanon and northern Israel. Finally she reiterated that the United States remained committed to the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, and national unity of Lebanon.¹⁰

The representative of the United Kingdom condemned the continuing rocket and other attacks by Hizbullah on northern Israel and expressed deep concern at the loss of life among the civilians in Lebanon and the severe humanitarian problems in the face of attacks on population centers. He called upon all parties to move to restore peace and a measure of stability in southern Lebanon and reiterated that attacks directed at civilian targets needed to end and that the 1993 arrangement needed to be respected, or a more effective arrangement should be put in its place.¹¹

The representative of Egypt stated that any armed aggression against a neighbouring State, whatever the motive, constituted prohibited aggression. However, self-defence also had rules prescribed by the United Nations and contemporary international law. First, under Article 51 of the Charter, there had to have been an "actual armed attack". While firing Katyusha rockets across borders was indeed a proscribed act which needed to cease, the armistice agreement between Lebanon and Israel continued officially to stand, and the mechanisms provided for in the armistice should have been invoked to deal with those events. Second, the situation needed to have been put to the Security Council. Third, self-defence by States was not "a blank cheque", but an element of proportionality was involved: the scale, duration and objective of military activity needed to be

proportionate to the reason for such activity. He also noted that Egypt could not consider that Israel had been unable to invoke other means, such as the Security Council or other channels, to find the means to obtain security. He then quoted a former Secretary of State of the United States in saying that "the right of self-defence implied the instant and overwhelming necessity for self-defence, leaving no choice of means and no time for deliberation" and stressed that, lacking those conditions, the use of military force was considered an act of reprisal prohibited by international law.¹²

The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran referred to the statement made by the representative of Israel, and rejected the "fabrications" about his country.¹³

The representative of Turkey stated that terrorism posed the greatest threat to security and stability in the Middle East. He further held that it had been the consistent position of his Government that the fight against terrorism was vitally important for the success of the peace process. However, Turkey also believed that it should not inflict any harm on innocent civilians. He informed the Council that the positions of Turkey regarding the fight against terrorism and its concerns for the safety of innocent civilians had once again been brought to the attention of Israel.¹⁴

A number of speakers stressed that the attacks by Israel were a clear violation of the principles of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Lebanon, and a violation of the Charter of the United Nations, international law and relevant Security Council resolutions, particularly resolution 425 (1978). They called on the Council to intervene to put an end to the Israeli aggression against Lebanon.¹⁵ Several speakers appealed to the parties to cease the fighting immediately and to enter into

¹² Ibid., pp. 14-15.

¹³ Ibid., pp. 24-25.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 28.

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 8-9 (Indonesia); pp. 16-17 (United Arab Emirates); pp. 17-18 (Saudi Arabia); pp. 18-19 (Syrian Arab Republic); pp. 19-20 (Cuba); pp. 20-21 (Kuwait); pp. 21-22 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); p. 22 (Algeria); pp. 22-23 (Afghanistan); pp. 23-24 (Morocco); pp. 25-26 (Tunisia); pp. 26-27 (Malaysia); pp. 27-28 (Jordan); p. 28 (Colombia); and pp. 28-29 (Pakistan).

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 12-13.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 13.

negotiations for a peaceful settlement on the basis of resolution 425 (1978).¹⁶

At its 3654th meeting, held on 18 April 1996 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council resumed consideration of the item. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Chile), with the consent of the Council, invited the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Canada, Colombia, the Comoros, Cuba, Djibouti, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

The President then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution submitted by Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen,¹⁷ with the Comoros joining as a sponsor;¹⁸ and to a draft resolution submitted by France, Germany, Honduras, Italy, Poland, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States.¹⁹ The President also drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 17 April 1996 from the representative of Italy addressed to the President of the Security Council, transmitting the text of the declaration by the Presidency on behalf of the European Union on the situation in the Middle East;²⁰ and to a letter dated 17 April 1996, from the President of the United Arab Emirates to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General transmitting the text of resolution 5573 issued on 17 April 1996 by the Council of the League of Arab States.²¹

At the same meeting, the first draft resolution submitted by Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Iraq,

Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen was put to the vote.²² The resolution would have, inter alia, called upon Israel to immediately cease its military action against the Lebanese territorial integrity and withdraw forthwith its forces from all Lebanese territory, considered that Lebanon was entitled to appropriate redress for the destruction it had suffered and held Israel responsible for adequate compensation for such destruction. The resolution received four votes in favour (China, Egypt, Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia), with 11 abstaining and was not adopted because it did not obtain the required majority.

At the same meeting, the draft resolution submitted by France, Germany, Honduras, Italy, Poland, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States was also put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1052 (1996), which reads:

The Security Council,

Recalling all its previous relevant resolutions regarding the situation in Lebanon, including resolution 425 (1978) of 19 March 1978 by which it established the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon,

Taking note of the letters dated 13 April 1996 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council,

Bearing in mind the debate which took place at its 3653rd meeting on 15 April 1996 on the situation in the Middle East,

Gravely concerned at the consequences which the ongoing fighting could have for the peace and security of the region and for the furthering of the peace process in the Middle East, and affirming its full support for that process,

Gravely concerned also at all attacks on civilian targets, including residential areas, and at the loss of life and suffering among civilians,

Stressing the need for all concerned to respect fully the rules of international humanitarian law with regard to the protection of civilians,

Gravely concerned at actions which seriously threaten the safety of the Force and impede the implementation of its mandate, and deploring in particular the incident on 18 April 1996 in which shelling resulted in heavy loss of life among civilians at a site of the Force,

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 10-11 (Republic of Korea); pp. 11-12 (Botswana); pp. 13-14 (Poland); p. 15 (Guinea-Bissau); and pp. 15-16 (Chile).

¹⁷ S/1996/292.

¹⁸ S/PV.3654, p. 2.

¹⁹ S/1996/304.

²⁰ S/1996/299.

²¹ S/1996/295.

²² For the vote, see S/PV.3654, p. 4.

1. *Calls for* an immediate cessation of hostilities by all parties;
2. *Supports* the ongoing diplomatic efforts to this end;
3. *Reaffirms its commitment* to the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries and to the security of all States in the region, and calls upon all concerned fully to respect those principles;
4. *Calls upon* all concerned to respect the safety and security of civilians;
5. *Also calls upon* all concerned to respect the safety, security and freedom of movement of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and to allow it to fulfil its mandate without any obstacle or interference;
6. *Calls upon* Member States to offer humanitarian assistance to alleviate the suffering of the population and to assist the Government of Lebanon in the reconstruction of the country, and requests the Secretary-General to ensure that the United Nations and its agencies play their part in meeting the humanitarian needs of the civilian population;
7. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the Council informed of developments on a continuing basis;
8. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter.

Speaking after the vote, the representative of Egypt commented that the manner in which the Council had dealt with the matter since the Israeli aggression began had been marked with a negativism which would have unfortunate effects on the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in the Middle East. He noted that differences in the positions of members of the Council had led to a delay in a favourable response being made to the request for an emergency meeting by Lebanon, which had enabled the aggressor to continue its aggression, flouting the principles of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations. He maintained that the draft resolution submitted by the Arab Group showed the severity and scale of the tragedy being experienced by the Lebanese people following the Israeli aggression. He stated that Egypt found it difficult to be convinced by the positions of those that had opposed it. He also noted that, while his country had supported it, resolution 1052 (1996) did not contain all of the principles which needed to apply with regard to the situation in Lebanon. The resolution did not clearly condemn Israel, and it did not deal with the question of the compensation to which Lebanon

was entitled for the loss of human life and the destruction of property.²³

The representative of Indonesia, speaking in regards to the two draft resolutions, stated that, while cognizant of the common threads between the resolution and the draft resolution, Indonesia recognized all too well the divergent elements which had proved to be irreconcilable. For his delegation, it was quite clear where the onus of responsibility rested for bringing the current hostilities to an immediate end. He reiterated that military action in Lebanon was a violation of resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973) and 425 (1978), and in total contradiction of the aims and objectives of the Madrid peace process.²⁴

The representative of China expressed his delegation's profound concern at the large-scale military offensive launched by Israel in the preceding days in southern Lebanon. He stressed his Government's belief that sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity within internationally recognized borders needed to be fully respected, and that the relevant Security Council resolutions, including resolution 425 (1978), needed to be implemented. He underlined that UNIFIL should not be obstructed in the implementation of its mandate. China called upon the international community, including the United Nations and its agencies, to provide immediate humanitarian assistance to the civilians of Lebanon. On the basis of those considerations, China had voted in favour of the two draft resolutions.²⁵

The representative of Germany stated that there needed to be a political solution on the basis of all relevant Security Council resolutions, including resolution 425 (1978), and that such a political solution, in the framework of the peace process, would best be helped by a decision of the Council that addressed the principal problems and, at the same time, commanded the widest support. That was why Germany had voted for resolution 1052 (1996) and had abstained in the vote on the other resolution.²⁶

The representative of Guinea-Bissau stressed that his country would support all peace initiatives and encouraged the initiatives being taken by certain

²³ S/PV.3654, pp. 3-4.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

countries of the region, which his delegation hoped would take into account the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, including resolution 425 (1997). He deplored the recent incidents, expressed support for all those who had been affected by the military activities in the area and made an appeal to the international community to come to the aid of the victims of the war in Lebanon. For all those reasons, he stated that Guinea-Bissau had voted in favour of both of the draft resolutions in the hope that it would make a major contribution to the immediate cessation of hostilities and to the continuation of negotiations on a just and lasting peace in the region.²⁷

The representative of the Republic of Korea stated that there was a window of opportunity which members could have utilized to promote a consensus text. However, it seemed to his delegation that the opportunity had not been fully explored. It was for that reason that the Republic of Korea had decided to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution submitted by the Arab Group.²⁸

The representative of France expressed the hope that the unanimity of the Council would give full weight and backing to the resolution and enable it to produce results; namely the cessation of hostilities by all the parties.²⁹

The representative of the Russian Federation stated that what was happening in Lebanon was unacceptable, as the actions of Israel were undermining the sovereignty of the State of Lebanon, hurting the civilian population and damaging civilian targets. It was essential to demonstrate restraint. A peaceful solution was required that provided for the cessation of the military action against Lebanon while not allowing terrorist attacks against the territory of Israel. He noted that the Security Council had faced a difficult choice. A group of Arab countries had introduced a draft resolution that had not received the requisite number of votes. In principle, the Russian delegation agreed with most of the ideas reflected in the draft resolution. But at the same time, it did not give a full picture of the very complex situation. The resolution passed over in silence such important aspects as the need to provide guarantees for the security of all States in the region

and to not allow provocative military actions by extremists from the territory of Lebanon, which undermined the peace process and ran counter to the intensive diplomatic efforts underway. Therefore, the Russian Federation had abstained. He stated that the second draft resolution had been more balanced, although his country would have preferred it to be worded more clearly and precisely and some things could have been called by their names. However, he stressed that the main point was that it did reflect support for an unconditional ceasefire and for the efforts to achieve peace.³⁰

The representative of the United Kingdom stated that his Government remained deeply concerned about the situation as it affected both Lebanon and Israel and condemned the continuing rocket and other attacks on northern Israel, which had started the crisis. While the Government of the United Kingdom deeply deplored the loss of innocent civilian lives in Lebanon, he maintained that what needed to be done was to focus on the future and to do all that could be done to prevent further such tragedies; and what was needed was an immediate cessation of hostilities.³¹

The representative of the United States informed the Council that President Clinton had called upon all parties to agree to an immediate ceasefire, which had been welcomed by the Governments of Israel and Lebanon. She stated that, unfortunately, the draft resolution put before the Council by Lebanon and others had not been one that the United States could support. She maintained that there should be no doubt that the actions taken by Israel were in response to Hizbullah strikes launched from Lebanese territory against civilian centres in Israel. The draft resolution sponsored by Lebanon and others did not mention that. She stressed that singling out Israel for condemnation would have set back negotiations towards an end to the fighting.³²

The representative of Lebanon underscored that his country deplored that the Council had not acted swiftly to put an end to the Israeli aggression, and that the Arab draft resolution had not been adopted. He noted that the draft resolution had represented the firm and constant position of Lebanon and the Arab world

²⁷ Ibid., pp. 6-7.

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 7-8.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 9.

³⁰ Ibid., pp. 10-11.

³¹ Ibid., p. 11.

³² Ibid., pp. 11-12.

in particular. He recalled that the Council of the League of Arab States, at the level of Ministers for Foreign Affairs, had adopted unanimously the same text at the end of its special meeting, which had taken place in Cairo. He reaffirmed that the only way to end the violence in Lebanon was through the full implementation of resolution 425 (1978).³³

The representative of Israel expressed regret for the loss of life among innocent people. He maintained that the tragedy that had occurred was caused because Hizbullah had launched Katyusha rockets at Israel from locations a short distance away from the United Nations position where innocent civilians had taken shelter. He noted that Israel knew Hizbullah had been using civilians as a shield and that they were also doing so with units of UNIFIL, and not for the first time. He expressed regret that Israel had not heard a word of condemnation of those who had initiated hostilities from some of the members of the Security Council who had spoken. He noted that Israel had accepted the initiative by President William Jefferson Clinton to reach a ceasefire, to be implemented as soon as the other party agreed to implement it as well.³⁴

The representative of Norway demanded, as the most important contributor of troops to UNIFIL, that Hizbullah put a stop to its practice of establishing positions close to civilian or United Nations installations, and that the Israeli authorities take every necessary step to prevent shelling of United Nations and civilian targets.³⁵

A number of speakers stated that the military actions against Lebanon constituted a violation of its territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence within its internationally recognized borders and were also a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations, international law, relevant Security Council resolutions, in particular resolution 425 (1978), and the 1949 armistice agreement between Lebanon and Israel. They called for the hostilities to end immediately.³⁶ Other speakers called for a ceasefire and expressed concern about the

security, safety and freedom of movement of UNIFIL.³⁷

B. United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and development in the Israel-Lebanon sector

Decision of 29 January 1996 (3622nd meeting): resolution 1039 (1996) and statement by the President

On 22 January 1996, pursuant to resolution 1006 (1995), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report covering developments in Lebanon since his last report.³⁸ In his report, the Secretary-General stated that during the past six months, hostilities had continued in southern Lebanon between the Israel Defence Forces (IDF) and the local Lebanese auxiliary of IDF, the de facto forces, on the one hand, and armed elements who had proclaimed their resistance against the Israeli occupation on the other. The United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon had continued its efforts to limit the conflict and to protect the inhabitants from the fighting. Israel had maintained its occupation of parts of southern Lebanon, and the mandate of UNIFIL, contained in resolution 425 (1978), had remained unfulfilled. However, during the past six months, incidents involving the targeting of civilians had decreased. Although there had been no progress towards the implementation of the mandate of UNIFIL, the contribution by UNIFIL to stability in the area and the protection it was able to afford the inhabitants remained important. He therefore recommended that the Council accept the request of the Government of Lebanon and extend the mandate of UNIFIL for another period of six months, until 31 July 1996.

At its 3622nd meeting, held on 29 January 1996 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The President (United Kingdom) then drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 17 January 1996 from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-

³³ Ibid., p. 13.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 14.

³⁵ Ibid., pp. 14-15.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 5 (Honduras); pp. 8-9 (Botswana); pp. 16-17 (Cuba); pp. 17-18 (United Arab Emirates); p. 18 (Pakistan); and p. 19 (Islamic Republic of Iran).

³⁷ Ibid., p. 7 (Poland); pp. 9-10 (Italy); pp. 12-13 (Chile); p. 15 (Canada); pp. 15-16 (Ireland); and p. 16 (Japan).

³⁸ S/1996/45.

General, requesting the Council to extend the mandate of UNIFIL, which would expire on 31 January 1996, for a further interim period of six months.³⁹

At the same meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁴⁰ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1039 (1996), which reads:

The Security Council,

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

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General of 22 January 1996 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, and taking note of the observations expressed therein,

Taking note of the letter dated 17 January 1996 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General,

Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,

1. *Decides* to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further period of six months, that is, until 31 July 1996;

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

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

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

5. *Condemns* all acts of violence committed in particular against the Force, and urges the parties to put an end to them;

6. *Welcomes* the streamlining of the Force described in paragraph 16 of the report of the Secretary-General of 22 January 1996, to be completed by May 1996, and stresses the need to continue efforts to achieve further savings by rationalizing the administrative and support services of the Force, provided they do not affect its operational capacity;

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

At the same meeting the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁴¹

The Security Council has noted with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General of 22 January 1996 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, submitted in conformity with resolution 1006 (1995) of 28 July 1995.

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

As the Council extends the mandate of the Force for a further interim period on the basis of resolution 425 (1978), it again stresses the urgent need for the implementation of that resolution in all its aspects. It reiterates its full support for the Taif Agreement of 22 October 1989 and for the continued efforts of the Lebanese Government to consolidate peace, national unity and security in the country, while successfully carrying out the reconstruction process. The Council commends the Lebanese Government for its successful effort to extend its authority in the south of the country in full coordination with the Force.

The Council expresses its concern over the continuing violence in southern Lebanon, regrets the loss of civilian life, and urges all parties to exercise restraint.

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

**Decision of 30 July 1996 (3685th meeting):
resolution 1068 (1996) and statement by
the President**

On 20 July 1996, pursuant to resolution 1039 (1996), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on developments in Lebanon since his last report.⁴² In his report, the Secretary-General observed that the past six months had been marked by the serious escalation of hostilities in April, of which the population of southern Lebanon had been the primary

³⁹ S/1996/34.

⁴⁰ S/1996/58.

⁴¹ S/PRST/1996/5.

⁴² S/1996/575.

victim, and that UNIFIL had also come under fire. The Force was in the same difficult and dangerous situation in which it had been since the Israeli forces had withdrawn to their current lines in 1985. In the circumstances, UNIFIL had done its best to limit violence and to protect the civilian population, which had become its de facto mandate. In that connection, he noted that the understanding announced on 26 April 1996 had the potential of contributing to the protection of civilians and restraining the parties. It was therefore to be hoped that it would soon be put into full effect. He had instructed UNIFIL to assist the monitoring group, which was currently being set up in accordance with the understanding. In view of the importance of the contributions of UNIFIL to stability and the measure of protection it was able to afford to the civilian population, the Secretary-General recommended that the Council extend the mandate for another period of six months, until 31 January 1997.

At its 3685th meeting, held on 30 July 1996 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (France) then drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 18 July 1996 from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General, requesting that the Council extend the mandate of UNIFIL.⁴³

At the same meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁴⁴ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1068 (1996), which reads:

The Security Council,

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

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General of 20 July 1996 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, and taking note of the observations expressed and the commitments mentioned therein,

⁴³ S/1996/566.

⁴⁴ S/1996/599.

Taking note of the letter dated 18 July 1996 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General,

Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,

1. *Decides* to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further period of six months, that is, until 31 January 1997;

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

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

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

5. *Condemns* all acts of violence committed in particular against the Force, and urges the parties to put an end to them;

6. *Welcomes* the completion of the streamlining of the Force described in paragraph 33 of the report of the Secretary-General, and encourages further efficiency and savings provided they do not affect the operational capacity of the Force;

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

At the same meeting the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁴⁵

The Security Council has noted with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General of 20 July 1996 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, submitted in conformity with resolution 1039 (1996) of 29 January 1996.

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

As the Council extends the mandate of the Force for a further interim period on the basis of resolution 425 (1978), it again stresses the urgent need for the implementation of that resolution in all its aspects. It reiterates its full support for the Taif Agreement of 22 October 1989 and for the continued efforts

⁴⁵ S/PRST/1996/33.

of the Lebanese Government to consolidate peace, national unity and security in the country, while successfully carrying out the reconstruction process. The Council commends the Lebanese Government for its successful effort to extend its authority in the south of the country in full coordination with the Force.

The Council expresses its concern over the continuing violence in southern Lebanon, regrets the loss of civilian life, and urges all parties to exercise restraint.

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

**Decision of 28 January 1997 (3733rd meeting):
resolution 1095 (1997) and statement by
the President**

On 20 January 1997, pursuant to resolution 1068 (1996), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on developments since his last report.⁴⁶ In his report, the Secretary-General noted that, while the level of hostilities had been somewhat lower than in the past, the situation in southern Lebanon had continued to be tense and volatile, as Israel had maintained its occupation of parts of the area, while Lebanese groups had continued their attacks against the occupying forces. Although UNIFIL had continued to be prevented from implementing its mandate, its contribution to stability and the protection it was able to afford the population of the area remained important and the Secretary-General therefore recommended that the Council accede to the request of the Government of Lebanon and extend the mandate of UNIFIL for another period of six months, until 31 July 1997.

At its 3733rd meeting, held on 28 January 1997 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The President (Japan) then drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 17 January 1997 from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General, requesting that the Council extend the mandate of UNIFIL for six months.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ S/1997/42.

⁴⁷ S/1997/4.

At the same meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁴⁸ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1095 (1997), which reads:

The Security Council,

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

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General of 20 January 1997 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon: and taking note of the observations expressed and the commitments mentioned therein,

Taking note of the letter dated 17 January 1997 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General;

Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,

1. *Decides* to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further period of six months, that is, until 31 July 1997;

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

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

4. *Condemns* all acts of violence committed in particular against the Force, and urges the parties to put an end to them;

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

6. *Encourages* further efficiency and savings provided they do not affect the operational capacity of the Force;

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

⁴⁸ S/1997/79.

At the same meeting the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁴⁹

The Security Council has noted with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General of 20 January 1997 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, submitted in conformity with resolution 1068 (1996) of 30 July 1996.

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

As the Council extends the mandate of the Force for a further interim period on the basis of resolution 425 (1978), the Council again stresses the urgent need for the implementation of that resolution in all its aspects. It reiterates its full support for the Taif Agreement of 22 October 1989 and for the continued efforts of the Lebanese Government to consolidate peace, national unity and security in the country, while successfully carrying out the reconstruction process. The Council commends the Lebanese Government for its successful effort to extend its authority in the south of the country in full coordination with the Force.

The Council expresses its concern over the continuing violence in southern Lebanon, regrets the loss of civilian life, and urges all parties to exercise restraint.

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

**Decision of 29 July 1997 (3804th meeting):
resolution 1122 (1998) and statement by
the President**

On 16 July 1997, pursuant to resolution 1095 (1997), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on developments since his last report.⁵⁰ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that the level of hostilities in southern Lebanon had risen somewhat during the past six months and that civilians had again been targeted or put at risk. The situation had remained volatile and continued to give cause for serious concern. Although UNIFIL had continued to be prevented from implementing its mandate, its contribution to stability and the protection

it was able to afford the population of the area remained important and the Secretary-General therefore recommended that the Council accede to the request of the Government of Lebanon and extend the mandate of UNIFIL for another period of six months, until 31 January 1998.

At its 3804th meeting, held on 29 July 1997 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The President (Sweden) then drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 10 July 1997 from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General, requesting that the Council extend the mandate of UNIFIL for six months.⁵¹

At the same meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁵² The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1122 (1997), which reads:

The Security Council,

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

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General of 16 July 1997 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, and taking note of the observations expressed and the commitments mentioned therein,

Taking note of the letter dated 10 July 1997 from the Charge d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General,

Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,

1. *Decides* to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further period of six months, that is, until 31 January 1998;

2. *Reiterates its strong support* for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political 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);

⁴⁹ S/PRST/1997/1.

⁵⁰ S/1997/550 and Corr. 1.

⁵¹ S/1997/534.

⁵² S/1997/575.

and calls upon all parties concerned to cooperate fully with the Force for the full implementation of its mandate;

4. *Condemns* all acts of violence committed in particular against the Force, and urges the parties to put an end to them;

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

6. *Encourages* further efficiency and savings provided they do not affect the operational capacity of the Force;

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

At the same meeting the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁵³

The Security Council has noted with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General of 16 July 1997 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, submitted in conformity with resolution 1095 (1997) of 28 January 1997.

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

As the Council extends the mandate of the Force for a further interim period on the basis of resolution 425 (1978), the Council again stresses the urgent need for the implementation of that resolution in all its aspects. It reiterates its full support for the Taif Agreement of 22 October 1989 and for the continued efforts of the Lebanese Government to consolidate peace, national unity and security in the country, while successfully carrying out the reconstruction process. The Council commends the Lebanese Government for its successful effort to extend its authority in the south of the country in full coordination with the Force.

The Council expresses its concern over the continuing violence in southern Lebanon, regrets the loss of civilian life, and urges all parties to exercise restraint.

The Council takes this opportunity to express its appreciation for the continuing efforts of the Secretary-General and his staff in this regard. The Council notes with deep concern the high level of casualties the Force has suffered and pays a special tribute to all those who gave their life while serving in the Force. It commends the troops of the Force and troop-contributing countries for their sacrifices and commitment to the

⁵³ S/PRST/1997/40.

cause of international peace and security under difficult circumstances.

**Decision of 30 January 1998 (3852nd meeting):
resolution 1151 (1998) and statement by
the President**

On 20 January 1998, pursuant to resolution 1122 (1997), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on developments since his last report.⁵⁴ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that during the past six months, the situation in southern Lebanon remained volatile and had continued to give cause for serious concern. The level of hostilities had risen, and the increase in the number of civilians who had been killed or injured was particularly worrisome. He also expressed concern at the harassment of United Nations personnel. However, he noted that Israel had expressed its readiness to implement resolution 425 (1978), subject to a number of conditions. Although UNIFIL had continued to be prevented from implementing its mandate, its contribution to stability and the protection it was able to afford the population of the area remained important and the Secretary-General therefore recommended that the Council accede to the request of the Government of Lebanon and extend the mandate of UNIFIL for another period of six months, until 31 January 1998.

At its 3852nd meeting, held on 30 January 1998 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (France) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 6 January 1998 from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General, requesting that the Council extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months.⁵⁵

At the same meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁵⁶ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1151 (1998), which reads:

⁵⁴ S/1998/53.

⁵⁵ S/1998/7.

⁵⁶ S/1998/80.

The Security Council,

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

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General of 20 January 1998 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, and taking note of the observations expressed and the commitments mentioned therein,

Taking note of the letter dated 6 January 1998 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General,

Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,

1. *Decides* to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further period of six months, that is until 31 July 1998;

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

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

4. *Condemns* all acts of violence committed in particular against the Force, and urges the parties to put an end to them;

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

6. *Encourages* further efficiency and savings provided they do not affect the operational capacity of the Force;

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

At the same meeting the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁵⁷

The Security Council has noted with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General of 20 January 1998 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, submitted in conformity with resolution 1122 (1997) of 29 July 1997.

The Council reaffirms its commitment to the full sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized

boundaries. In this context, the Council asserts that all States shall refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

As the Council extends the mandate of the Force for a further interim period on the basis of resolution 425 (1978), it again stresses the urgent need for the implementation of that resolution in all its aspects. It reiterates its full support for the Taif Agreement of 22 October 1989 and for the continued efforts of the Lebanese Government to consolidate peace, national unity and security in the country, while successfully carrying out the reconstruction process. The Council commends the Lebanese Government for its successful effort to extend its authority in the south of the country in full coordination with the Force.

The Council expresses its concern over the continuing violence in southern Lebanon, regrets the loss of civilian life, and urges all parties to exercise restraint.

The Council takes this opportunity to express its appreciation for the continuing efforts of the Secretary-General and his staff in this regard. The Council notes with deep concern the high level of casualties the Force has suffered and pays a special tribute to all those who gave their lives while serving in the Force. It commends the troops of the Force and troop-contributing countries for their sacrifices and commitment to the cause of international peace and security under difficult circumstances.

**Decision of 30 July 1998 (3913th meeting):
resolution 1188 (1998) and statement by
the President**

On 16 July 1998, pursuant to resolution 1151 (1998), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on developments since his last report.⁵⁸ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that fighting in southern Lebanon had continued and civilians had again been put at risk, although the number of those who had been killed had decreased. The Force had continued its efforts to limit the conflict and to protect the inhabitants from the fighting. Although UNIFIL had continued to be prevented from implementing its mandate, its contribution to stability and the protection it was able to afford the population of the area remained important and the Secretary-General therefore recommended that the Council accede to the request of the Government of Lebanon and extend the mandate of UNIFIL for another period of six months, until 31 January 1999.

⁵⁷ S/PRST/1998/2.

⁵⁸ S/1998/652.

At its 3913th meeting, held on 30 July 1998 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Russian Federation) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 26 June 1998 from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General, requesting that the Council extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months.⁵⁹

At the same meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁶⁰ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1188 (1998), which reads:

The Security Council,

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

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General of 16 July 1998 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, and taking note of the observations expressed and the commitments mentioned therein,

Taking note of the letter dated 26 June 1998 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General,

Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,

1. *Decides* to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further period of six months, that is, until 31 January 1999;

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

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

4. *Condemns* all acts of violence committed in particular against the Force, and urges the parties to put an end to them;

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

6. *Encourages* further efficiency and savings provided they do not affect the operational capacity of the Force;

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

At the same meeting the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁶¹

The Security Council has noted with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General of 16 July 1998 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, submitted in conformity with resolution 1151 (1998) of 30 January 1998.

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

As the Council extends the mandate of the Force for a further interim period on the basis of resolution 425 (1978), it again stresses the urgent need for the implementation of that resolution in all its aspects. It reiterates its full support for the Taif Agreement of 22 October 1989 and for the continued efforts of the Lebanese Government to consolidate peace, national unity and security in the country, while successfully carrying out the reconstruction process. The Council commends the Lebanese Government for its successful effort to extend its authority in the south of the country in full coordination with the Force.

The Council expresses its concern over the continuing violence in southern Lebanon, regrets the loss of civilian life, and urges all parties to exercise restraint.

The Council takes this opportunity to express its appreciation for the continuing efforts of the Secretary-General and his staff in this regard. The Council notes with deep concern the high level of casualties the Force has suffered and pays a special tribute to all those who gave their life while serving in the Force. It commends the troops of the Force and troop-contributing countries for their sacrifices and commitment to the cause of international peace and security under difficult circumstances.

⁶¹ S/PRST/1998/23.

⁵⁹ S/1998/584.

⁶⁰ S/1998/682.

Decision of 28 January 1999 (3970th meeting): resolution 1223 (1999) and statement by the President

On 19 January 1999, pursuant to resolution 1188 (1998), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on developments since his last report.⁶² In his report, the Secretary-General observed that fighting in southern Lebanon continued at an increased pace. Although UNIFIL had continued to be prevented from implementing its mandate, its contribution to stability and the protection it was able to afford the population of the area remained important and the Secretary-General therefore recommended that the Council accede to the request of the Government of Lebanon and extend the mandate of UNIFIL for another period of six months, until 13 July 1999.

At its 3970th meeting, held on 28 January 1999 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Brazil) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 8 January 1999 from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General, requesting that the Council extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months.⁶³

At the same meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁶⁴ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1223 (1999), which reads:

The Security Council,

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

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General of 19 January 1999 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, and taking note of the observations expressed and the commitments mentioned therein,

Taking note of the letter dated 8 January 1999 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General,

Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,

1. *Decides* to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further period of six months, that is, until 31 July 1999;

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

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

4. *Condemns* all acts of violence committed in particular against the Force, and urges the parties to put an end to them;

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

6. *Encourages* further efficiency and savings provided they do not affect the operational capacity of the Force;

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

At the same meeting the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁶⁵

The Security Council has noted with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General of 19 January 1999 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, submitted in conformity with resolution 1188 (1998) of 30 July 1998.

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

As the Council extends the mandate of the Force for a further interim period on the basis of resolution 425 (1978), it again stresses the urgent need for the implementation of that resolution in all its aspects. It reiterates its full support for the Taif Agreement of 22 October 1989 and for the continued efforts of the Lebanese Government to consolidate peace, national unity and security in the country, while successfully carrying out the

⁶² S/1999/61.

⁶³ S/1999/22.

⁶⁴ S/1999/75.

⁶⁵ S/PRST/1999/4.

reconstruction process. The Council commends the Lebanese Government for its successful effort to extend its authority in the south of the country in full coordination with the Force.

The Council expresses its concern over the continuing violence in southern Lebanon, regrets the loss of civilian life and urges all parties to exercise restraint.

The Council takes this opportunity to express its appreciation for the continuing efforts of the Secretary-General and his staff in this regard. The Council notes with deep concern the high level of casualties the Force has suffered and pays a special tribute to all those who gave their lives while serving in the Force. It commends the troops of the Force and troop-contributing countries for their sacrifices and commitment to the cause of international peace and security under difficult circumstances.

**Decision of 30 July 1999 (4028th meeting):
resolution 1254 (1999) and statement by
the President**

On 21 July 1999, pursuant to resolution 1223 (1999), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on developments since his last report.⁶⁶ In his report, the Secretary-General observed that the situation in the area remained volatile and continued to give cause for serious concern. The level of hostilities had risen and civilians had again been targeted. Although UNIFIL had done its best to limit the violence and to protect the civilian population, its ability to do so was dependent on the parties, who had too often not honoured their commitments in that regard. He stressed that the fact that UNIFIL itself had been targeted and a member of UNIFIL killed and others injured needed to be strongly condemned. However, he noted that, despite the recent escalation of hostilities, there had been positive signs. In June, Jezzín once again came under the full control of the Government of Lebanon, and there had been new hope that the same would become possible soon for the part of Lebanon that was still under Israeli control. Although UNIFIL had continued to be prevented from implementing its mandate, its contribution to stability and the protection it was able to afford the population of the area remained important and the Secretary-General therefore recommended that the Council accede to the request of the Government of Lebanon and extend the mandate of UNIFIL for another period of six months, until 31 January 2000.

⁶⁶ S/1999/807.

At its 4028th meeting, held on 30 July 1999 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Malaysia) drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 25 June 1999 from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General, requesting that the Council extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months.⁶⁷

At the same meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁶⁸ The draft resolution was then put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1254 (1999), which reads:

The Security Council,

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

Having studied the report of the Secretary-General of 21 July 1999 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, and taking note of the observations expressed and the commitments mentioned therein,

Taking note of the letter dated 25 June 1999 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General,

Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon,

1. *Decides* to extend the present mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for a further period of six months, that is, until 31 January 2000;

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

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

4. *Condemns* all acts of violence committed in particular against the Force, and urges the parties to put an end to them;

⁶⁷ S/1999/720.

⁶⁸ S/1999/826.

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

6. *Encourages* further efficiency and savings provided they do not affect the operational capacity of the Force;

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

At the same meeting, the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁶⁹

The Security Council has noted with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General of 21 July 1999 on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, submitted in conformity with resolution 1223 (1999) of 28 January 1999.

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

As the Council extends the mandate of the Force for a further interim period on the basis of resolution 425 (1978), it again stresses the urgent need for the implementation of that resolution in all its aspects. It reiterates its full support for the Taif Agreement of 22 October 1989 and for the continued efforts of the Lebanese Government to consolidate peace, national unity and security in the country, while successfully carrying out the reconstruction process. The Council commends the Lebanese Government for its successful effort to extend its authority in the south of the country in full coordination with the Force.

The Council expresses its concern over the continuing violence in southern Lebanon, regrets the loss of civilian life, and urges all parties to exercise restraint.

The Council takes this opportunity to express its appreciation for the continuing efforts of the Secretary-General and his staff in this regard. The Council notes with deep concern the high level of casualties the Force has suffered and pays a special tribute to all those who gave their lives while serving in the Force. It commends the troops of the Force and troop-contributing countries for their sacrifices and commitment to the cause of international peace and security under difficult circumstances.

⁶⁹ S/PRST/1999/24.

C. United Nations Disengagement Observer Force

Decision of 30 May 1996 (3669th meeting): resolution 1057 (1996) and statement by the President

On 23 May 1996, pursuant to resolution 1024 (1995), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on the activities of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF).⁷⁰ In his report, the Secretary-General stated that the ceasefire in the Israel-Syria sector had been maintained without serious incident and that the area of operation of UNDOF had remained calm. UNDOF had supervised the area of separation to ensure that no military forces had been deployed in it. Despite the current quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East 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. 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 UNDOF for a further period of six months, until 30 November 1996. He noted that the Governments of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel had expressed their agreement.

At its 3669th meeting, held on 30 May 1996 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The President (China) then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁷¹ The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1057 (1996), which reads:

The Security Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General of 23 May 1996 on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force,

Decides:

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

⁷⁰ S/1996/368.

⁷¹ S/1996/363.

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 30 November 1996;

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

At the same meeting, in connection with the resolution adopted, the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁷²

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General of 23 May 1996 on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 14: "Despite the present quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached." That statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council.

Decision of 27 November 1996 (3715th meeting): resolution 1081 (1996)

On 18 November 1996, pursuant to resolution 1057 (1996), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on the activities of UNDOF.⁷³ In his report, the Secretary-General stated that the situation in the Israeli-Syrian sector had remained quiet and that there had been no serious incidents. However, in the prevailing circumstances, the Secretary-General considered the continued presence of UNDOF in the area to be essential and therefore recommended that the Council extend the mandate of UNDOF for a further period of six months, until 31 May 1997. He noted that the Governments of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel had expressed their agreement.

At its 3715th meeting, held on 27 November 1996 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The President (Indonesia) then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁷⁴ The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1081 (1996), which reads:

The Security Council,

⁷² S/PRST/1996/27.

⁷³ S/1996/959 and Corr.1.

⁷⁴ S/1996/975.

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General of 18 November 1996 on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force,

Decides:

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

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 31 May 1997;

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

At the same meeting, in connection with the resolution adopted, the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁷⁵

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General of 18 November 1996 on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 13: "Despite the present quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East 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 28 May 1997 (3782nd meeting): resolution 1109 (1997) and statement by the President

On 16 May 1997, pursuant to resolution 1081 (1996), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on the activities of UNDOF.⁷⁶ In his report, the Secretary-General stated that the situation in the Israeli-Syrian sector had remained quiet and that there had been no serious incident. However, 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 UNDOF for a further period of six months, until 30 November 1997. He noted that the Governments of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel had expressed their agreement.

At its 3782nd meeting, held on 28 May 1997 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The President (Republic of Korea) then drew the attention of the

⁷⁵ S/PRST/1996/45.

⁷⁶ S/1997/372.

Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁷⁷ The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1109 (1997), which reads:

The Security Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General of 16 May 1997 on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force,

Decides:

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

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 30 November 1997;

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

At the same meeting, in connection with the resolution adopted, the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁷⁸

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 13: "Despite the present quiet in the Israeli-Syrian sector, the situation in the Middle East 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 21 November 1997 (3835th meeting): resolution 1139 (1997) and statement by the President

On 14 November 1997, pursuant to resolution 1109 (1997), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on the activities of UNDOF.⁷⁹ In his report, the Secretary-General stated that the situation in the Israeli-Syrian sector had remained quiet and that there had been no serious incident. However, 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 UNDOF for a further period of six months, until

31 May 1998. He noted that the Governments of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel had expressed their agreement.

At its 3835th meeting, held on 21 November 1997 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The President (China) then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁸⁰ The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1139 (1997), which reads:

The Security Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General of 14 November 1997 on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force,

Decides:

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

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 31 May 1998;

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

At the same meeting, in connection with the resolution adopted, the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁸¹

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 9: "Despite the present quiet in the Israeli-Syrian sector, the situation in the Middle East continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached." That statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council.

Decision of 27 May 1998 (3885th meeting): resolution 1169 (1998) and statement by the President

On 14 May 1998, pursuant to resolution 1139 (1997), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security

⁷⁷ S/1997/396.

⁷⁸ S/PRST/1997/30.

⁷⁹ S/1997/884.

⁸⁰ S/1997/904.

⁸¹ S/PRST/1997/53.

Council a report on the activities of UNDOF.⁸² In his report, the Secretary-General stated that the situation in the Israeli-Syrian sector had remained quiet and that there had been no serious incident. However, 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 UNDOF for a further period of six months, until 30 November 1998. He noted that the Governments of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel had expressed their agreement.

At its 3885th meeting, held on 27 May 1998 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The President (Kenya) then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁸³ The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1169 (1998), which reads:

The Security Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General of 14 May 1998 on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force,

Decides:

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

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 30 November 1998;

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

At the same meeting, in connection with the resolution adopted, the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁸⁴

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 10: "Despite the present quiet in the Israeli-Syrian sector, the situation in the Middle East continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle

⁸² S/1998/391.

⁸³ S/1998/422.

⁸⁴ S/PRST/1998/15.

East problem can be reached." That statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council.

Decision of 25 November 1998 (3947th meeting): resolution 1211 (1998) and statement by the President

On 14 November 1998, pursuant to resolution 1169 (1998), the Secretary-General submitted to the Council a report on the activities of UNDOF.⁸⁵ In his report, the Secretary-General stated that the situation in the Israeli-Syrian sector had remained quiet and that there had been no serious incident. However, 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 UNDOF for a further period of six months, until 31 May 1999. He noted that the Governments of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel had expressed their agreement.

At its 3947th meeting, held on 25 November 1998 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The President (United States) then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁸⁶ The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1211 (1998), which reads:

The Security Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General of 14 November 1998 on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force,

Decides:

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

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 31 May 1999;

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

⁸⁵ S/1998/1073.

⁸⁶ S/1998/1115.

At the same meeting, in connection with the resolution adopted, the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁸⁷

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 8: "Despite the present quiet in the Israeli-Syrian sector, the situation in the Middle East continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached." That statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council.

**Decision of 27 May 1999 (4009th meeting):
resolution 1243 (1999) and statement by
the President**

On 18 May 1999, pursuant to resolution 1211 (1998), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on the activities of UNDOF.⁸⁸ In his report, the Secretary-General stated that the situation in the Israeli-Syrian sector had remained quiet and that there had been no serious incident. However, 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 UNDOF for a further period of six months, until 30 November 1999. He noted that the Governments of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel had expressed their agreement.

At its 4009th meeting, held on 27 May 1999 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The President (Gabon) then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁸⁹ The draft resolution was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1243 (1999), which reads:

The Security Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force of 18 May 1999,

Decides:

⁸⁷ S/PRST/1998/33.

⁸⁸ S/1999/575.

⁸⁹ S/1996/609.

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

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 30 November 1999;

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

At the same meeting, in connection with the resolution adopted, the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁹⁰

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 11: "Despite the present quiet in the Israeli-Syrian sector, the situation in the Middle East 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 24 November 1999 (4071st meeting):
resolution 1276 (1999) and statement by
the President**

On 15 November 1999, pursuant to resolution 1243 (1999), the Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council a report on the activities of UNDOF.⁹¹ In his report, the Secretary-General stated that the situation in the Israeli-Syrian sector had remained quiet and that there had been no serious incident. However, 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 UNDOF for a further period of six months, until 31 May 2000. He noted that the Governments of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel had expressed their agreement.

At its 4071st meeting, held on 24 November 1999 in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations, the Security Council included the report of the Secretary-General in its agenda. The President (Slovenia) then drew the attention of the Council to a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.⁹² The draft resolution

⁹⁰ S/PRST/1999/15.

⁹¹ S/1999/1175.

⁹² S/1999/1189.

was put to the vote and adopted unanimously as resolution 1276 (1999), which reads:

The Security Council,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General of 15 November 1999 on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force,

Decides:

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

(b) To renew the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for another period of six months, that is, until 31 May 2000;

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

At the same meeting, in connection with the resolution adopted, the President made the following statement on behalf of the Council:⁹³

As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force states, in paragraph 10: "Despite the present quiet in the Israeli-Syrian sector, the situation in the Middle East 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.

⁹³ S/PRST/1999/33.

31. The situation in the occupied Arab territories

Deliberations of 15 April 1996 (3652nd meeting)

By a letter dated 10 April 1996 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of the United Arab Emirates requested the Council to meet to consider the serious situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including Jerusalem.¹

At its 3652nd meeting, held on 15 April 1996 in response to that request, the Security Council included the letter in its agenda. Following the adoption of the agenda, the President (Chile), with the consent of the Council, invited the representatives of Algeria, Colombia, Cuba, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Morocco, Norway, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen, and the Permanent Observer of Palestine, at their request, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. The President also invited the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the Permanent Observer of the Organization of the Islamic Conference under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.

The President then drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 2 April 1996 from the

Permanent Observer of Palestine addressed to the Secretary-General.² In his letter, the representative informed the Council that Israel had been taking very harsh measures against the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem. The measures included the demolition of homes, the confiscation of land and expansion of settlements and severe restrictions on the movement of persons and goods within the Palestinian territory, as well as into and out of the territory.

The representative of Palestine stated that the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem, had been enduring a very difficult time due to a set of policies adopted by Israel in several fields. Speaking on the first field, he elaborated on the points in the above letter. He stressed that it was clear that the policy represented "a siege of the Palestinian territory and the strangulation of the Palestinian people and their economy". In addition, the measures had been taken by Israel unilaterally, without consultation with the Palestinian side, and they were illegally imposed by military means. The second field involved a set of Israeli measures with multiple aspects, which began with the resumption by the occupying Power of the practice of demolishing Palestinian homes and its threats to revert to deportation, and included political assassinations and

¹ S/1996/257.

² S/1996/235.