

Jacob Wallace  
Jan 5, 1999  
Israel Desk  
State dept.

He said that the US involvement could only be based on what the Israel government wants to do.  
Israel must do it.  
He feels that there is no basis for withdrawal.  
Israel does not want to withdraw from Lebanon.  
Wye happened because of Netanyahu, not thrust upon him.  
Stated clearly that the Sharon plan has nothing to do with unilateral withdrawal.

Sir Kieran Prendergast  
Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs

I told him about our group, our activities, and our reason for this visit: to call on the UN to be more active in the issue of Lebanon. Since the UNIFIL has been there since 1978, it is time for them to act. They could oversee temporarily a withdrawal although he doubted that would redeploy.

Implementation of security council 425  
calls for withdrawal, security on border, 242 and 338  
practical reality

no correlation between losses and Israel's actions trying to put pressure on Lebanon through the UN.  
Rather there is pressure from Israel when there is public outcry in Israel.

Israel wants orderly withdrawal, reasonable guarantees, no vacuum.  
Intimately linked with revival of Syria track.  
Syria demands starting where the talks broke off.  
Syria says things promised; Israel that there were only verbal discussions.

Lebanon not able to give them any guarantees.  
High risk strategy: withdrawal without some guarantees.  
Unifil could monitor Israeli's withdrawal not protect the border.  
Unifil is temporary

At first he said that it would take a new mandate in the Security Council, then checking the wording of 425 and UNIFIL mandate, agreed that it could monitor withdrawal.

Seemed to say that UNIFIL would not move into positions which Israel vacates. They are temporary. [I argued that temporary would allow Israel an interim situation, but he seemed skeptical that they could fulfill this role. I asked then what is their function. NOT clear.]

Seemed to say that UN and US coordinating plan, he and Indyk, that after Wye the next question would be Lebanon, but nothing happening now.

They are against getting out gradually

Tied to Syria

*Golan:  
Security  
Demilitarized  
3 zones  
time table  
not clear  
peace*

Strange that leaks are going on about secret meetings  
HE thinks that once Israel pulls out unilaterally, the Syrians  
will pay Palestinians or fringe groups to bomb Israel, and then  
Israel will retaliate forcefully. Afraid of destabilization.

Syria knows Israel wants to get out, thinks that puts them in  
weakened position.

When I asked if Israel's withdrawal would weaken the hold that  
Syria had on Israel, he didn't seem to know. Assumes that  
immediate withdrawal would be a bad thing.

[i need to check wording of 425, 242, and 338]

Robert Satloff

Washington Institute for Near East Policy

Argues as well that the key is Syria and that any unilateral  
withdrawal would be a bad thing. He is for bombing Syria each  
time something happens in Israel, believes in bringing the war to  
syria.

He is completely against people to people meetings, thinks I  
would be like Jane Fonda, and it would hurt our movement in  
Israel. He says that our biggest job is to work within Israel.  
What would be the point of the people to people meetings. Said  
that the Lebanese would be happy to have you, would use you for  
publicity. What would be gained.