

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

1426th MEETING: 21 MAY 1968

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1426)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Letter dated 25 April 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8560);	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 2254 (ES-V) relating to Jerusalem (S/8146)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 21 May 1968, at 4 p.m.

President: Lord CARADON

(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Algeria, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Hungary, India, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1426)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Letter dated 25 April 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8560);
 - (b) Report of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 2254 (ES-V) relating to Jerusalem (S/8146).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Letter dated 25 April 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8560);
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 2254 (ES-V) relating to Jerusalem (S/8146).

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision previously taken by the Council, I shall now invite the representatives of Jordan and Israel to take places at the Council table in order to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. H. El-Farra (Jordan) and Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel) took places at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: The Council will now continue its consideration of the question before it.

3. I invite the attention of the Council to the fact that since our meeting yesterday a revised text of the draft resolution sponsored by Pakistan and Senegal has been submitted. This revised text is before us in document S/8590/Rev.2.

4. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): At the 1425th meeting of the Security Council, held yesterday, the Pakistan delegation had the honour to introduce, on behalf of the delegation of Senegal and itself, the draft resolution contained in document S/8590. As a result of further consultations held today, a revised version of that draft resolution has been circulated as document S/8590/Rev.2. I shall read out the text of the revised draft resolution.

"The Security Council,

"Recalling General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) of 4 July 1967 and 2254 (ES-V) of 14 July 1967,

"Having considered the letter of the Permanent Representative of Jordan on the situation in Jerusalem (S/8560) and the report of the Secretary-General (S/8146),

"Having heard the statements made before the Council,

"Noting that since the adoption of the above-mentioned resolutions Israel has taken further measures and actions in contravention of those resolutions,

"Bearing in mind the need to work for a just and lasting peace,

"Reaffirming that acquisition of territory by military conquest is inadmissible,

"1. Deplores the failure of Israel to comply with the General Assembly resolutions mentioned above;

"2. Considers that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel, including expropriation of land and properties thereon, which tend to change the legal status of Jerusalem are invalid and cannot change that status;

"3. Urgently calls upon Israel to rescind all such measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any further action which tends to change the status of Jerusalem;

"4. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the implementation of the present resolution."

5. The changes which are included in the revised draft resolution will be apparent from a comparison of the two texts. The co-sponsors and the other Asian, African and

Latin American delegations which jointly evolved the earlier text are grateful for the suggestions made during the consultations. These suggestions have resulted in a revision of the text which, besides accommodating some important viewpoints, has lent it great precision.

6. In my statement yesterday I made it clear that the legal measures and administrative actions which the draft resolution seeks to invalidate and forbid are those measures and actions which have already been taken or are contemplated by Israel in an attempt to change the status of Jerusalem. The revised version of operative paragraphs 2 and 3 brings out this intent with greater clarity. It is the belief of the seven African, Asian and Latin American delegations that the revised version of the draft resolution will command the Council's support.

7. Considering the urgency of the issue, and also the Council's preoccupation with other pressing business, my delegation would greatly appreciate it if the Council, after having heard all the representatives who wish to make statements this afternoon, would proceed to vote on the revised draft resolution.

8. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): The United States had strongly hoped that in dealing with the question of Jerusalem it would have been possible for this Council to act with the same unanimous agreement that has characterized the handling of every facet of the Middle East situation which has come before the Council since the Middle East war erupted last June. We backed up that hope with intensive consultations to formulate the elements of a draft resolution which could command unanimous support. We greatly regret that these efforts were not successful and that our hope was not fulfilled.

9. While sharing many of the concerns which have motivated members of the Council who have supported the draft resolution submitted by Pakistan and Senegal, the United States finds it impossible to lend its support to that draft resolution. I wish to use this occasion to explain briefly the reasons why we have come to this conclusion.

10. Fundamental to our position have been two convictions: first, that this Council should encourage and support the peace-making process which we initiated in November 1967 in Security Council resolution 242 (1967); second, that this Council, and indeed all concerned, should avoid any action that might prejudice the efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace in the area, including actions or measures purporting to alter the status of Jerusalem. We find the draft resolution placed before us seriously deficient on these two counts.

11. Our own view has been and remains that the future of Jerusalem is a problem which falls within the purview of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and of Mr. Jarring's mission and mandate.

12. I wish to reaffirm the view of the United States Government that the United States, while agreeing that Jerusalem is a most important issue, does not believe that the problem of Jerusalem can be dealt with realistically

apart from other aspects of the situation in the Middle East with which resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 is concerned; nor do we believe that Jerusalem can be excluded from the scope of the resolution of 22 November. Rather we consider it essential that a peaceful and accepted settlement, in conformity with the resolution of 22 November, encompass all aspects of the Middle East problem including Jerusalem. We have sensed general agreement with this view among the members of the Council.

13. Nevertheless, in our view, the draft resolution presented and to be voted on this afternoon, would unfortunately work in the direction of separating out and dealing in isolation with one particular aspect of the Middle East situation, the question of Jerusalem. This is not the course envisaged in resolution 242 (1967) of last November, a resolution which we believe must remain the touchstone of all steps towards a desirable settlement in the Middle East. It is not, accordingly, a course which my Government favours with regard to Jerusalem or any other of the many specific problems which must be resolved to arrive at the peaceful and accepted settlement called for in resolution 242 (1967).

14. As I stated to the Council on 9 May 1968, at the 1424th meeting, the United States believes that one of the most constructive contributions that this Council could make at this juncture of the difficult search for a Middle East settlement would be an explicit expression of its support for the peace-making efforts in which Mr. Jarring, at the unanimous behest of this Council, has been and remains engaged. The absence of this element from the draft resolution, and indeed the notable absence of expressed recognition of the resolution of 22 November, is a further reason why my Government cannot support this draft resolution. Further, the United States is not in a position to vote favourably on a text which contains specific and selective reference to two General Assembly resolutions among many on which we previously abstained for reasons explained at the time of their adoption.

15. Every member of this Council, as well as the parties concerned, knows that the United States has made a maximum effort to build upon the basis which exists for unanimity in this Council's settlement of the question immediately before us in this debate. We have been prepared to declare, as everyone knows, that unilateral actions and measures by Israel cannot be accepted and are not recognized as altering or prejudging the status of Jerusalem, and we have been ready to call upon Israel to refrain from such actions. At the same time, we have regarded it as essential that the Council should call upon all parties to avoid all acts that might prejudice efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace in the area and that it should express its support for Mr. Jarring's efforts under resolution 242 (1967).

16. It is simply incomprehensible to the United States that such a reference should not be included in this draft resolution. For the members of the Council, the search for a peaceful and accepted settlement is not only an opportunity; it is a responsibility, and it is one which all members

of this Council assumed when they empowered the Secretary-General's representative to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve such a settlement.

17. I very much regret that it has not been possible today to preserve the unanimity which has characterized the Council's work since the tragic conflict of last June, because it is upon unanimity, and not merely the words of a resolution, that a peaceful settlement in the final analysis will largely depend. It is nevertheless my profound hope that it will be possible to return to unanimity in the coming days and weeks.

18. Mr. President, if you will pardon a personal note: having participated all through this past year in the strenuous efforts of the Security Council concerning the Middle East, I find that my dominant impression is connected not with any expressions of hostility or bitterness—which are unfortunate but perhaps inevitable—but with those few decisive moments in which fifteen nations, representing all the diverse interests and cultures of the world, were able to rise above their particular predilections and unite on the necessity that is common to all of us in this world in which survival still remains an open question, the necessity to live together in peace and tolerance.

19. From those decisive moments—especially that moment last 22 November which will certainly live in United Nations history—I do not derive any false comfort, for hard tasks lie ahead; but I do derive much hope from this record because it proves what we can do together at our best when we are united in a common dedication to a common cause. I pray that in future days this Council will perform at its best again and again until it has overcome even the most stubborn difficulties on the road towards peace in that area which, above all, needs a permanent, just and lasting peace.

20. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): At the Council's 1417th meeting on 27 April, I emphasized the concern of the Canadian delegation that nothing should be done that would upset or make more difficult efforts to achieve "a peaceful and accepted settlement" in accordance with the unanimously adopted resolution of 22 November last. It is of course equally important that everything possible should be done to support and advance the mission undertaken by the Secretary-General's representative, Mr. Jarring, under the terms of resolution 242 (1967). These two principles reflect my Government's primary concern in this matter: the furtherance of progress towards "a just and lasting peace in the Middle East".

21. It follows that any step should be avoided which would weaken the guidelines for a settlement provided in resolution 242 (1967) or disturb the equitable balance of obligations laid down in that resolution. That resolution and the mission of Mr. Jarring which it authorized still represent our best hope for peace in the Middle East. The integrity of the resolution, and hence of Mr. Jarring's mandate, must be maintained. We must stand by that basic jurisdiction in this Council. That will only be possible, however, if the parties refrain from actions which tend to foreclose or predetermine the terms of an agreed settlement. Such actions in effect challenge the principles and

provisions laid down in resolution 242 (1967). They pose a threat to the continued validity of that resolution and indeed to the search for a peaceful settlement.

22. It is in the light of these considerations that Canada has examined carefully the issues relating to Jerusalem placed before us at our current series of meetings. The Canadian position on Jerusalem has been made amply clear both in our statements and in our votes in the General Assembly and in the Security Council. We stand by those statements and we stand by those votes. In our view, however, the status of Jerusalem and the Holy Places cannot, in practical terms, be considered or resolved as an isolated issue. We are opposed to any unilateral actions which would be prejudicial to the legitimate international concern about that city, to the preservation of the special spiritual and religious interests there, or to the peaceful and accepted settlement being sought under the auspices of this Organization. Such actions are neither helpful nor acceptable, and we cannot condone any steps which would either alter or attempt to alter unilaterally the status of Jerusalem or endanger the prospects for a settlement.

23. The actions of the Council and the statements made in the Council during the past month have shown that there is a consensus on those points; in this instance also it should have been possible, in my judgement, to reach agreement on such a basis. The Council, I am confident, remains united in its support of Mr. Jarring's important mission. I believe, too, that it remains united on the principle that nothing should be done to disturb his mission and that it should receive the fullest support of all concerned.

24. If that assessment is correct, I believe we must all ask ourselves a question. Will we in fact be assisting Mr. Jarring in his task if we press the resolution before us to a vote? It has been clear from the start that the type of resolution on which we are now expected to vote would not command unanimous consent in the Council—and the statement to which we have just listened confirms that judgement. This draft resolution, if adopted, will be the first resolution adopted without unanimity since 22 November last, when we in this Council, by the passage of resolution 242 (1967), established the basis for the Special Representative's efforts to work towards a political solution of the outstanding problems in the Middle East.

25. In these circumstances we believe that dividing the Council to pass a resolution that deals with only one of the problems covered by resolution 242 (1967) cannot be helpful and indeed will be self-defeating. The Canadian delegation will, therefore, abstain from this vote. In our view, the members of the Council have a special obligation to try to help find solutions within the primary responsibility of this Council for international peace and security. That obligation particularly falls on the permanent members—and it is well known that this text will not command the support of all the permanent members. Particularly as we have proceeded by unanimity in the Council since November last, it is regrettable that this divisive resolution should be pressed to a vote.

26. To adopt the draft resolution submitted yesterday by the representative of Pakistan, despite the amendments to

which he alluded today, also means, as the representative of the Soviet Union reminded us at our last meeting, starting on the road towards the application of sanctions to Israel in the event that the rescinding required by this resolution is not complied with. Is that the road we want to follow? Is it either wise or practical for the Council to pursue the course of sanctions when it is fully committed to a diplomatic approach? What will be left of Mr. Jarring's mandate if the Council by action on this particular issue undermines the fine balance of rights and obligations embodied in resolution 242 (1967) as the basis for an accepted settlement?

27. The timing of the present move is particularly unfortunate. It is especially regrettable that the Council should be divided just when Mr. Jarring, who has been entrusted with an important mission under resolution 242 (1967), has returned to New York to enter on a new and delicate phase of his work with far-reaching implications for the prospects of peace in the Middle East. This is surely a time for unity, not for division. We should not now divide over one problem but unite in full support of Mr. Jarring's important mission for peace in all its aspects, with the goal of finding an accepted settlement of the many outstanding problems in the Middle East.

28. Mr. SETTE CAMARA (Brazil): Mr. President, allow me first of all to express the satisfaction of the Brazilian delegation at seeing you preside over the deliberations of this Council. Allow me also to thank Mr. Malik of the Soviet Union for discharging in such a competent and skilful manner during April the heavy duties that now devolve upon you.

29. At this stage of the current Security Council debate on the question of Jerusalem, I wish to state briefly the position of my delegation in regard to this problem.

30. As Brazil is one of the founding Members of the United Nations, this question is not new to us. Twenty years ago Brazil voted for General Assembly resolution 181 (II), adopted on 29 November 1947, which created independent Jewish and Arab States in Palestine and established a special international régime for the city of Jerusalem under which that city would be considered a *corpus separatum* to be administered by the Trusteeship Council on behalf of the United Nations. Brazil also voted for General Assembly resolution 303 (IV), adopted on 9 December 1949, which *inter alia* restated the Assembly's intention "that Jerusalem should be placed under a permanent international régime, which should envisage appropriate guarantees for the protection of the Holy Places, both within and outside Jerusalem". At the time of the adoption of resolution 303 (IV) the Brazilian representative expressed in the General Assembly the firm hope of his Government that Israel and Jordan, notwithstanding the difficulties that were certain to arise, would co-operate loyally to abide by the Assembly's decision and faithfully carry out the plan endorsed by that organ.

31. Those high hopes remained unfulfilled as the situation in the Middle East deteriorated steadily in the wake of the armed conflicts of 1949, 1956 and 1967. During the fifth

emergency special session of the General Assembly my country once again had the opportunity of upholding those United Nations principles on Jerusalem. Brazil then proposed the placing of Jerusalem under permanent international administration, with special guarantees for the protection of the Holy Places within a *corpus separatum*, in full support of the suggestion made by His Holiness Pope Paul VI. Speaking before the General Assembly on 28 June 1967, the Foreign Minister of Brazil clearly expressed the deepest feelings of the Brazilian Government and people on the subject when he pointed out: "Jerusalem, symbol of love and hope, cannot continue being a source of hate and despair. It must be restored to its status as the City of God."¹ In keeping with those feelings, Brazil co-sponsored, during the same session, the so-called "Latin American draft resolution", which referred in its operative paragraph 4 to "the desirability of establishing an international régime for the city of Jerusalem".² Also during the fifth emergency special session Brazil gave its full support to resolutions 2253 (ES-V) of 4 July 1967 and 2254 (ES-V) of 14 July 1967.

32. It was in view of its consistent support of General Assembly decisions on the status of Jerusalem that my delegation voted for Security Council resolution 250 (1968) which called upon Israel "to refrain from holding the military parade in Jerusalem", held on 2 May 1968 in flagrant violation of a unanimous decision of the Council.

33. In giving the members of the Security Council this summary of the Brazilian position on the question of Jerusalem, my intention has been to emphasize the consistency with which my country has followed that position since the very first days of this Organization. In the course of the last twenty years Brazil has not accepted any unilateral action tending to alter the international status of Jerusalem and has not recognized any changes in this status as a result of unilateral actions by the Governments concerned, be it the Government of Jordan or the Government of Israel. For us, the problem of Jerusalem is not one of political accommodation or bargaining. It is a matter of principle, for it involves the religious feelings of Brazil's Arab and Jewish communities as it also involves the interests of its overwhelmingly Christian population. We deplored the violation by Jordan of the international status of Jerusalem as we now deplore the current violation committed by Israel. We will maintain this impartial position until the day comes when Jerusalem is fully restored to its status as the spiritual centre of three great world religions and of three great world civilizations.

34. As one of the sponsors of the Latin American draft resolution of the fifth emergency special session and as a member of this Council, Brazil made its contribution to the adoption of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which established the guidelines for an organic settlement of the question of the Middle East. We believe that the problem of

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1540th meeting, para. 6, principle 6.

² *Ibid.*, *Fifth Emergency Special Session, Annexes*, agenda item 5, document A/L.523/Rev.1.

Jerusalem should be solved in the context of this organic settlement, and we are very much encouraged by the recent news that we have had on the prospects of the Jarring mission.

35. This does not mean, however, that the Council should desist now from any action. Nor does it mean that any action we take here on permanent principles will necessarily prejudice the work being done by Mr. Jarring. On the contrary, my delegation believes that in the meantime the Security Council must make it clear, as the General Assembly has already done, that it rejects any measures taken by Israel which tend to alter the international status of Jerusalem and that it will not recognize any changes in that status resulting from such measures.

36. It is in the light of these considerations that the Brazilian delegation will vote for the revised draft resolution [S/8590/Rev.2] submitted by Pakistan and Senegal.

37. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Brazil for his kind reference to myself.

38. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): At yesterday's meeting of the Security Council the Soviet delegation expressed its views on the draft resolution on the situation in Jerusalem submitted by the delegations of Pakistan and Senegal [S/8590]. The changes which the co-sponsors have made today in the draft resolution do not change the substance of the text. The Soviet delegation therefore supports this draft resolution and will vote in its favour, although, as I said yesterday, it considers that the draft should condemn in more decisive terms Israel's unlawful expansionist activities in the Arab sector of the city of Jerusalem.

39. Despite the importance and urgency of the question now under discussion here, it has, as was noted yesterday, already been on the Council's agenda for nearly a month, and the Council has so far taken no effective steps to compel Israel to implement the well-known resolutions adopted by the fifth emergency special session and by the Security Council regarding Jerusalem, resolutions which called upon Israel to rescind the measures already taken to annex the Arab sector of the city and not to undertake any further unlawful measures in that city.

40. We cannot but ask how Israel's continued disregard of these United Nations resolutions can be explained and why the Security Council has been quite unjustifiably dilatory in enforcing the implementation of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council relating to the illegal measures undertaken by the Israel occupation authorities in Jerusalem. The Soviet delegation would like to express its views on these matters.

41. At a number of meetings the Security Council has considered a letter from the representative of Jordan [S/8560] and the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Jerusalem [S/8146]. The Council has also listened to statements by the representative of Jordan, the Mayor of Arab Jerusalem and the representatives of most member States of the Security Council. It has also listened

patiently to numerous statements by the representative of Israel, who has tried to divert the Security Council's attention from the question under discussion, namely, the arbitrary and illegal activities of the Israel occupation authorities in the Arab sector of Jerusalem. The Security Council, however, has rejected these unsuccessful attempts and adopted two resolutions [250 (1968) and 251 (1968)] which in substance condemn the unlawful, annexationist actions of the Israel invaders in Jerusalem, particularly in connexion with the military parade held on 2 May.

42. Analysing the course of the debate on this agenda item, we cannot avoid the conclusion that two fundamentally different lines have clearly emerged. The first, which is followed by the majority of the members of the Security Council, including the Soviet Union, is based on an evaluation of the activities of the Israel occupation authorities in the Arab sector of Jerusalem in the light of the fundamental principles of international law, and particularly of the principle whereby the appropriation of foreign territory by means of military conquest is unlawful, inadmissible and a contravention of the United Nations Charter. The majority of the members of the Council, including the Soviet Union, consider that Israel, by its annexationist activities in the Arab sector of Jerusalem, has flagrantly violated these principles, just as it has violated the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. On this premise, and being deeply concerned about the dangerous consequences of such actions on the part of Israel, most members of the Security Council, in strict observance of the United Nations Charter and of the provisions of the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, have demanded that Israel should rescind the measures already taken to annex the Arab sector of Jerusalem and refrain from such unlawful actions in the future.

43. The second line emerging from the discussions, apparent in the statements of only one or two representatives, notably the United States representative, can be summarized as follows: although these representatives cannot bring themselves openly to recognize as legal the annexationist activities of the Israel authorities in Jerusalem, they are attempting to persuade the Security Council to *de facto* acceptance of those activities as some kind of "temporary measures". Attempts have been made to represent the situation in such a way that the Security Council need not demand that the measures should be rescinded since, it is said, they are of a temporary nature and therefore have no effect on the status of Jerusalem either now or in the future. But how can such annexationist activities fail to affect the status of Jerusalem, when it is precisely by such measures that Israel is changing the status of the Arab sector of Jerusalem by illegally including it within the territory of Israel and Israelizing a city that does not belong to it? This position, as many members of the Security Council have pointed out, is in direct contravention of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on 4 and 14 July 1967 [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)] and of the Security Council decision of 22 November 1967 [resolution 242 (1967)]. It is clear to all that attempts to conceal these illegal activities of the aggressor are tantamount to encouraging further aggression.

This cannot but hinder not only the normalization of the situation in Jerusalem, but also the solution of the whole problem of a political settlement in the Middle East.

44. Two fundamentally different approaches to the question of the situation in Jerusalem have emerged clearly also at today's meeting of the Security Council. At the time of the preparation and submission of the draft resolution, the representatives of a number of countries are stubbornly attempting to advance their own policy of protecting and consequently encouraging the aggressor. The aim of this policy is to prevent the Security Council from taking an effective decision on the situation in Jerusalem. We hear it said that the adoption of a resolution condemning Israel's activities might complicate the whole Middle East question and jeopardize the success of the Jarring mission. Such arguments are fallacious; the facts tell another story. If we assess the situation in the Middle East objectively, we cannot fail to see that the only obstacle to a political settlement is the policy pursued by Israel and those who protect it.

45. There are no grounds whatsoever for failing to assess the annexationist activities of the Israeli occupiers as they should be assessed, condemning them and demanding that they cease and that the illegal steps already taken in regard to the Arab sector of Jerusalem be rescinded.

46. The general situation which has arisen in the Middle East as the result of Israel's aggression continues to be extremely tense and to threaten the peace and security of the peoples in that region. The eyes of the world are focused on that situation. Recently the Teheran International Conference on Human Rights adopted a resolution³ in which it expressed its grave concern for the violation of human rights by the Israel authorities in the territories of the Arab States occupied by Israel. The Conference particularly called on the Government of Israel to stop exercising tyranny and violence against the Arab population in these territories, to stop destroying the homes of the Arab population in the occupied regions and to implement the resolutions adopted at the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly and the Security Council resolution. This resolution adopted by the International Conference on Human Rights reflects a realization on the part of the vast majority of States of the need for greater urgency in abolishing the consequences of Israel's aggression.

47. In this connexion it should be noted that the Arab States have taken new constructive steps to create the most favourable situation for the implementation of the Security Council's resolution of 22 November 1967. As you know, they have not only expressed their readiness to implement that resolution and to co-operate with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Jarring, but have also proposed that a time-table be worked out for implementing the 22 November resolution. We must take advantage of this new initiative on the part of the Arab countries.

48. The next move must be made by Israel and, of course, along with Israel by its protectors and supporters. So far the Government of Israel has continued to put obstacles in the way of a political settlement in the Middle East and has done its utmost to hinder the implementation of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967. The statements recently made by the Prime Minister, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Defence Minister of Israel reaffirm the Government of Israel's determination virtually to disregard the Security Council resolution of 22 November and even, in reality, the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Jarring. The other day Defence Minister Dayan wrote a newspaper article full of threats against the Arab States and made it clear that Israel intends to disregard the decisions of the Security Council and the United Nations on the Middle East. He said in particular that Israel cannot be forced to withdraw to its former frontiers. The Israel Government's expansionist policy towards the Arab States is clearly expressed in this article. Threatening the Arabs Dayan declared that Israel "must be ready for a renewal of hostilities". Israel's threats against the Arab countries are supported by systematic acts of armed provocation against its Arab neighbours.

49. Every member of the Security Council knows that the Lebanese Government has just sent a letter *[S/8591]* to the President of the Council protesting against Israel's aggression against Lebanon. The letter stressed that the Israel authorities bore the full responsibility for the dangerous military incidents which took place on 12 May on the southern frontier of Lebanon, when armed Israel forces fired on a peaceful Lebanese village.

50. In connexion with this new act of hostility against the Arab side, the Tel Aviv radio broadcast a statement threatening to invade Lebanese territory and to annex the southern part of that country.

51. It is obvious that there can be no political settlement in the Middle East so long as Israel maintains such an aggressively obstructionist attitude. It is the duty of the Security Council to take all steps to achieve a political settlement in that region. Every State, and particularly the permanent members of the Security Council, must take every available opportunity to ensure that Israel implements the resolution adopted by the Security Council on 22 November 1967 and that it withdraws its troops from the occupied Arab territories to the positions from which they began their attack on the neighbouring Arab countries. Otherwise, the prestige of the Security Council, and indeed of the United Nations as a whole, will be dealt a serious blow. The peoples of the world will begin to lose faith in the ability of the United Nations to guarantee international peace and security.

52. The Soviet delegation wishes to stress that there should be no doubt in anyone's mind about the determination of the Soviet Union to bring about, together with other peace-loving States, an end to Israel's aggression against the Arab States, the abolition of all the consequences of that aggression, the return to their lawful owners of all the Arab territories seized as a result of the

³ See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.XIV.2), p. 5.

aggression and the achievement of a political settlement in the Middle East on the basis of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967.

53. The PRESIDENT: As there are no other representatives wishing to speak before the vote, I propose to put to the vote the revised draft resolution before us contained in document S/8590/Rev.2.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Algeria, Brazil, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Hungary, India, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, United States of America.

The revised draft resolution was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.⁴

54. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of their votes after the vote.

55. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): The Council has just reached a decision on the draft resolution submitted by Pakistan and Senegal [S/8590/Rev.2]. I would like briefly to explain the reasons which led my delegation to vote in favour of it.

56. At the Council's 1417th meeting, on 27 April, I made the following statement:

"Over the many years during which the Middle East question has been discussed in the United Nations, Paraguay has always considered that Jerusalem should be under an international régime, in conformity with United Nations decisions for which we voted.

"To cite a further example, this position was recently confirmed by the inclusion of a special operative paragraph in the draft resolution which my delegation, together with other Latin American delegations, submitted at the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly. During that same session, prompted likewise by its concern to preserve the international status of Jerusalem, my delegation supported resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V).

"In the general context of the Middle East problem, this is my country's attitude towards the specific question of Jerusalem." [See 1417th meeting, paras. 57 to 59.]

57. As far as my delegation is concerned, the preservation of the international status of Jerusalem in accordance with the decisions of the General Assembly is of prime importance. We consider that, despite the *de facto* situation, those provisions are still legally valid and we feel that the

resolution that has just been adopted contributes to the preservation of that international status. This being the case, all legislative and administrative measures taken by Israel that might change that international status are without validity, in our eyes, and will inevitably remain so.

58. These are the reasons for my delegation's favourable vote.

59. Before concluding my statement, I would like to express my delegation's gratitude to the sponsors of the draft resolution for taking account of our comments on the original text we discussed and for agreeing not only to the amendments we suggested to that text but also to certain deletions we asked them to make. We are also particularly grateful to you, Mr. President, for your valuable suggestions today which resulted in the second, revised version of the draft text we have just transformed into a resolution.

60. Mr. BORCH (Denmark): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution on Jerusalem, now adopted by this Council. Having done so, I wish to stress that we deeply deplore the fact that the genuine efforts made during recent weeks with a view to producing a compromise text which would gather the unanimous support of the Council did not succeed. Already, this lack of unanimity in itself leads us to doubt the political expediency of adopting that resolution, and my country voted in favour of it only because, in consequence of the position taken by my country previously in the General Assembly, we could not in principle disagree with its contents. Nor do we believe that the adoption of such resolutions on isolated questions is the proper means by which to bring closer a solution of the Middle East problem. That solution must be a comprehensive one, on the basis of the endeavours of Mr. Jarring and in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. The resolution, therefore, in our view, ought to have had a reference to resolution 242 (1967), and we find it not only deplorable but also surprising that such a reference could not be made.

61. In conclusion, I wish to express our strong hope that all concerned, including the parties and all members of this Council, will whole-heartedly and with energy and goodwill support Mr. Jarring's mission and work for a peaceful and accepted settlement in the Middle East in accordance with the provisions and principles of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

62. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Jordan.

63. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): My delegation expresses its satisfaction at the adoption of the resolution concerning the illegal measures adopted by the Israelis in Jerusalem. This resolution reaffirms the two resolutions adopted by the Assembly in July and deplores the failure of Israel to comply with them. It reaffirms the established international principle that the acquisition of territory by military conquest is inadmissible and therefore emphasizes the validity of the concept of territorial integrity whereby no territorial acquisition or any advantages may be obtained by force or by any other coercion. Thus the resolution

⁴ See resolution 252 (1968).

categorically considers that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel which tend to change the legal status of Jerusalem are invalid and cannot change that status. Furthermore, it called upon Israel in clear terms to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any further actions or measures of that nature. The Security Council also decided to remain seized of the matter and to consider the question further in the light of the Secretary-General's report on the effective implementation of the resolution.

64. We pay a tribute to the Security Council for taking this firm and urgent action. My delegation would like to thank all members which sponsored the resolution and those which worked and voted for it. A special tribute should be paid to Member States of the Latin American, African and Asian groups which worked diligently to protect the principles enshrined in our Charter and to safeguard the integrity of one of the main organs of the United Nations, namely, the General Assembly.

65. The seven Latin American, African and Asian members of the Security Council represent the three major continents. They also represent a new and vital force—a force for justice, equity and peace. This group of nations has already shown its effectiveness as a voice for morality and for upholding the great values enshrined in our Charter.

66. I should like to be quite candid and mention specifically the great contribution and constructive efforts of Ambassador Sette Camara of Brazil, who unfortunately will be bidding us farewell soon. His work in the United Nations will always stand out as a shining example of courage and sense of justice.

67. I should like to thank Paraguay and its distinguished representative, Ambassador Solano López for the part they played in reaching this just and fair conclusion.

68. Ambassador Ibrahima Boye of Senegal was most instrumental in putting the situation in Jerusalem most brilliantly before the Security Council. His statesmanship shows itself very well in the paragraphs of the resolution that was just adopted.

69. The continuous stand for justice shown by India and Pakistan has been quite self-evident throughout this unfortunate crisis. We are most grateful to them for their continued and firm support.

70. It has been shown here today that Jerusalem has many friends. The positions of France, Ethiopia, Denmark, the United Kingdom and China are shining evidence of this. My delegation expresses its deepest gratitude to both the Soviet Union and Hungary which consistently and without reservation supported our just cause.

71. On behalf of my Government and my people, including those in Jerusalem, and the elected Mayor of Jerusalem, I should like to thank all those who consistently stood up for justice, freedom and the rights of man.

72. Many attempts were made to reach unanimity—and my delegation exerted every possible effort to help mem-

bers reach such unanimity without endangering our legal rights. Unanimous action may enhance the prestige of the Security Council and may also help small members like my country—the more so when just resolutions and decisions are coupled with unanimity. I am sure most of us agree that unanimity cannot precede just solutions on the ladder of priorities or else the cost will be higher than the returns, and the means become the ends in themselves. The cost will be to forego principles and rights that this Council is here to defend and cannot afford to sacrifice. The principles of conciliation and compromise, which may yield some results in disputable issues, cannot but endanger a case where there is an aggressor on one side and a victim on the other. Under no circumstances should this Council, if it is to be consistent with itself and its duties, or any Member State in this Council, equate the aggressor with the victim. Those who drafted the Charter and created this main organ of the United Nations never intended it to function through unanimity when the price of this was the very values which this organ is intended to protect.

73. The situation in Jerusalem is a very clear case of aggression and a deliberate attempt by one Member to annex the territories of another Member against the overwhelming will of the Member States of the United Nations. Jordan, the victim, cannot yield to coercion or to pressure. Jordan does not stand alone in this respect. It has the Charter and the majority of Member States in the Assembly and the Security Council behind it.

74. I have already reminded the Council that fourteen members of this body supported the Assembly injunction against Israel last July on the Jerusalem situation; only one Council member was among the delegations that abstained in the Assembly. I have referred to this in the past. By “only one member” I meant one member around this table: only one Council member was among the delegations that abstained in the Assembly. At least that member, for whatever unknown reason it may have, continued to be consistent in its stand. But we cannot but express regret about another abstention. Nothing has changed since the adoption of the two Assembly resolutions—I say, nothing, other than further illegal measures and continued defiance by the authorities of Tel Aviv. This makes it more imperative to reaffirm the previous stand. This body is the law-enforcing organ of the United Nations; there is no room for abstention in the face of reckless acts of lawlessness.

75. We agree that the resolution just adopted by the Security Council should have been a unanimous resolution. That is the minimum expected from the Council by Jordan, and particularly by the people of Jerusalem. In fact, this measure should have been taken a long time ago, and the same Powers that spoke to us this afternoon about being wise, being realistic, being practical, being peace-loving are the very same Powers responsible for the split in the Council. The argument is an old one; it has a background going back to last August. It is only fair, since this question of being realistic and wise and practical was raised, to acquaint the Council with the background. We wanted to come to the Council for action in August last year—1967—but the so-called friends of Jordan asked us to wait. They said: “Let the capitals have a chance to consider the July

resolutions; let them ponder, exchange views, and digest what happened; do not push them to hasty debate in the Security Council; give your friends a chance to help you; let quiet diplomacy, not public debate, play its part; you need your friends."

76. It is true that Jordan badly needs friends. We therefore waited. We said: "Those are our friends; they mean well; they want to help; let us give them a chance; let us not antagonize them; they can make our task in the Council difficult."

77. Therefore, we did not seek an urgent meeting in August 1967; we waited. We simply kept the Council informed of every Israeli violation. We sent one letter after another, citing legislative and administrative measures and other Israeli violations, referring to the bulldozing of Arab lands and property, the destruction of Arab dwellings and trespassing on Arab lands, and referring also to the expulsion of Arab leaders and people.

78. The delegations of the Arab States also sent a joint complaint on Jerusalem. Later, to our disappointment, no quiet diplomacy, no action, no real and genuine help was rendered to the victim, Jordan. Instead, we discovered that the inaction on the part of the Council encouraged more Israeli violations. So on 27 April 1968 we came to the Security Council, only to hear again that we were not being realistic, not being wise, not being practical. Now our friends tell us again: "Why rescind what has happened? Let us just call on Israel to refrain from committing such acts; be wise and practical and realistic and accept this; this is enough."

79. To this we said: "What if Israel continues: would the Security Council then rescind the violations?" To this we received no satisfactory answer. We repeated the question time and again: "What if we come back next month, saying Israel is continuing: would you then rescind the violations?" To that we received no answer. Instead, we heard the statement this afternoon that we should call upon all the parties concerned to refrain from such actions and measures.

80. I know of only two parties—Jordan and Israel. One is the complainant and the other is the party against which Jordan is complaining; and the essence of the problem—the whole complaint—is Jerusalem. What are we doing in Jerusalem? Who are the parties? Is there not one single victim of the aggression, and one committing the violation? So to hear all parties is a clear attempt to serve another, irrelevant purpose—something that has nothing to do with Jerusalem.

81. Again we heard something about resolution 242 (1967) as the touchstone for the settlement of all phases of the problem. I have not come here for a settlement of any problem now in this complaint: I have come here to beg the Council for action to stop violations and to rescind violations in order to help the man working for a solution to work properly and in order to contribute to the success of his mission.

82. Instead of my question being answered, Mr. Jarring's mission was raised as an excuse; attempts were made to put Mr. Jarring in the picture, although we are here seeking and requesting an interim measure, not a solution. Jerusalem is part and parcel of the territories on which a resolution was taken calling for the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict. I have come here only for an interim measure. Voices were heard saying that Mr. Jarring is coming. We have seen members showing grave concern and deep interest in helping Mr. Jarring, telling us that any action to be taken by the Council will affect the mission of the Secretary-General's Special Representative.

83. I have inquired whether or not Mr. Jarring expressed or implied, by cable or by letter, or by any other means of communication, any concern about whether what was going on in the Council would affect his mission. I was told that at no stage of our deliberations did Mr. Jarring express any concern or apprehension about any possible adverse effect on his mission of the debates and of the measures contemplated. If that is the case, do those who express concern about Mr. Jarring really and genuinely and sincerely contribute to the success of his mission?

84. Do not all these attempts encourage the Israeli authorities to continue their arrogance and to continue their violations and defiance of United Nations will, instead of helping the Council to put an end to Israeli violations? I refuse to believe that the rescinding of invalid measures, in conformity with the injunction endorsed by ninety-nine Members of the United Nations, is harmful to Mr. Jarring's mission. I refuse to believe that a decision deploring the continued failure of Israel to show any regard for the two General Assembly resolutions is not helpful to Mr. Jarring's mission. I refuse to believe that deploring this failure does not strengthen Mr. Jarring's hand.

85. It is not Jordan, it is the Israeli authorities which are actively attempting to weaken the mission of a man who is genuinely endeavouring to bring peace to our troubled area. We certainly want Mr. Jarring's mission to succeed. We have done everything possible to help Mr. Jarring, but should his mission fail, it will not be Jordan which will be responsible for that failure. The responsibility for failure should rest squarely on those who pay lip service to peace. Indeed, the same Powers that show concern in the Council about Mr. Jarring's mission have not uttered a word in the Council against the party really responsible for obstructing the efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, and it is this inaction which encouraged Israel to continue its violations.

86. All the members will recall that at the meeting of this Council held on 23 March 1968, in answer to a question put by me, Mr. Tekoah said:

"... we do accept the goal of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 to establish a just and lasting peace by agreement..." [1406th meeting, para. 52].

87. Later, at the 1418th meeting on 1 May 1968, answering another question, Mr. Tekoah said:

"...my Government has indicated its acceptance of the Security Council resolution for the promotion of agreement on the establishment of a just and durable peace. I am also authorized to reaffirm that we are willing to seek agreement with each Arab State on all the matters included in that resolution." [1418th meeting, para. 111.]

88. According to *The New York Times* of today:

"Israel declared again today that she would not retreat from any occupied territory until a peace treaty had been signed with the Arabs after direct talks. The Government warned that it was ready to fight to defend the new frontiers."

89. What would those who raised Mr. Jarring's mission as one of their excuses say to this Israeli policy based on misrepresentation and deceit? I have not heard them say a word about this. Why do they not raise their voices in this Council to save Mr. Jarring's mission when this serious threat can be seen so clearly? Why this manoeuvring in the Council when the issue is very clear? Why is there a lack of unanimity on a resolution which is the result of hard word and a real desire on the part of all who drafted it to reach unanimity? We are not creating difficulties for the Council or for Mr. Jarring. We are simply reacting to Israeli actions, Israeli violations and Israeli defiance, and it is our earnest hope that this Council in the future will be able to reach unanimity on measures to be taken if Israeli violations continue. If the Israelis make it imperative that further action should be taken in this respect, including the measures prescribed in Article 41 of the Charter, we hope that through the determination of the friends of Jerusalem such action will be taken.

90. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Israel.

91. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): The Security Council has ended its deliberations on Jerusalem. Through the morass of acrimony and abuse, the truth about Jerusalem emerges more clearly than ever. Jerusalem faithful to its history, Jerusalem at peace at last, reunited again, Jerusalem where Christian, Moslem and Jew live side by side, work together and create together. Jerusalem of the Holy Places, venerated and secure, beckoning to worshippers and pilgrims of all faiths, from all parts of the world. Jerusalem the workshop of understanding and coexistence between Israeli and Arab. Nothing can tarnish the truth about Jerusalem. Nothing can change its reality. Nothing can overshadow its glory.

92. Fully conscious of its international obligations, respectful of the universal interests in the city, inspired by Jerusalem's rejuvenation, the Government of Israel will do all in its power to ensure the welfare of the city and the happiness of its people.

93. The principles of the Charter, the precept of equality of all Member States, the fundamental right to peace and

security will guide us with regard to the resolution adopted today by the Security Council. The resolution is neither practical nor reasonable. It ignores reality and disregards Israel's basic rights. It seeks to violate the natural unity of Jerusalem and to overlook the interests of Jerusalem's inhabitants and their welfare. It advocates the return to the nightmare of separation and religious discrimination. It does not contribute to the attainment of peace. On the contrary it is designed to serve as a weapon in the pursuance of Arab belligerency against Israel. It does not bring closer the prospects of understanding between the parties but further deepens the abyss between them.

94. When, in 1948, the Arab States took up arms in defiance of the United Nations and launched their aggressive attack against Israel and Jerusalem, little international concern was expressed; when Jerusalem was shelled and bombarded and its population brought to starvation, the Security Council remained silent. When for twenty years there existed an occupation by Jordan resulting from aggression, when for twenty years access to the Western Wall was barred, when ancient synagogues were deliberately destroyed by the Jordanian Government, when any idea of agreement with world religious interests was rejected by the occupying Power, the Security Council remained silent.

95. Where was the Security Council in those hours of trial and agony? Where was the Security Council when Jordan again launched an onslaught against Jerusalem last June? Where was it when Jordan refused to make peace? Where was the Security Council when Jordan openly declared the intention to continue its warfare against Israel by raid and terror?

96. Now, a whole year after the barriers fell in Jerusalem, now when Jews and Arabs live side by side in peace and work together in coexistence, when reconstruction and restoration are well on their way, and above all, when, for the first time in twenty years, access to the Holy Places is universal and complete, guaranteed by law and open to constructive dialogue with the universal religious interests involved, the Security Council hastens to evince concern.

97. To be of any consequence, a resolution must first of all be realistic and equitable. Is the world really to believe that there is an international principle whereby Jerusalem must be divided against the wishes of its citizens, its Jews and Arabs separated, access to some of the Holy Places denied? The resolution would have us reinstall the barbed wire and minefields which have been removed and rescind measures which have brought normalcy and peace to a city artificially bisected for nineteen years.

98. It is, of course, regrettable that some still find it possible to support the revival of military confrontation and chaos in Jerusalem. The people of Jerusalem, however, cannot be expected to welcome the weird idea that they should be amputated and sacrificed on the altar of belligerency. To suggest this to them would be contrary to all the principles of international law, of morality and justice.

99. At this point I should like to reiterate Israel's intention to ensure fully the universal character of the Holy

Places themselves, Christian as well as Moslem, and to seek arrangements to this effect with the authoritative representatives of the faiths concerned. This policy has been repeatedly enunciated by Israel and is being pursued constantly in practice.

100. We appreciate the attitude of the Member States that have dissociated themselves from the resolution.

101. In the past I have had occasion to draw attention to the disabilities of the Security Council when it comes to deal with questions of the twenty-year Arab war against Israel. The resolution now adopted does not change or add to the known pattern of Security Council resolutions on the Middle East situation. It adds, however, to the determination of the people of Israel to gird themselves with even greater fortitude for the defence of their rights and the pursuit of peace and security, despite the malice of those who have injured us and despite injustice born in error.

102. After twenty years of war it is evident beyond any doubt that peaceful and accepted settlement rather than Security Council resolutions will resolve the Israel-Arab conflict. Indeed, the choice lies once again with the Arab States: the choice between continued acrimony and the search for understanding; between contests of public debate and quiet constructive effort; between warfare by terror, threat, inequitable resolutions on the one hand and agreement on the other; the choice between impasse and solution. We hope to be able to make progress towards agreement and peace. We still await, however, an indication from the Arab States that they too are ready to join in a common effort in this direction.

103. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Jordan in exercise of his right of reply.

104. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): On the question of normalcy and peace in Jerusalem, I would simply like to read to the Council a piece of information which has just come from Jerusalem. It states:

"A delegation of six well-known Palestinian Arabs of the old city of Jerusalem yesterday sent a new petition to General Odd Bull, the representative of U Thant for supervising the cease-fire, in which they support the initiatives taken by the Arab States at the United Nations regarding the status of Jerusalem.

"This petition, signed in particular by the Arab Mayors of Nablus, Jennin and Tulkarim, as well as by other well-known Palestinian intellectuals and businessmen, has in addition been countersigned by hundreds of inhabitants of Jerusalem and the west bank of Jordan.

"This delegation of distinguished people has asked General Odd Bull to transmit the text of their petition to Thant and Jarring. Copies have been sent to all foreign consulates in Jerusalem."

105. This is an answer to the additional fabrication which we heard this afternoon to the effect that everything was normal and peaceful.

106. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel.

107. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I do not think that it is necessary to go beyond the report read out by the representative of Jordan to prove how really normal and peaceful life can be in Jerusalem and on the west bank if people are free to speak their minds, and I hope that at some future point this will be the situation as far as the Jewish population of the Arab States is concerned.

108. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Jordan.

109. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): Since the question is one of freedom and of will, the will of the people as expressed here is to get rid of the occupier and to ask the conqueror to move out. So, if there is this kind of willingness on the part of the Israelis to give them the right to express their will, this is their will, and the Israelis should show their desire to heed the will of the people and get out of the occupied area. The answer to occupation is going to be liberation, unless the methods of peace are really used effectively by every member at this table.

110. The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers in our debate, but before I adjourn the meeting I would exercise my own right to speak, not as President but on behalf of the UNITED KINGDOM.

111. Nearly a month ago I restated in this Council the attitude and policy of my Government at this critical stage in our efforts to promote a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

112. I said first that my Government stands firmly by the statements we have made and the votes we have cast both in the Assembly and in this Council on the question of the future of Jerusalem. I said that all that has since taken place has reinforced the views which we have publicly and clearly and repeatedly stated. By the vote I cast today we have confirmed and reaffirmed the policy which we have throughout maintained.

113. But at the same time I emphasized, as all the time I have tried to emphasize, that there should be one overriding aim, an aim which transcends all others. I said then that I trusted that from now on the whole weight of the Council would again be thrown into an effort to turn from recrimination to a renewed productive and constructive advance towards the settlement to which we are all publicly committed, and which all the peoples of the Middle East so desperately need.

114. In the past four weeks I have consequently directed every effort of argument and persuasion to a single, simple proposition. That proposition is that what we need to do now is to proceed together in full unity on the common ground of general agreement. I have argued for that proposition as representative of my country and as President of this Council. I was convinced that common ground existed—limited, it is true, but certain and firm. We all know from our long consultations the extent of the area of

agreement. We could have advanced confidently and unanimously on that basis. I dearly hoped that we should all see the need, at this time more than ever, not to dispute and divide but to advance together and so give maximum weight to the authority of the Council as an instrument for peace. I greatly regret that my appeal has not been successful. I am bound to say that I have felt at times in our long consultations that not all of us have put first the pursuit of the search for success in an ultimate settlement. Nevertheless I trust that we can now turn once again to our main aim in an atmosphere not of rancour but of reason.

115. In this long-drawn-out tragedy of the Middle East, the search for common ground was undertaken last year. We succeeded on 22 November. Moreover, our efforts to provide the structure of a settlement have not been repudiated. They have not even been questioned. On the contrary, they have been increasingly accepted. There has been a growing realization, a steadily mounting certainty, that only by proceeding along the road we took last November can disaster be averted.

116. Our confidence in the Secretary-General's representative, Mr. Gunnar Jarring, has not been diminished. His patient and persistent endeavours have reinforced the admiration we all feel for a statesman of such skill and such discretion and such courageous perseverance.

117. In many of the disputes and conflicts of the world we grope for some basis, for some beginning, for some method of making a start towards a settlement. In the Middle East we are past that stage. We know what the basis of the solution must be. We have all agreed on the principles to be applied. Moreover, we have agreed on how we should proceed to put those principles into effect. We all welcomed the appointment of Mr. Jarring by the

Secretary-General. What we need now is not the basis for a settlement. We have it already. We do not need a new method of working towards a settlement. We have that already too. What we need now is not further debate in this Council. To come back to the Council repeatedly in a spirit of renewed dispute and piecemeal pugnacity can only do harm. We should strongly disapprove of that.

118. Now that this debate is finished, it is the most earnest wish of my Government, as I believe it is the wish of us all, that we should all support and encourage and facilitate the efforts to put agreed provisions and principles into practical effect. Let us put behind us wrangles on wording and exercises in animosity and diversions in disagreement. We should be partisans only for peace. We should show that we have the goodwill and the good sense to put everything aside except further effort finally to achieve a just peace.

119. As we have continued our consultations and our debate we have heard daily of acts of violence and declarations of hostility. We think of the thousands of innocent people who suffer in want and hardship and fear. Surely we must all recognize the urgency of pressing on with the work, for the purpose stated in our unanimous resolution of last November and repeated in the resolution we have just passed. It is a just and lasting peace we work for. Nothing else and nothing less must be our urgent concern and our overriding preoccupation.

120. As our proceedings have been concluded, I shall bring our debate to an end. Unless there is some objection, I propose to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre librairie ou adressez-vous à: Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Приводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
